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Thesis 4418
In a petition to the Earl of Halifax in 1752, a Mr. Andrew Read of Maryland complained that "the Jesuits have large estates, well stocked and cultivated by tenants and slaves, . . . and frequently prevail on theirs to leave them more land." 1 Read, out of fear, jealousy, or bigotry, distrusted these Jesuits in Maryland who, he continued, were known to "correspond with the enemies and to dissuade the Indians from peace with us." 2

An historian reading Mr. Read's statement today would say that his words typified the Anti-Papist or Anti-Catholic feeling prevalent in Maryland at that time. 3 The fact that the Jesuits owned large estates might not seem particularly strange to him. The Church had traditionally possessed large tracts of land to finance its work. The fact, however, that Jesuit priests condoned slavery and even owned slaves might arouse the historian's curiosity.

1Petition of Mr. Andrew Read to the Earl of Halifax, Old Records, Saint Thomas', 1752, MS, Maryland Province Archives, Provincial's Residence, 5704 Roland Ave., Baltimore, Md., 4 1/2. Maryland Province Archives hereafter abbreviated MPA.

2Ibid.

Other historians before me have explored different problems relating to the question of the Jesuit ownership of slaves. Fr. Joseph Zwinge, S.J., in his study of the Jesuit farms in Maryland in Woodstock Letters (1912), presented a rather detailed account of the everyday life of the Jesuit slave and the conditions under which he lived. As Procurator of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus, Zwinge had ready access to the documents on the farms and the slaves, and he possessed a good knowledge of the physical layout of the farms, most of which were still owned by the Jesuits in 1912. He also had the opportunity of speaking with one former Jesuit-owned slave named Aunt Louisa who had been a house servant and who was a descendant of one of the first slave families of the Jesuits. Unfortunately, Zwinge used no footnotes and glossed over the important issue of the contentment of the slaves. Thomas Hughes, S.J., in volume II of his text on the History of the Society of Jesus in North America devoted a few pages to the Jesuits slaves. He gave a quick rundown of the conditions they experienced and spoke briefly on the Jesuits' slaves' benign acceptance of their status. In chapters two and three of her history of American Catholic Opinion in the Slavery Controversy, Madeleine Hooke Rice spoke of how the Jesuits and other religious orders in the United
States treated their slaves both on a practical and spiritual basis. In recent years, Fr. Robert Judge, S.J., wrote in *Woodstock Letters* (1959) an article entitled "The Foundation and First Administration of the Maryland Province." Here he has given us a fine study of the sale of most of the Jesuits' slaves in 1838. Finally, in 1960, Edwin Beitzel, in his history of the Jesuit Missions of St. Mary's County, merely has reiterated what Zwinge had presented on this matter. Except for Zwinge, no one has attempted up to this time to give a full treatment of the question of the Jesuits' slaves. A new study on this subject, therefore, has been long overdue.

In my research I have relied heavily on the Archives of the Maryland Province at the Provincial's residence in Baltimore. Contained in those archives are the account books of the various farms of the Maryland Province and most of the correspondence on the slaves of the Jesuits during the period from 1710 to 1840. The Georgetown College Archives and Hughes' two volumes of documents in his *History of the Society of Jesus in North America: Colonial and Federal* have also been most helpful. I also found Kenneth Stampp's *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Anti-Bellum South* most useful for comparing the life of the Jesuit owned slave with that of the average bondsman in the South.
With this evidence I hope to answer four questions: How did the Jesuits practically and theoretically justify their owning slaves? How did they treat their slaves? Did the Jesuit owned slaves ever express discontent with their status? Was the slave system, in the long run, profitable on the Jesuit farms?

A special thanks should go to Dr. Richard Walsh, my mentor, and Dr. Ronald Johnson, my reader, for their helpful suggestions on improving this thesis.
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CHAPTER I
THE NECESSITY AND THEORETICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR OWNING SLAVES

PART I
THE PRACTICAL NECESSITY

When the Maryland Mission of the Society of Jesus became a Province in 1833, the Jesuits owned six estates in Maryland, altogether totalling 11,740 acres. 1 The Jesuits acquired these six farms by right of colonization, by purchase, or by bequest. Having transported fifty-nine servants to Maryland in the 1630's, Fr. Thomas Copley, S.J., obtained the 3,000 acres of St. Inigoes Manor in St. Mary's County and most of the 4,500 acres of St. Thomas' Manor in Charles County in 1649 according to Lord Baltimore's "Conditions of Plantations." 2 In 1668 Fr. Henry Warren, S.J.,
The first 150 acres of the 1,150 acres of the Bohemia estate in 1833 came as a bequest from Marian O'Daniel to Fr. Thomas Mansell, S.J., in 1706. In 1728, Mr. James Carroll generously willed the 2,000 acres of the White Marsh estate in Prince George's County to Fr. George Thorold, Superior of the Maryland Mission. In June of 1765, Fr. Joseph Mosley, S.J., founded St. Joseph's farm at Tuchahoe in Talbot County with his purchase of 207 acres.

Since the Jesuits both acquired and held their land on the same conditions as other people, Fr. Thorold warned each priest manager of the four redidences in 1726 to "have sixteen; two thousand acres for every settler who brought five others with him."


Ibid., nos. 28, 38 and 48, pp. 207-8; 220-1; 223. The Society of Jesus in the eighteenth century gradually purchased the remainder of the Bohemia estate. See Devitt, op. cit., "Chapter IX, Bohemia," WL 63 (Feb., 1934): 3-5.


Ibid., no. 95 F and G, pp. 331-2; Fr. George Hunter's Day Book Memoranda, 1765, MS, MPA, 172 C; Fr. Joseph Mosley's Diary and Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph's Talbot, June, 1765, MS, MPA, 62 b-M. By 1830, St. Joseph's farm was 340 acres; see Hughes, ed., Documents, op. cit., I, part I, no. 114 C, p. 379.
always a will by him, whereby he bequeaths all his private estate both real and personal...and to name two or three of ours, lest possibly our land become escheat." Thus, the Jesuits kept their property intact by a regular succession of wills and deeds. Similarly, the Jesuits paid quit rents to the Lord Proprietor, later on, county and state land taxes, taxes on slaves and various other types of government levies. When the Jesuits faced suppression in 1773 they formed the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen in order to maintain legal tenure of all the property belonging to the Society of Jesus in Maryland. Thus, when the society of Jesus was canonically reestablished in 1805, the Jesuits were legally able to repossess their lands.

The Jesuits divided their estates into two kinds of farms—the home farm with its extension, the plantation, and the tenant farms. The proceeds of the home farm supported the residence and its work. The Province treasury or Arca would receive the rents of the tenants together with any surplus from the plantation.

---

7Old Records, St. Thomas', 1726, MS, MPA, 4 1/2.


The home farm was practically self-sufficient. On it there were a main residence for the priests, a house for the overseer, and quarters for the slaves. All the estates had grist mills, and three, St. Inigoes, St. Thomas', and Newtown had wind mills.\textsuperscript{11} To shelter the horses, hogs, sheep, cattle, chickens, geese, and ducks, there were a barn, a hen house, and a cow house. Each farm also had a kitchen house or a smoke house where a slave woman would pickle the beef and mutton for the Fathers and salt the pork for the slaves. There were also tanyards where the cattle hides would be curried and tanned to make shoes. From the cattle they would extract beef tallow to make candles for liturgical services and for house use.\textsuperscript{12} At St. Inigoes there was a separate corn house to store the corn. Both Newtown and St. Inigoes possessed warehouses where the tobacco of the different farms would be kept and cured before sale.\textsuperscript{13} The home farms all had blacksmith shops and sometimes a weaving house where the linens of the Fathers and the clothes for the slaves would be made.\textsuperscript{14} Finally, each estate had its

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 72.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., pp. 57-8.

\textsuperscript{13} Fr. George Hunter's Day Book Memoranda, 1766, MS, MPA, 172 C.

\textsuperscript{14} Fr. Thomas Pulton, Account Book, St. Thomas', 1741-3, MS, MPA, 172 A.
store which according to Fr. Thomas Pulton, S.J., in 1741 would "supply men & tenants with cloth, wooden shoes, stockings, breeches, rum etc." The tenants would furnish most of the materials for the store at regular prices and store accounts would be balanced with other accounts. 15

The Jesuits needed a rather large and varied work force to cultivate all their lands and to provide the necessary services to run their estates. From the establishment of St. Inigoes in the 1630's to the sale of their slaves in 1838, the Jesuits like other Maryland planters looked to three different systems of labor--bond servitude, Negro slavery and free wage labor--to supply a sufficient work force for their farms. The choice of one labor force over the other chiefly depended on the availability of men from any one of these three sources of labor. 16

15 Brother Joseph Mobberly's Diary, 1819, p. 135, MS, Georgetown College Archives, Georgetown University Library, Washington, D.C. 20007, 4.4 1/2 I. Brother Mobberly has a map of the buildings on the home farm of St. Inigoes in 1819 on page 134 of his Diary. Georgetown College Archives will be hereafter abbreviated as GCA.

16 For a brief discussion of these three systems of labor and the availability of men from these systems during this two hundred year period of Maryland History see James M. Wright, "The Free Negro in Maryland," Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, ed. by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, XCVII, no. 222 (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1921), pp. 11-18.
In the 1630's the Jesuit Fathers transported fifty-nine bond servants to Maryland. Matthias Sousa who came in 1633 and Francisco who arrived in 1635 were mulattoes and probably among the first blacks transported to Maryland.17

By 1638 the terms of service of some of the servants brought over in 1633 had expired, and the Fathers had to look for more servants in Virginia.18 The Annual Letter of 1638 mentioned that they had bought two Catholic bond servants in Virginia.19 That same year, they purchased four other servants there to do their domestic chores.20


18Ibid, Text, I, p. 337.

19Ibid., Documents, I, part I, no. 8 G, p. 112; Clayton Colman Hall, ed., Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684, Original Narratives of Early American History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910) p. 123. On page 115, Mr. Hall mentions that "The Annual Letters of the Provincials of the Society of Jesus are the reports they were required to make to the General of the Society at Rome of the chief events of the province during the preceding year, and in particular of the results accomplished by the Jesuit fathers in the missionary fields. The letters of the Provincials are compilations from the reports which they themselves received from those under their jurisdiction. The Maryland mission was included in the English Province, and therefore reports concerning it are contained in the letters of the English Provincial."

Fr. Andrew White, S.J., a few years after his arrival in 1633, took some of the servants to Mettapany on the Patuxent. For several years, the servants cultivated the land there for Fr. White. After their term of service was over, the servants rented the same land from the Jesuits. Four of these men—Henry Bishop, Richard Lusted, John Bryant, and Nicholas Harvey—actually sat in the first Assembly of Maryland in 1638. Later on, the Jesuits continued their policy of leasing their lands out to their former indentured servants at St. Inigoes, St. Thomas', and Newtown.

In 1645 there were twenty-one bond servants at St. Inigoes. Half were farm hands. The others served as domestics or mission helpers. That same year, a Captain Richard Ingle, who together with Captain William Clairborne was leading a rebellion against the Catholic governor, Leonard Calvert, raided St. Inigoes and drove the servants away. After the

21 Zwinge, "Our Fathers in the Colonization of Maryland," op. cit., p. 87. On pages 88-91 of the same article Zwinge has noted that the chief of the Patuxents gave the land at Mattapany to the Jesuits in the 1630's. Due to a law passed by the Maryland Assembly in 1642 which stated that all Indian grants of lands to settlers were invalid, the Jesuits eventually lost all claim to their land at Mettapany in 1662.

22 Ibid., p. 87.

raid one of the servants named John Howard refused to return until actually arrested. Another servant John Kekcape did not come back at all. 24

In 1655 the Puritains rebelled in Maryland and for three years took charge of the government there. That year, they attacked the Jesuit houses and robbed them of almost all their property "private and domestic." 25 When Lord Baltimore regained control of Maryland, the Jesuits were forced to build up their estates again. By this time, however, indentured servants were harder to find, and by 1696 there were only two at St. Inigo's. 26

Normally the Jesuits could expect only four to seven years of service from their indentured servants. Thus, they regularly had to replenish the supply of laborers for their plantations. Although there were some tenants on their farms at the beginning of the eighteenth century, there were still not enough to farm all their land profitably. Instead of remaining as tenants on the Jesuit farms, many of the indentured servants probably sought their own property, perhaps in western Maryland or in other areas of

24 Ibid., 41 (Feb., 1912): 54-5.
western Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Like other planters in eighteenth century Maryland, the Jesuits witnessed the gradual decline of indentured servitude and the rapid rise of slavery and the slave trade.\textsuperscript{27} In response to this trend, the Jesuits bought and sometimes inherited slaves to cultivate their lands.

One of the last living former Jesuit owned slaves in 1912, Aunt Louisa, told Fr. Zwinge that her slave ancestors came to Maryland as a gift from Baltimore to the Jesuits. If this were true, Zwinge has pointed out, the two servants working at St. Inigoes in 1696 might very well have been black slaves.\textsuperscript{28} The first clear mention of the Jesuits' slaves in the records comes in 1717 in Fr. George Hunter's deed of the Newtown estate to Thomas Jameson of Charles County.\textsuperscript{29} The same year, Hunter wrote out a schedule of the possessions at Newtown and there enumerated fifteen slaves: four men--Will, Jack, Kill, and Peter; four women--Mary, Teresa, Clare, and Pegg; four boys--Jack, Clem, Tomm, and James and three girls--Betty, Cate, and Susan.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{27}Wright, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{28}Zwinge, "Jesuit Farms," \textit{op. cit.}, 41 (April, 1912): 197-8.
\textsuperscript{29}Hughes, ed., \textit{Documents, op. cit.}, I, Part I, no. 40, p. 222. To save their property from confiscation by a sometimes hostile Maryland government, the Jesuits deeded their lands over to laymen.
\textsuperscript{30}Zwinge, "Jesuit Farms," \textit{op. cit.}, 41 (April, 1912): 
The number of slaves grew on all the Jesuit farms from 1717 to 1765. The bequest of James Carroll in 1728 of the White Marsh estate and seventeen of his slaves contributed to the increase.\(^{31}\) Natural reproduction also accounted for the growth in numbers. From 1749 to 1776, Fr. Hunter recorded forty childbirths among the slaves at St. Thomas'. Twenty of these babies survived infancy according to Hunter.\(^{32}\) Neither natural reproduction nor the Carroll bequest fully explains the number of slaves on the Jesuit farms during these years. As they had invested their money in the transportation of indentured servants in the seventeenth century, the Jesuits turned to the purchase of slaves in the eighteenth century to furnish their labor supply. Thus, by 1734, besides the slaves at White Marsh, there were twenty-seven at Newtown and twenty at St. Ingoes.\(^{33}\) According to the Full Account of Plantations of the Maryland Mission in 1765, the number of slaves at St. Ingoes was twenty, at Newtown twenty-nine, at White Marsh 197-8.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., p. 204; Hughes, ed., Documents, op. cit., I, no. 62 E, pp. 250-1.

\(^{32}\) Old records, 1749-1776, on the cover of the manuscript, MS, NPA, 4 1/2.

\(^{33}\) Notebook-Almanac of Fr. Arnold Livers, S.J., 1734, MS, MPA, 6.2 1/2-L.
In 1785, the numbers of Jesuit owned slaves continued to increase. In his twenty three "Propositions against the Maryland Jesuits" in 1826, Archbishop Ambrose Marechal of Baltimore accused the Jesuits of owning as many as 500 slaves. Though Marechal might have exaggerated the number to bolster his attack, Fr. Grivel, S.J., Superior of the Maryland Mission, reported to Fr. General Roothaan, the religious superior of the whole Jesuit Order, in 1831 that the Jesuits of Maryland possessed 400 slaves. To put this figure in its proper context, there were in 1850 only fifty six slaveholders in the United States who owned between 300 and 499 slaves and only eleven others who had 500 or more. This made the Jesuit fathers of Maryland one of the largest slaveholders in the whole country at that time. By 1838, as we shall see later, most of these slaves had been sold off.

---

34 Fr. George Hunter, S.J., Full Account of Plantations of the Maryland Mission, 1765, MS, MPA, 202-A12.
36 Judge, op. cit., p. 81.
Following the system used by other southern slaveholders of plantations of thirty or more slaves, the Jesuits made a clear distinction between household servants and field hands. The Full Account of Plantations of the Maryland Mission in 1765 noted that the field workers numbered nine at St. Inigoes, twelve at Newtown, eighteen at St. Thomas', twenty-six at White Marsh, twelve at Bohemia, four at St. Joseph's in Deer Creek, and three at St. Maria's in Queenstown. Each of these estates in 1765 had three house servants except for St. Joseph's and St. Maria's which has one apiece.

Of the 192 slaves in 1765, only 102 were working full time. The other ninety were either children or old people. The proportions of those capable of work seemed to have dipped below the fifty percent mark in 1833. That year, for instance, only forty-three of the ninety slaves at St. Inigoes and thirteen of the thirty-six slaves at Newtown were capable of work.

---

38 For a description of how southern plantation owners with 30 or more slaves divided up their labor force see Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Antebellum South (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, pp. 41-4.


40 Ibid.

As on other large plantations throughout the South, some of the field workers and domestics specialized in different tasks on the plantation. In 1773 three young slaves at Newtown named Clem, Jim, and Billy took care of the sixty head of cattle, the eighty sheep and ninety hogs on the estate. On the same farm, one of the domestic servants, Old Jinney, had the job of pickling the priests' beef and mutton and smoking the slaves' pork. Since the Fathers made their rounds through their large parishes on horseback, there were stable boys and coachdrivers to make sure the horses were kept in good condition.

Some of the slaves became involved in more specialized skills. The slave Dick was a carpenter for the fathers at St. Thomas' in the latter half of the eighteenth century. He might have passed his skill on to a younger slave at St. Thomas' named Charles who built a fine windmill for Fr. Joseph Carbery at St. Inigoes in 1826. Fr. Ambrose

---

42 Stampp, op. cit., pp. 41-2
44 Ibid. (April, 1912): 195.
45 Fr. George Hunter's Day Book Memoranda, 1765, MS, MPA, 172 C; Day Book, St. Thomas', 1772, MS, MPA, 172 D.
46 Rent Book, St. Inigoes, 1826, MS, MPA, 170 G; Fr. Francis Neale to Fr. Francis Dzierozynski, Jan. 10, 1826, MS, MPA, 207 M 5.
Marechal of Bohemia manumitted his slave blacksmith named Patrick Barnes in 1797.  
Barnes might have been responsible for training the other slave blacksmith at Bohemia named James who was hired out to a Mr. James Morton in the year 1798. In 1763 Fr. George Hunter of St. Thomas commissioned the two French Benoit sisters, Clare and Margaret, to do the Fathers' knitting, weaving, and sewing and to make the slaves' clothes. In 1763, and then again, in 1765, he convinced them to set up two sewing and weaving circles for the ladies in the neighborhood, referred to as the haute ville and the basse ville schools. The slaves must have benefited from their training since, after the Benoit sisters left in 1767, there were no bills for knitting, sewing, weaving, mending or making clothes for the slaves in the St. Thomas' accounts until 1779. Similarly, in 1820, Fr. Francis Neale, S.J., of St. Thomas' engaged a Mrs. Elizabeth Norris to do the weaving and spining for the estate and also to use the assistance of eleven of the slave spinners.

47 Contract between Fr. Ambrose Marechal and Patrick Barnes, Aug. 17, 1797, MS, MPA, 103 P 3.
48 Agreement between Fr. Ambrose Marechal and James Morton, Jan. 11, 1798, MS, MPA, 103 P 5.
50 Agreement between Fr. Francis Neale and Elizabeth Norris, 1820, MS, MPA, 52 T 8.
Though there were some skilled workers on the farms, they were more the exception than the rule. To do their carpentry, weaving, repair work, shoemaking, and other specialized tasks on their farms, the Jesuits would hire a free white or black on a monthly or yearly basis, or they might pay a tenant or tenant's wife for various odd jobs. By this practice, the tenant was probably happy to make a little extra money, and the Fathers could more easily maintain their estates. Over the years, the hiring of men on their estates proved to be one of the Jesuit's biggest expences.

In the early 1740's thirteen hired hands were working at St. Thomas'. Fr. Pulton arranged to pay one of them, John Kelley, nine pounds sterling, or twenty pounds currency, or 2,000 pounds of tobacco with a pair of shoes and a hat for the year 1743. Most of the hired hands at St. Thomas' were Irish with last names such as Kelley, Kennedy, Fitzpatrick, Hughes, Reley, and Mehan. In 1745, the Maryland Assembly, trying to discourage the growth of Catholicism in Maryland, imposed a tax on Irish servants which virtually drove most of them out of the...

Account Book, St. Thomas', 1743-5, MS, MPA, 172 A. From now on, when pounds, shillings or dollars are referred to, it should be assumed that it is in currency unless otherwise noted in the text.
Thus, the Jesuits and St. Thomas' lost access to a good source of skilled and semi-skilled labor.

As we have seen before in the case of the Benoit sisters at St. Thomas' in 1763, The Jesuits hired people to do the necessary spinning, weaving, making and mending of clothes on their plantations. At St. Joseph's in Talbot County on June 20, 1765, Anne Hawkins agreed with Fr. Mosley to do his mending and ironing for forty shillings a year. At Newtown in 1760, Fr. Joseph Hatter sty, S.J. paid a woman one pound for weaving forty yards of wool and five shillings for acting as a midwife for one of the slaves. From 1785-1786, Fr. Ignatius Matthews of Newtown gave Peg Custice one pound and nine shillings for spinning some yarn, fifteen shillings to the Widow Thompson for weaving thirty yards of the slaves' cloth, and fifteen shillings to Marianne Boulin for making the blacks' clothes.

---


53 Fr. Joseph Mosley's Diary and Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph's, Talbot, 1765, MS, MPA, 62 b-M.

54 Account Book, Newtown, 1768, MS, MPA, 171 B.

55 Ibid., 1785 and 1786.
The Fathers also hired shoemakers for the slaves and themselves. George Howard at Newtown doubled as a tanner and shoemaker and, in 1789, was paid one shilling, six pence for tanning five hides and twenty-seven bushels of corn for making twenty-seven pairs of shoes. Mr. Mor­rick, the shoemaker of St. Thomas' in 1825, made twenty-six pairs of shoes for the black people at fifty cents a pair and one special pair of "fine shoes" for one of the Fathers at seventy-five cents a pair.

To do the occasional building and repair work on the farms, the Jesuits sought the full or part time aid of masons and carpenters. A tenant named Ignatius Matt­ingly received four pounds and ten shillings for the brick­laying at Newtown in 1786. Two years later, Fr. Matthews paid fifteen pounds to a Mr. Jones for his slave's work in "making and burning" 6,000 bricks. Zachariah Matt­ingly, a tenant at Newtown, earned 3,000 pounds of tobacco for building a barn and six pounds, ten shillings for

56Account Book, Newtown, 1789, MS, MPA, 171 B.
57Account Book, St. Thomas', 1825, MS, MPA, 172 E.
58Account Book, Newtown, 1786, MS, MPA, 171 B.
59Ibid., 1788.
St. Thomas' hired Jacob, the black slave carpenter of a Mr. Francis Digges, several times between 1812 and 1824.61

Reflecting on the conditions of the White Marsh estate in 1814, Archbishop Carroll mentioned to Fr. Grassi that there was a "carpenter & wheelwright & a good Smith on the place."62 Having their own blacksmith and wheelwright might seem an extravagance for the Jesuits, but, for an estate that size and for all the traveling the Fathers did on horseback, both were necessary. In any case, as at St. Thomas' in 1771, the plantation's blacksmith would not only serve the Jesuits' farm, but he would occasionally do work for farms in the surrounding area.63

In 1779 a free black named Luke agreed to work as a blacksmith for St. Thomas' in exchange for barrels of corn.64 Wheelwright Bernard Medley received seven dollars for making a pair of cartwheels for Newtown in 1806.65

60 Ibid., 1786.

61 Account Book, St. Thomas', July, 1812; April, 1812; April, 1813; Feb., 1824, MS, MPA, 172 E.

62 Archbishop John Carroll to Fr. Grassi, July 23, 1812, MS, MPA, 204 N 6.

63 Day Book, St. Thomas', 1771, MS, MPA, 172 D.

64 Ibid., 1779.

65 Account Book, Newtown, 1806, MS, MPA, 171 D.
Since the Jesuit estates all had grist mills at one time, they sometimes had to hire a miller. St. Thomas' recruited a man in 1764 to act as miller for 2,000 pounds of tobacco a year and two shillings a day for the carpentry work he might be asked to do. As in the case of the blacksmith on the Jesuit farms, the miller would also work for the surrounding farms in the area. Thus, in 1779, at St. Thomas' a Raphael Neale agreed to be miller for twentyfive pounds a year and for a "sixth part of the income of the mill." Neale's own grain was to be ground toll free.

At times, there were not even enough unskilled laborers on the Jesuits farms to do all the work that had to be done. In 1810 the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergyment paid fifty dollars for the hire of a slave for St. Inigoes. Newtown gave a Mr. Miles seven pounds for the hire of his slave Jerry from June 19, 1769, to September of the same year. St. Thomas' frequently needed

---

66 Fr. George Hunter's Day Book Memorands, 1764, MS, MPA, 172 C.
67 Day Book, St. Thomas', 1778, MS, MPA, 172 D.
68 Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen, Annual Statements, 1810, p. 47, MS, MPA, 196 B.
69 Account Book, Newtown, 1769, MS, MPA, 171 B.
extra help especially at harvest time. For twenty years between 1794 and 1820, St. Thomas' paid as much as seventy-six pounds currency for hirelings at harvest time.\(^{70}\)

To coordinate the efforts and activities among and on the different farms, the Jesuits had a definite administrative hierarchy. At the very bottom of this hierarchy was the overseer who was directly in charge of the slaves and responsible for the cultivation of the home plantation. According to Brother Mobberly, S.J., in 1819 a good overseer is one who "makes common good crops, keeps everything in good repair, makes some useful improvements, and preserves good order among the people [the slaves]."\(^{71}\)

Throughout the years of their ownership of the slaves, the Jesuits' contracts with their overseer varied only slightly. If not a tenant, the overseer could expect to move into a good house, usually well preserved.\(^{72}\)

---

\(^{70}\)Account Book, St. Thomas; July 16, 1794; July 8, 1797; July 27, 1797; Sept. 24, 1801; Aug. 18, 1802; Sept. 7, 1803; July, 1804; Aug. 30, 1805; March 12, 1807; July 18, 1809; July 21, 1810; Aug. 10, 1810; July 10, 1811; July 29, 1811; July 14, 1812; Aug. 1, 1812; July 9, 1813; July 14, 1813; July 16, 1813; July 12, 1814; July 13, 1814; July 12, 1815; July 13, 1818; July 14, 1819, July 12, 1820, MS, MPA, 172 E.

\(^{71}\)Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1819, p. 73, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 i.

\(^{72}\)Ibid., p. 73.
two pounds, six shillings for twenty four panes of glass
and sashes for the windows of the overseer's house. 73 An
overseer would usually receive a share of the pork and the
crop on the estate plus some cash. 74 In return for his
supervising nine slaves and assisting "in making of Cyder,
sowing and reaping of wheat, Oats, Barley and thrashing
thereof, getting of Wood and in other works where hands
usually assist," a tenant named John Jones received his
land rent free, some cash, and a share of the crop of St.
Inigoes in 1744. 75 On the same farm in 1740, John Pavat
obtained the same benefits together with a share in corn
for his slave. 76 St. Thomas' overseer, Joseph Tiar, took
104 bushels of wheat of the 907 harvested that year, fifty-
one and one half barrels of corn out of 407 barrels, forty-
eight feet of cotton out of 450 feet, one-half bushel
of peas out of twenty-four and one-half, thirty-seven
bushels of oats our of 355 bushels, and 190 pounds of
tobacco as his share for the year 1781. 77 Likewise,

73 Account Book, St. Thomas', 1779, MS, MPA, 172 E.
74 Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1819, p. 73, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.
75 Rent Book, St. Inigoes, 1744, MS, MPA, 170 A.
76 ibid., 1740
77 Day Book, St. Thomas'. 1781, MS, MPA, 172 D.
Newtown's overseer, John Clements, killed twenty-three hogs weighing 3117 pounds and set aside 300 pounds of pork as his share in 1804. 

The amount of cash paid the overseers tended to increase over the years. The overseer at Newtown received forty pounds in 1786, fifty pounds in 1809, and by 1812 $200. The Fathers at St. Thomas' paid the overseer John Stone sixty-six dollars in 1807, eighty dollars in 1810, $100 in 1811, and $150 in 1815. By 1820, Fr. Adam Marshall at Georgetown advised Fr. Francis Neale at St. Thomas' to pay the new overseer $250.

As on other plantations throughout the South, not all the overseers on the Jesuit farms were hard-working, honest, and competent. Reflecting on the different problems he experienced with overseers, Brother Mobberly complained

---

78 Account Book, Newtown, Dec. 13, 1804, MS, MPA, 171 C.
79 Ibid., Jan. 11, 1786, MS, MPA, 171 B; Jan. 29, 1810, MS, MPA, 171 D; March 12, 1812, MS, MPA, 171 D.
80 Account Book, St. Thomas', Jan. 28, 1807; Feb. 9, 1810; Jan. 18, 1811; Dec. 29, 1815, MS, MPA, 172 E.
81 Fr. Adam Marshall to Fr. Francis Neale, Oct. 27, 1820, MS, MPA, 205 F 3.
82 For a good discussion of the difficulties southern plantation owners had with their overseers see Stampp, op. cit., pp. 39-40, 82-3, 106-8, 124, 149-150, 180-1, 183 394-5.
that one might be honest but a drunkard, another a hard
worker but cannot inspire others to work, another a good
authority figure but an incompetent farmer, and, finally,
another honest and competent but overworks the slaves and
the animals on the plantation. In 1820, Fr. Adam
Marshall encouraged Fr. Francis Neale to fire the present
overseer at St. Thomas' since he has permitted "disorder
and idleness" to prevail among the slaves. In 1818, St.
Inigoes experienced a great deal of trouble with their
overseer Samuel Leach. Brother Mobberly found him at dif-
ferent times during the year away from home on his own
business, at Mr. Gipson's house, loafing, fishing for him-
self, and out catching oysters when he should have been
working. From December 15, 1817, to January 23, 1818,
Leach totally neglected his job for no good reason at all.
That year he missed eighty-one days of work and, conse-
quently, had to relinquish a quarter of his $100 salary for
1818. St. Inigoes also fined him fifty cents for putting
the slave woman Nelly to work in his garden, two dollars
for taking two slaves with him in a boat on the river for
a day and a night without any permission, fifty cents for

83Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1819, pp. 74-75, MS, GCA,
4.4 1/2 I.

84Fr. Adam Marshall to Fr. Francis Neale, Sept. 22,
1820, MS, MPA, 205 G 10.
taking the slave Joe for the day to loft his corn, and fifty cents for using the slave Michael for digging his potatoes. 85  In 1831, Fr. Hardy complained to the visitor of the Maryland Mission, Fr. Peter Kenny, that "Overseers unworthy of the name have been employed" at St. Joseph's in Talbot County for a number of years. 86 Undoubtedly, the laziness, dishonesty and incompetence of some overseers proved detrimental to the efficiency and effectiveness of the administration of the Jesuit farms.

The local superior or priest manager has the immediate charge of the farms. He was responsible for collecting rents for the General Agent, for the overall upkeep of the farm, for the spiritual and physical welfare of the slaves and for keeping the accounts of his farm. 87 Occasionally, a Jesuit brother would assist the priest manager or act as manager himself. From 1807 to 1816, for instance, Brother Mobberly was in complete charge of the farm at St. Inigoes.

85Rent Book, St. Inigoes, Nov. 8, 1818, MS, MPA, 170 G.

86 Fr. Hardy to Fr. Peter Kenny, 1831, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 w 13. Fr. Kenny was sent as an official visitor in 1820 to report on the spiritual and physical state of the Maryland Mission for the General in 1821, Kenny ended his visit abruptly and returned in 1830 to America to complete his visitation. See Zwinge, "Jesuit Farms," op. cit. 41 (Sept., 1912): 276.

and kept the rent book and account book.\(^88\) In 1811, relations between the priest assigned to St. InigoEs, Fr. Boarman, and Brother Mobberly became a bit strained. Fr. Boarman had interfered with Mobberly's authority over the farm, given to him by Fr. Charles Neale. To settle the dispute, Archbishop Carroll wrote Fr. Neale that year and directed that "Mr. Boarman shall have the interior management of the house" and "control the servants necessary for attending on him and about the house" while Mobberly was to be in charge of the farm.\(^89\) Apparently, Mobberly's administration was not altogether successful, since Fr. Kenny, the Visitor, advised that he be removed from St. InigoEs in 1820 because the slaves were "furious" against him.\(^90\) In 1820 Brother Joseph Marshall, S.J., assisted Fr. Francis Neale in the management of St. Thomas', but, according to Fr. Adam Marshall, the brother could not manage the farm on his own without the help of a good

\(^{88}\)Account Book, St. InigoEs, 1810 to 1811, MS, MPA, 170 E; Rent Book, St. InigoEs, 1806-1832, MS, MPA, 170 G. Brother Mobberly kept this book from 1807 to 1816. From October, 1817, to 1820 he helped Fr. Joseph Carberry keep this book.

\(^{89}\)Archbishop John Carroll to Fr. Charles Neale, Jan. 4, 1811, MS, MPA, 203 K 1.

\(^{90}\)Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline, 1820, p. 11, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X T 1.
overseer which St. Thomas' sis not have at that time. 91 St. Joseph's was looking for a new priest manager in 1831 since the two brothers who helped the then sickly Fr. Marshall were according to Fr. Hardy "not able or fit persons to manage." 92 The Jesuit superiors sent the brothers to the farms to give the Fathers more time to minister to their parishes. Unfortunately, even when the priest was lucky enough to have a brother to assist him, the brother was not always successful in his efforts to manage affairs on the farm.

During most of the time the Jesuits owned their slaves, there were no brothers to aid the priest on the farms. 93 Thus, for many years, most of the practical problems in running the farms fell on the shoulders of the priest manager. There were many responsibilities connected with his four major duties on the farm. He made sure that the slaves were in good health and clothed, fed, and housed.

91 Fr. Adam Marshall to Fr. Francis Neale, Sept. 22, 1820, MS, MPA, 205 G 10.

92 Fr. Thomas Hardy to Fr. Peter Kenny, 1831, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W 13.

93 From 1736 to 1757, there were not more than two brothers in the whole Maryland Mission and from 1758 to 1807 there were no brothers at all to help the Fathers. See, Jesuits, Maryland Mission: Catalog of Members, 1634-1807, MS, Georgetown University Library, Washington, D.C., BX 3709. M3 A3.
properly. Besides caring for the spiritual lives of those in his oversized parish, he directed the slaves moral and spiritual development, a task quite challenging at times, as we shall see later. He saw that all the farm buildings were kept in good condition. When necessary, he purchased tools, animals and slaves. He hired and fired laborers and overseers and checked up on them occasionally to see if they were doing their work properly. He painstakingly kept accounts of even the smallest transactions on the farm. These and many other tasks must have drained the priest manager. One priest, in particular, could not cope with this position. Fr. Hardy in 1831 suggested to Fr. Kenny that the manager at St. Joseph's in Talbot County, Fr. Adam Marshall, "who by sickness and a disposition not insurable" was "quite unfit to be placed in his present situation."94 Others found the job difficult also. According to the second postulatum of the Provincial Congregation of 1835, the running of the farms created so many distractions for the Fathers that they found that they could not perform their spiritual duties and were in danger of spiritual shipwreck.95 The reverse was, perhaps, also

94 Fr. Thomas Hardy to Fr. Peter Kenny, 1831, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W 13.

95 Acta Prima Congregationis Provinciae Marylandiae Societatis Jesu, 1835, secundum postulatum, p. 11, MS, MPA.
Their attention to their spiritual duties and parish work hindered their effectiveness as farmers and managers of large estates.

There were three main officials in charge of all the farms—the Mission Superior, later in 1833, the Provincial, the Procurator and the Agent. Among his main responsibilities, the Superior was supposed to set general policy and regulate the amount of expenditures on the farms. On these matters, he would frequently seek the advice of his consultants from the different residences throughout the Mission. During the Jesuit Suppression in Maryland (1773-1805), former Jesuits Fr. John Lewis and, after his death, Archbishop John Carroll with the aid of the Trustees of the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen voted on measures relating to the regulation of the farms. The Procurator looked after the Arca or Mission Treasury and noted down the money received each year from the various farms. Occasionally, he supervised the storage of the farms' tobacco. In 1794, for instance, he received one pound, four shillings, six pence for warehouse charges on

Liber Continens Acta Congregationum Provincialium, Pars Prima, 1832-1896.

six hogsheads of tobacco. The Agent visited the farms, collected the rents, set certain economic regulations, and also kept accounts of each farm. Since the rents were frequently collected in tobacco, the Agent made sure that the tobacco was transported to market. In 1794, he received one pound, seventeen shillings, six pence for freight on five hogsheads of tobacco sent to Georgetown. In 1775, the Agent depended on four German factors in Philadelphia to market the farms' tobacco and he paid them each twenty pounds sterling for their services. In 1796, the Agent also paid the county tax on St. Thomas' amounting to twenty-one pounds, twelve shillings on 3,200 acres of land. By 1820, the Procurator of the Mission acted also as the Agent of the Corporation and, thus, filled two positions. The Jesuits' overall administration of their farms sometimes showed signs of weakness. In 1820, Fr. Kenny

97 Account Book, St. Thomas', April 26, 1794, MS, MPA, 172 E.
98 Ibid., Sept. 15, 1794.
99 Day Book, St. Thomas', March 1, 1775, MS, MPA, 172 D.
100 Account Book, St. Thomas', 1796, MS, MPA, 172 E.
101 Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline, 1820, p. 9, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, XT 1.
asked the Consulars to:

make an arrangement on the treatment, which the slaves are to receive on all our farms—from which the local procurator cannot depart. Almost everywhere there is a sort of arbitrary regulation, which is different from that of other farms; which is frequently changed by the new manager.

Kenny further emphasized that the failure to have any clear set general policy on this issue made the slaves even more querulous. This lack of initiative from above and lack of continuity of administrative policy on the local level seemed only to hinder the smooth running of the Jesuit farms.

The Jesuits came to Maryland in 1633, befriended the Indian, and faced the hardships of living in a wilderness. They traveled for miles on horseback or by canoe to serve the Catholics of Maryland. They labored in a land generally unreceptive to their work and their beliefs. Why did they accept the added burden of the administration of large estates which brought them much grief and aggravation?

By acquiring these large farms the Jesuits hoped to raise enough money to support themselves and their missionary efforts. They needed money to build residences where they might live, churches where their parishioners might worship, and schools and seminaries where they might educate the young Catholic men of America and produce a native.

Ibid., p. 11.
clergy. To support all their activities, the money from the farms was frequently inadequate, and the Jesuits often found themselves in debt, as we shall see in Chapter IV.

Each year a Jesuit priest received a certain allowance or salary. From 1770 to 1774 Fr. John Lewis was given twenty five pounds currency each year. Between 1808 and 1815 the standard allowance for the Jesuit priest manager was eighty dollars per year. Mission funds also financed certain extraordinary expenses, such as the transporting of Jesuits coming to and from Europe. The Jesuit Superior, Fr. George Hunter, gave Fr. John Williams of Frederick twenty four pounds, eighteen shillings sterling for his passage back to England on July 27, 1768. Fr. John Lewis took seventy pounds currency from the General Fund in 1774 to pay for the transportation to Maryland of two recently ordained priests, Fr. Charles Sewall and Fr. Augustine Jenkins.

---

103 Day Book, St. Thomas', Oct. 1, 1770; Oct. 1, 1771; Oct. 1, 1772; Oct. 1, 1774, MS; MPA, 172 D.

104 Account Book, St. Thomas', Feb. 13, 1812; Nov., 1812; April 19, 1812; April 19, 1813; Dec. 15, 1814, MS, MPA, 172 E; Account Book, Newtown, April 11, 1815, MS, MPA, 171 D.

105 Fr. George Hunter's Day Book Memoranda, July 27, 1768, MS, MPA, 172 C.

106 Day Book, St. Thomas', July 30, 1774, MS, MPA, 172 D.
Among the many duties of the Jesuit Fathers was the education of the Catholic youth in Maryland. The first attempts at this were quite informal. The Fathers taught various small groups and families. A former Jesuit novice, Mr. Ralph Crouch, established a school at Newtown in 1653 and closed it in 1659 upon his return to Europe. In 1677, nine years after the Jesuits' purchase of Newtown Manor, they began a school there which was later shut down by an Act of the Maryland Assembly in 1704. 107

The establishment of a school by Fr. Thomas Pulton in 1742 at Bohemia Manor stood out as the most serious and successful attempt of the Maryland Jesuits to educate the sons of Maryland Catholics before the Suppression. From this school numbers of Catholic youths from outstanding Maryland families, such as the Carrolls and the Neales, ventured to European universities, particularly the English Jesuit university St. Omers in Flanders. Bishops John Carroll and Leonard Neale received their education at the hands of the Jesuits of Bohemia and St. Omers. Thanks to the fine educational work of the Jesuits during these years there were thirty-four native American Jesuits in 1773.

Thus, the Jesuits' personal and financial investment in the education of the young Catholic gentlemen of Maryland proved to be a wise one. 108

The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in Maryland did not end the educational efforts of the Jesuits but actually accelerated them. During the Suppression years (1773-1805), proceeds from the tenant or Arca Farms on Jesuit estates went into the General Fund of the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen together with any surplus funds from the home farms. Those same funds supported, among other things, the building and maintenance of Georgetown College. 109 In 1801, the Corporation placed the management and control of the Bohemia estate in the hands of the President of Georgetown College for the benefit of that college. 110 The same year, the Corporation also voted that subsidies from the White Marsh estate and from the stock of the Insurance Office support the professor of philosophy at Georgetown at the rate of eighty-five pounds per annum and that seventy-five pounds be given "for each free place of


students in philosophy in said college." Since the Corporation passed on the control of the Bohemia estate to the Bishop of Baltimore in 1806, the fathers dictated that the annual rents from St. Inigoes help maintain the College. By 1813, the Maryland Mission vested complete control of St. Inigoes in the President of Georgetown College. Brother Mobberly boasted in 1819 that $1850 worth of produce came to Georgetown from St. Inigoes each year. In 1833 the College requested and received permission from Fr. General Roothaan to accept the tuition from their students. Despite the continued aid of the Jesuit farms and the new revenues from tuitions, Georgetown College was $30,000 in debt by 1835. Without the financial aid of the Jesuit farms during these crucial early years of its history, Archbishop John Carroll's dream of establishing and maintaining a Catholic university in the new United States of America might never have been realized in his lifetime.

111 Ibid., nos. 170 B and 174 D, pp. 761 and 778.  
112 Ibid., no. 179 E, p. 870.  
113 Archbishop John Carroll to Fr. Grassi, July 23, 1814, MS, MPA, 204 N 6, no. 162.  
114 Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1819, p. 137, GCA, 4.4 1/2.  
115 Judge, op. cit., pp. 380-1. On these pages, Fr. Judge has pointed out that the Society formerly had forbidden the acceptance of tuition at their schools.
During the Suppression, the Corporation also helped to finance the Sulpician Seminary of St. Sulpice begun in Baltimore in 1793. Both the Secretary of the General Chapter of the Corporation, ex-Jesuit Fr. Robert Molyneux, and the Superior of the new seminary resolved in 1793:

1. That the profits arising from the Bohemia estate be granted to the Seminary of St. Sulpice... for so long a time as the legal Trustees for the property shall find it advantageous to the general benefit of the diocese.
2. That the profits be employed for the maintenance of the Superior and Director of the Seminary.
3. That, if any surplus should remain, it be applied to the education of such students as the Bishop may think proper to recommend...\(^{116}\)

The Seminary kept charge of Bohemia until 1799 when they returned it to the Corporation. In that same transaction, the Seminary obtained the use of the two Bohemia slaves, Jack and Peg, from the Corporation.\(^{117}\)

The Jesuits set up a novitiate at Georgetown in 1806, a year after the conclusion of the Suppression in Maryland. The novitiate subsequently moved to St. Inigoes and Frederick (1812-1814), then to White Marsh (1814-1823), back to Georgetown (1827-1831), to White Marsh again (1831-1834) and, finally, in 1834, found its home at Frederick


\(^{117}\)Ibid., 170 U, p. 756.
During these years, the proceeds from the farms supported the novitiate. By 1836 these funds proved insufficient, and the Maryland Jesuits had to request $1,000 from the Jesuits in Bavaria for the support of the novitiate. Still, during all these years, it was the farms that provided most of the money to train the young Jesuits for work in America.

Money from the General Fund of the Corporation also financed the building of churches. In 1798, members of the Corporation voted to give St. Thomas' 500 pounds for the construction there of St. Ignatius Chapel. Thus, the construction of Catholic places of worship depended greatly on the proceeds from the farms.

The funds needed to support a missionary effort in a land hostile to Catholicism were substantial. For this effort, the Jesuits purchased farms and assumed the ultimate responsibility for their administration. In the seventeenth century, they were able to acquire indentured

119 Judge, op. cit., pp. 386, 391, 392.
120 Fr. Stephen Dubuisson to Fr. William Mc Sherry, Oct. 8, 1836, MS, MPA, 211 H 10.
121 Account Book, St. Thomas', March 15, 1798; June 20, 1802, MS, MPA, 172 E.
servants was decreasing in Maryland. Thus, the Jesuits purchased slaves to cultivate their home farms. In the final analysis, they realized that without the help of slaves and tenant farmers they could not secure the necessary funds to support themselves and their missionary efforts.
PART II

THE THEORETICAL JUSTIFICATION OF SLAVERY

The Maryland Jesuits of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries rarely expressed their views on the morality of owning slaves. Since they and many of the prominent Catholics of Maryland owned slaves, they, perhaps, found it awkward even to address themselves to the problem. They, at times, did see the spiritual danger of adopting many of the genteel customs of some of the more affluent planters. Fr. Thomas Parker, S.J., Provincial of the English Province, wrote Fr. Thomas Mansell, S.J., Superior of the Maryland Mission, on May 4, 1713 and ordered that the keeping of maid servants, the playing of cards, and the entertaining of secular people, which cannot be done without great expense and scandal, must cease. ¹²² In 1724, the next Superior of the Maryland Mission, Fr. George Thorold, S.J., repeated this warning to his fellow Jesuits not to keep many house servants and not to play cards. ¹²³ In the Provincial Congregation of 1835, the Maryland Jesuits complained about how the care of the slaves and the administration of the farms was stealing time from their

¹²² Fr. Thomas Parker to Fr. Thomas Mansell, Old Records, May 4, 1713, MS MPA, 4 1/2.

¹²³ Fr. George Thorold, Old Records, MS, MPA, 4 1/2.
Yet the Jesuits still realized their practical need for owning slaves to do their farm work. As we shall see in Chapter IV, when it came time for them in the 1830's to decide whether and how to rid themselves of their slaves, the major reasons considered were purely practical, for the most part.

One Jesuit, however, Brother Joseph Mobberly, who, during the course of his Jesuit career, managed St. Inigo's and taught at Georgetown, wrote a lengthy defence of slavery and the slave system in his diary. In this personal treatise of 1820 entitled "Slavery or Chast," he echoed many of the scriptural, ethical, philosophical, cultural, and scientific arguments used by other southern slave-holders in their defence of slavery in the first half of the nineteenth century. Mobblerly seriously deviated once from the usual southern pro-slavery arguments. At the beginning of his defense, he blamed abolitionism on "Presbyterianism, Baptistism, Quakerism and Methodism" and virtually all


Protestantism. Due to their "misguided" belief in the right of every man or woman to interpret the Bible in his or her own way, the Protestants have presented us with an exaggerated notion of universal freedom. Relying on this principle, the Protestants have asserted that slavery and, moreso, the selling of slaves, violated the divine law. Furthermore, these Protestants have argued that "slavery is quite unauthorized by Scripture." Thus, the Catholic Jesuit Mobberly initiated his defense of slavery by objecting to a basic principle of Protestantism, a step the average pious Protestant slaveholder would not normally take.126

Mobberly attacked the "Protestant" abolitionist argument by using their primary weapon, the Scriptures. By citing various texts in Genesis, Mobberly showed how Abraham and, later, Jacob, owned and had full control over their slaves.127 The Book of Exodus (21:2, 5, 6, 7) has justified a man's buying slaves, retaining them for life, and even selling his own daughter into slavery.128 Leviticus (25:44), Mobberly argued, has pointed out how

126Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, pp. 1-5, MS, GCA 4.4 1/2.
127Ibid., pp. 13-5.
128Ibid., pp. 15-6.
God had given the Israelites the right to take slaves from the race of Cham or Chanaan, from whom the black slaves of his own time were supposedly descended. Mobberly found justification for slavery not only in the Old Testament examples and in the Mosaic Law but also in the New Testament where the Apostle Paul urged the slaves in Ephesians (6:5) to serve their masters faithfully and obediently. Mobberly then gave examples of good and virtuous men in Ecclesiastical History, such as St. Gerald and St. Pamphilius, who apparently owned slaves. At the conclusion of his Scriptural arguments, the Jesuit Brother ironically warned against the Protestant tendency to pick and choose passages from the Bible to bolster your position on any issue. Might not, he asked, the black slaves hear or read the story of the Jewish Exodus from Egypt and, thus establish their religious right to rebel against their white slaveholders? Thus, Mobberly appealed to a perennial fear of the nineteenth century southern slaveholder of bloody black slave rebellions.

129 Ibid., pp. 12, 17-8.
130 Ibid., pp. 20-1.
131 Ibid., pp. 22
132 Ibid., pp. 16-9.
The brother continued his assault on abolitionism by trying to reveal the flaws in the reasoning of the eighteenth century Nationalists like Rousseau who have emphasized that all men are free and equal and that slavery violates the law of nature. He challenged those who subscribed to these theories to observe how nature is arranged hierarchically—man is ruler of all living creatures and, in turn, submits to the will of the Creator. If one traveled the four corners of the globe, one would find, according to Mobberly, that all nations condone slavery. With its disorder and bloodshed, the French Revolution, in fact, was a prime example of the folly of the extreme nationalists' positions on liberty and equality. Mobberly then exhorted us not to confuse civil with religious liberty. All men are justly entitled to liberty on matters of faith and conscience, but, to avoid anarchy in society and government, due subordination to the ruling powers—e.g., the submission of the slave to the master—must be maintained.

133 Ibid., pp. 26-9.
134 Ibid., pp. 22-3.
135 Ibid., p. 30.
136 Ibid., pp. 31-2.
Mobberly felt that for those of inferior intellect and character, such as the black, slavery was a positive good. Without the care of good masters to feed, house, and clothe them, the blacks would have to live the lives of miserable beggars, since they could not manage their practical affairs. In his description of the black he followed the southern stereotype:

Vices the most notorious seem to be the portion of this unhappy race: idleness, treachery, revenge, cruelty, impudence, stealing, lying, profanity, debauchery, nastiness and intemperance are said to have extinguished the principle of natural law... 138

The inferiority of their character and the very color of their skin marked the blacks with the judgement of God and nature that they were to remain a race of slaves. Mobberly agreed with Jefferson that the black was the white man's equal in memory but inferior in reasoning and imagination. Indeed, their only superior quality seemed to have been in music where their rhythm and sense of tune were "unsurpassable." 140

137 Ibid., pp. 33-6.
138 Ibid., p. 38.
139 Ibid., p. 61.
140 Ibid., p. 63.
On July 4, 1826, six years after his treatise, "Slavery or Cham," Mobberly answered those who had placed the moral burden of slavery upon the American people:

The introduction of slavery was not the work of our Government--It was done by a foreign land [England]; and the evil is now so fastened upon us that we know not how to get rid of it.141

Thus, even if slavery were actually immoral, the moral guilt for its presence in the United States could not be pinned on the southern slaveholder.

It is, perhaps, unfair to take one example--Brother Mobberly--and say that his ideas completely represented the thought of his fellow Maryland Jesuits on slavery. Still, the Maryland Jesuits did not actively preach by word or by example against slavery itself. Mobberly's Diary perhaps best illustrates the extent to which the Jesuits had adapted, in some ways, to the lifestyle of the southern plantation owner and adopted their ideas and beliefs on slavery in order to justify their owning slaves.

141 Ibid., July 4, 1826, p. 92, 4.5 V.
CHAPTER II

THE TREATMENT OF SLAVES

While accepting some of the ways and ideas of the Maryland planter, the Jesuits through preaching and by their example also acted as a moderating influence on the slaveholder's spiritual and physical treatment of their slaves. Religious regulations inscribed in the Old Records of St. Thomas' called on the masters and mistresses to make sure the slaves observed all Sundays and holydays by going to church or, if this were impossible by attending prayer services and spiritual and catechetical sessions on the plantations during these days. These regulations also forbade servile work on Sundays and holydays for the slaves except during the period of farming from the beginning of May until the end of September. Over this same stretch of time, exception to this rule would not be made on the feasts of the Ascension, Whitsunday, Corpus Christi and the Assumption of Our Lady.1 In 1820, the Visitor, Fr. Peter Kenny, directed that all the priest managers

---

1 Frs. Francis Ashton, S.J., and Robert Hill, S.J., Regulations Concerning the Observance of Holydays in Maryland, Old Records, St. Thomas', Dec. 21, 1722, MS, MPA, 4 1/2.
send the slaves to church on Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and on the feast day of the patron saint of the local church or place.  

Jesuits actively engaged in catechetical and ministerial work among the blacks of Maryland. Fr. Thomas Lilly, S.J., in the 1830's at Federick, Maryland, was the first Jesuit to enroll black slaves in the Sodality of Our Lady. He subsequently moved to Philadelphia where he organized a sodality for the free blacks and begged for money to build a school for them. In 1827 the Georgetown Jesuits helped to finance a seminary for black girls in Georgetown started by a black woman named Maria Becraft. Superiors from time to time encouraged their fellow Jesuits to administer to the souls of their slaves. In 1820 Fr. Kenny asked the various priest managers to find more effectual ways of promoting morality and the

---

2 Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline, 1820, p. 11, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X T 1.


frequentation of the sacraments among the slaves. Fr. Aloysius Mudd, Superior of White Marsh, exhorted Fr. Kenny to set up the novitiate on that farm, where the novices might have the opportunity of administering to the spiritual and physical needs of the more than 100 slaves there. Fr. Grivel praised the scholastic, Mr. Charles C. Lancaster, S.J., for his essential work of teaching the servants catechism and praying with them every night. At St. Thomas' in the 1820's, Fr. Philip Sacchi earned a reputation for his dedication to the slaves there.

When the General approved the sale of the Jesuit slaves of Maryland in 1836, he directed that "It must be stipulated in the sale that the Negroes have the advantage of practicing their religion and the assistance of a priest." According to a letter of Fr. Grivel in 1840,

5Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline, 1820, p. 11, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X T1.

6Fr. Peter Kenny, Statement of Fr. Aloysius Mudd to Fr. Peter Kenny on the Eligibility of White Marsh as a Novitiate, July 29, 1830, MS, MPA, 209 M 9a.


one of the two major purchasers, one time Catholic governor and United States Senator of Louisiana, Hiram Johnson, promised in the sale that he would build a chapel and hire a priest if one were available.\(^{10}\) When a Fr. Van de Velde, S.J., of Missouri went to check up on the slaves in 1848, he found that Johnson had not lived up to his promise to build a chapel, and, consequently, Fr. Boulier who lived ten miles away at Donaldsonville stopped coming to his plantation. Van de Velde suggested that the Maryland Provincial consult Johnson on this matter while the Senator was still in Washington.\(^{11}\) The interest shown in their slaves even after the sale again manifested the sincerity of the Jesuits' concern for the spiritual welfare of their slaves.

Jesuits were also concerned that the Catholic masters deal with their slaves charitably. Fr. George Hunter reflected in 1749 that:

Charity to Negroes is Due from all particularly their Masters. As they are members of Jesus Christ, redeemed by his precious blood, they are to be dealt with in a charitable, Christian, 

\(^{10}\)Fr. Grivel to C.C. Lancaster, May 30, 1840, MS, MPA, 213 W 3a.

It is interesting how this Jesuit saw the slave as almost a split personality. On the religious level, the slave was the master's or the white man's equal. On the practical level, the master was to treat the slave benevolently and paternally. Thus, in the priest's eyes, the slave was reduced to the role of a dependant child.

In 1820, Brother Mobberly gave more detailed instructions to the Catholic slaveholders:

Masters must answer for their slaves
1. For exposing the lives of their slaves by not providing them with beds and comfortable houses.
2. Permitting whole families of children without regard to sex, to sleep in the same bed, by which means they become corrupt in their tender years.
3. Not providing them with necessary food and raiment, & thus refusing to pay their labourers their wages—a sin crying to heaven for vengeance.
4. Not permitting them to marry.
5. Not instructing them in their Christian duty, so as to prepare them properly for the Sacraments.


13In his book, Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968) on pages 81 to 139, Stanley M. Elkins has devoted his chapter entitled "Slavery and Personality" to a discussion of the childlike dependant role of the slave in the North American system of slavery which he summed up in the traditional stereotype of "Sambo."
6. Not compelling them by proper means to perform their Christian duties.
7. Not restraining them in their evil courses & not caring to chastise them for their immoral conduct.
8. Using cruel methods in correcting them.
10. Selling them under grievous circumstances and separating man and wife. 14

Here again the master was to take on the paternal role of the provider, religious counselor, and the just, but merciful authority figure. The slave, in turn, though dependent, possessed some basic human rights—the right to proper food, shelter, and clothing; the right to proper care in sickness and old age; the right to be spared from cruel punishment, and the right to marry and preserve that union until death. The states themselves did not recognize slave marriages. Thus it was up to the discretion of the master to determine if and even whom his slave should marry. Oftentimes, according to Kenneth Stampp, religious principles or the persuasion of a clergyman led the master to recognize the solemn right of the slave to marry and to maintain that union until death separated either partner. 15

14 Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, pp. 142-3, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.

this right. Fr. James Walton, for instance, between the years 1765 and 1784 recorded a number of slave marriages at Newtown in his diary.16

More than their words of persuasion, the Jesuits' overall kindness to their own slaves, perhaps, influenced Catholic masters to consider treating their slaves more humanely. There were times as we shall see, when the Jesuits' handling of their slaves fell short of ideal Christian principles. Nevertheless, the Jesuit slave was regarded the envy of the other blacks in the neighborhood.17

In their correspondence, Jesuits frequently refrained from using the term "slaves." Instead, they would somewhat euphemistically and affectionately refer to their slaves as "servant men," "servant women," "the negroes," or "the family."18 The Jesuits named their slaves after Old Testament figures, such as Abram, Moses, Isaac, and Rebecca or saints, such as Mary, John and Benedict. They also gave some of their male slaves names of Jesuit saints--Regis, Ignatius, and Francis. In their records, the Jesuits, more often than not, gave their slaves nicknames--Ike, Dolly, Kitty, Henny, Old Harry, Nace, etc.--which betrayed on their part a type of familiarity and

16Fr. Walton's Diary, 1765-84, MS, MPA, 6.3; see also Edwin W. Beitzell, "Newtown Hundred," Maryland Historical Magazine 51 (June, 1956): p. 131.


benevolent paternalism.19 Twice in their records of the farms, the Jesuits assigned their slaves both a name and a number. They did this at St. Inigoes in 1818 to help the shoemaker more easily distribute the shoes to the slaves with their correct sizes.20 In another case, the priest in his inventory of the property of St. Joseph’s in Talbot County indicated no reason for assigning each slave a particular number.21 The assignment of a number to each slave perhaps allowed for greater efficiency in handing out clothes, food etc., but it also revealed how the Jesuits sometimes viewed their slaves as mere chattel.

At St. Inigoes Fr. Gerard, S.J., surnamed his slaves after the estate—e.g., Ben St. Inigo, Sam Inigo, Jenny St. Inigo, etc. This, however, fell out of practice. Slaves purchased from another master would take on the surname of their former master. Thus there was a whole family of Isaacs at White Marsh, a Tom Duck at Bohemia, a Billy Plowden at Newtown, and a Pat Hawkins at St. Thomas’.22

---


20Rent Book, St. Inigoes, 1818, MS, MPA, 170 G.

21Inventory of St. Joseph's Farm, Talbot County, 1803, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W.10.

Most of the slave went through life without a surname. Even on the Jesuit farms, therefore, where the spiritual values of marriage and a good family life were encouraged, the slave family did not enjoy the dignity of the identity of a last name.

The black families on the Jesuit farms lived in quarters usually situated nearby the main residence. The family quarters were made from logs sixteen feet long and twelve feet wide whose crevices were packed in with clay for insulation. On the outside and inside they were regularly and customarily neatly kept. Each quarters had a door, a window on the ground floor opposite the fireplace, a small window looking out from the garret or upper apartment where the children slept, and a main room on the ground floor which served as a kitchen, dining room, parlor, sitting room for all, and a bedroom for the adults. A bachelor's quarters was eight by ten feet, just barely room enough for sleeping space. When two or three bachelors were housed together the quarters was proportionately larger. These quarters were little more than places of shelter, eating, and sleeping and not centers of family activity. During the day, both the mother and the father would be working in the fields or in the main

\[23\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 195-6.}\]
residence. The younger children were probably under the supervision of an old slave woman throughout the day or were helping out at the stable or at the residence.\textsuperscript{24}

The bedding provided each slave was rather primitive. The Jesuits gave them each a blanket and an old straw sack which the slaves would place on two or three wooden planks, resting upon some old wooden horses. Apparently the slave men and boys preferred to sleep on the floor in a semi-circle around the hearth with their feet facing the fire.\textsuperscript{25}

As seen previously, the Jesuits hired weavers, spinners and seamstresses to make their own clothes and those of their slaves. The plantation's supply of wool furnished some of the material for the slaves' winter apparel. Still, the Jesuits had to purchase what was commonly referred to as "Negro cloth"—i.e., coarse British linen, osnaburgs and calicoes.\textsuperscript{26} The Jesuits also hired

\textsuperscript{24}For a discussion of the slaves quarters, their conditions and functions see Stampp, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 292-5.

\textsuperscript{25}Zwinge, "Jesuit Farms," \textit{op.cit.}, 41 (April, 1912): 196.

\textsuperscript{26}For examples of the types of cloth used to make the slaves' clothes on the Jesuit farms see Rent Book, St. Inigoes, July 19, 1734; 1729, MS, MPA, 170 A; Fr. Joseph Mosley's Diary and Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph's, Talbot, Oct. 8, 1765, Dec. 24, 1766, MS, MPA, 62 b-M; Account Book, St. Thomas', July 20, 1815, MS, MPA, 172 E; Account Book, Newtown, July 30 1766, Nov, 7 1786, MS, MPA, 171 B.
Shoemakers to make shoes for their slaves with the hides provided by the estate. According to Brother Mobberly:

Each Labourer received from the farm for summer 2 shirts and one pair of trousers—for winter 1 pr. of double soaled shoes, 1 pr. of stockings, 1 pr. of pantloons and a round-about coat, all made on the farm from the crops of wool and flax. The women received 2 shifts, and 1 habit for summer and for winter 1 pr. of double soaled shoes, 1 pr. stockings, 1 petticoat, & 1 short gown. Hats and Sunday app al, they provided with their own funds.27

On occasion, the Jesuits themselves would purchase extra items of clothing for their slaves. In 1734, Fr. Gerard gave a slave at St. Inigoes named Susan two aprons. In 1825 at St. Thomas' a slave named Alexius received a waist coat. The Jesuits of St. Inigoes in 1818 distributed three pairs of Sunday shoes to the slaves named Bill, Nace and Fil.28 The Jesuit slave by the time of the next allotment of clothes must have looked rather tattered since he rarely had the time to mend or clean his clothes, and the few clothes he was given would necessarily have fallen apart from frequent wear.

In 1774 at Newtown each slave obtained 100 pounds of pork per year or two pounds per week. The Jesuits at Newtown also distributed herring, stock fish, and cod to

27Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, pp. 133-4 MS. GCA, 4.4 1/2.

28Rent Book, St. Inigoes, August 20, 1734, MS, MPA 170 A; Account Book, St. Thomas', Jan. 18, 1825, MS, MPA, 172 F; Rent Book, St. Inigoes, 1818, MS, MPA, 170 G.
their slaves for their Friday meal and two quarts of molasses per week which the slaves would mix with their corn bread or with hot water to make a mocha coffee. 29 In the early nineteenth century at St. Inigoes the Jesuits allotted the slave laborers and those too old to work two pounds of pork and a peck of meal per week [one half peck for each child]. Furthermore, each family at St. Inigoes had their own garden where they would grow cabbages, sweet potatoes and cotton. The slave family would also raise as many as 200 chickens per year and go fishing or oyster digging on Sundays and holydays to supplement their diets. 30

In 1820, on some of the Jesuit estates, the slaves complained to Fr. Kenny that they were not getting enough to eat. Some farms were providing only a pound and a quarter of meat per week. This shocked Fr. Kenny and he asked that the rations on all the estates be fixed uniformly. In that same report Kenny questioned whether the slaves should be allowed to raise their own chickens and hogs. 31


30 Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, pp. 132-3, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2. I; Rice, op. cit., p. 49.

31 Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline, 1820, p. 11, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X T 1.
At harvest time, after the crops were all gathered together, the fathers held a huge feast for the slaves. That day, the slaves ate their fill of beef and lamb and also enjoyed some rum. 

Some of the house slaves had the privilege of eating the father's beef and mutton regularly. With the exception of feast days, the everyday diet of the slave field hand must have been rather dull. As we have seen, a sufficient quantity of the weekly allotment of pork was lacking for a period on some of the Jesuit farms. Nevertheless, with the fish, poultry, and vegetables that were available to each slave, the Jesuit-owned slave's diet was, at least, more balanced than that of his counterpart in the South.

Medical services for the Jesuit slaves seemed to have varied. According to Brother Mobberly, when a slave became ill, the manager would give him sugar, tea, and any medicine he might need. He would call for a doctor only in extraordinary cases. Thus, in 1815, Mobberly estimated the yearly medical expenses at St. Inigoes, which included

---


33For a good description of the average diet of a slave see Stampp, op. cit., pp. 282-9.

34Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, p. 135, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.
both medicine and visits by the doctor to be only twenty dollars. The usual medical treatment by the manager and the reluctance to call on a physician made the medical care of the slaves at St. Inigoes during this period neither better nor worse than the average care given elsewhere.

Investment in medical care increased at St. Inigoes during the 1830's. A Dr. Jones agreed to be on call for St. Inigoes in 1831 at the rate of $50 per year. Five years later, St. Inigoes paid a Dr. Davis $150 for his visits and for the medicine he gave the slaves between July 10, 1835, and September 22, 1836. In 1779, St. Thomas' paid a French doctor 140 pounds currency for his past services. Between 1811 and 1816, a Dr. Speaker received from $50 to $60 per year from St. Thomas'.

---

35 Brother Joseph Mobberly to Fr. J. Grassi, Feb. 5, 1815, MS, MPA, 204 K 3.

36 Stampp, op. cit., discusses the average medical treatment given the slave in the South on pages 314-21.

37 Account Book, St. Inigoes, Jan. 1, 1831, MS, MPA, 170 G.

38 Ibid., July 10, 1835 - Sept. 22, 1836.

39 Fr. George Hunter's Day Book Memoranda, St. Thomas', July 24, 1779, MS, MPA, 172 D.

40 Account Book, St. Thomas', Jan. 14, 1811; Feb. 13, 1812; March 22, 1816, MS, MPA, 172 E.
Dr. Roach obtained $68 at Newtown for his services for the years 1811 and 1812. In hiring out the slave blacksmith James for the year 1798, Fr. Marechal of Bohemia agreed that he would pay the doctor's bills for his slave in case he should become sick while working for Mr. James Morton. The Jesuits' financial investment in doctors and medicine on the different farms showed that they, in general, were a little more concerned for the health of their slave than the average planter.

During these years, the Jesuits called on a midwife to deliver the babies of their slaves. An old slave woman would frequently fill this role. At St. Thomas', between 1801 and 1822, for instance, a slave woman named Henny received fifteen shillings or its equivalent in dollars for each slave baby she helped bring into the world. Records of infant mortality on the Jesuit farms are scarce. Fr. George Hunter at St. Thomas', however, carefully noted each birth and infant death between the years 1749 and 1776. Over that span of time, twenty-one of the forty slaves born...
survived infancy which was not a bad rate for those days. 44

The Jesuits recorded only one serious epidemic among their slaves. This occurred at St. Thomas' during the winter of 1826 and 1827. Fr. Francis Neale complained in a letter to his Superior, Fr. Dzierozynski, that "a young married woman died, five men were confined with sickness as also six women & five children... Our quarters are condemned & must be destroyed by fire in the beginning of spring..." 45

In contrast, the health record of the slaves at St. Inigoes between the years 1806 and 1818 was excellent. Brother Mobberly reported that during this period only one man died of fever there. 46

The high number of superannuated slaves on the Jesuit farms attested to the fine care the Jesuit slave received. As we have seen before, 90 of the 192 Jesuit slaves in 1765 were either too young or too old to work. 47

44Old Records, St. Thomas', on the cover of the manuscript, MS, MPA, 4 1/2; Stampp, op. cit., wrote about the infant mortality rate among slaves in the South on pages 319-21 of his work.

45Fr. Francis Neale to Fr. Dzierozynski, Jan. 8, 1827, MS, MPA, 208 Z 3.

46Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, p. 35, MS, GCA, 4, 4 1/2 I.

Of those ninety a significant number were older people since there were ten slaves around the age of seventy at White Marsh alone in 1764.\textsuperscript{48} Statistics from two of the Jesuit farms in 1833 seem to indicate that the number of slaves too old for work had increased. That year, forty of the ninety slaves at St. Inigoes and twenty-three of the thirty-six slaves at Newtown were listed as incapable of work.\textsuperscript{49} During Brother Mobberly's administration of St. Inigoes four slaves died of old age—Old Matthew at the age of 99, Old Nacy at the age of 60; Old Sucky at the age of 96, and Old Billy at the age of 66.\textsuperscript{50} This high rate of superannuated slaves was undoubtedly exceptional in the South.\textsuperscript{51}

The Jesuits showed a particular concern for their old slaves. When Fr. General Roothaan approved the sale of the Jesuit slaves in 1836, he directed that "Those who cannot be sold or transported on account of old age or

\begin{footnotes}
\item[48]Hughes, ed., \textit{Documents, op. cit.}, I, part I, no. 46, p. 231.
\item[50]Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, p. 35, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.
\item[51]Stamp, \textit{op. cit.}, noted on page 319 that "In 1842, Edward Lloyd, of Talbot County, Maryland, owned 211 slaves, of whom 11 were over seventy. This was far above average in fact, it would be hard to find a master anywhere with a larger proportion of senile slaves."
\end{footnotes}
... incurable diseases must be provided for as justice and charity demand."

The Maryland Jesuits followed their General's orders on this matter. In 1839, after the slaves had been transported to Louisiana, Fr. Grivel asked the scholastic Mr. C.C. Lancaster to remember him to "Old Nancy, Michael & Wife, Samuel, and Ned and Wife." In 1842 Grivel wrote again to Lancaster and reported that he was at White Marsh where "Old Isaac at 77, can do little, but goes on, living at the meat house near the Kitchen with his wife. He & all spoke of you wishing to be remembered..."

Both letters indicated not only a particular concern for the aged but also a certain familiarity with their slaves among the Jesuits.

In varying degrees, depending on the kindness or cruelty of their master, slaves in the South received punishment for laziness, stealing, immorality, etc. The Jesuits' slave was no exception. Though he recognized the need to be charitable and kind to the slaves, Brother

---


53 Fr. Fidele Grivel to Mr. C.C. Lancaster, March 2, 1839, MS, MPA, 212 G O.

54 Ibid., April 15, 1842, MS, MPA, 213 R 7a.
Mobberly supported the master's right to whip his slave and even based his position on Exodus to lend authority to his opinion. Still, Jesuit superiors forbade their fellow Jesuit priests to whip their slaves. Fr. Kenny in 1819 warned all priests and brothers that:

*It is strictly forbidden them to inflict any species of corporal chastisement on a female slave, or even to threaten by word or act, that they will themselves personally chastise them... Neither are the priests to inflict corporal chastisement on the male servants, but this, when necessary, may be allowed to lay brothers who have authority over them. By this prohibition priests are prevented from administering to anyone corporal chastisement, however well deserved.*

Actually through their long history of owning slaves, there was only one recorded incident of a priest whipping a slave. Sometime during the Suppression years at St. Inigoes Fr. James Walton administered a whipping to a young slave girl named Sucky for her curiosity in peeking into his room while he was flagellating himself for his personal mortification. Sucky had related this incident to Brother Mobberly many years later and claimed that she

---

55 Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, pp. 16 and 69, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2.

56 Fr. Peter Kenny, Fr. Kenny's Visitation at Georgetown, Sept. 27, 1819, Kenny Papers, MS, MPS, X S 1.
had served under twenty-three Jesuit masters and never once had a bad one. 57

Despite the fact that the Jesuits did not personally administer any form of physical chastisement, the slaves were, nevertheless, whipped from time to time. The Jesuits delegated this unpleasant task to their overseers. 58 In fact, Fr. Kenny noted that if a woman needs to be punished the Jesuit manager should call on a lay-person to do this. 59 From the complaints made by the slaves to Fr. Kenny in 1819 this practice had apparently been abused. In regards to the physical punishment of the slaves, Kenny ordered that "pregnant women should not be whipped" and that "this chastisement should not be inflicted on any female in the house, where the priest lives." Kenny went on to say that "Sometimes they [slave women] have been tied up in the priests own parlour which is very Indecorous." 60 Here again the Jesuits exhibited an almost schizophrenic

57 Brother Mobberly's Diary, June, 1806, p. 21, MS GCA, 4.4 1/2; Fr. J.W. Beschcr to Fr. Patrick Leavy, Jan. 7, 1836, MS, MPA, 211 K 2.


59 Fr. Peter Kenny, Fr. Kenny's Visitation at Georgetown, Sept. 27, 1819, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X S 1.

60 Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline, 1820, p. 11, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X T 1.
attitude towards their slaves. On the one hand, they recognized their slaves as fellow Christians whom they could not as ordained priests physically chastise. On the other hand, they considered them as property or mere chattel who needed the overseer's whip to be encouraged to do their work and avoid any wrongdoing.

Like any other slave in the South, the Jesuit slave was subjected to the uncertain fate of being hired out. Both to save and earn money in hiring out a slave, the temporary master might overwork him, beat him, or neglect to provide him with the proper diet, clothing, and medical treatment.\(^{61}\) By hiring out their slaves, the Jesuits hoped to earn some extra money or necessary revenues for their estates. When St. Joseph's in Talbot County was experiencing grave financial difficulties, they hired out for the year two slaves named Sam and Mat.\(^{62}\) The hiring out of a slave named Jim brought in twelve pounds to Newtown in 1766.\(^ {63}\) For humanitarian and practical reasons, the Jesuits made special provisions in the contracts for

\(^{61}\)Stampp, op. cit., illustrated the difficulties faced by the slave who was hired out on pages 84, 185 and 318 of his work.

\(^{62}\)Brother Robert Fenwick to Fr. Dzierozynski, Jan. 9, 1826, MS, MPA, 207 M 4.

\(^{63}\)Account Book, Newtown, Jan., 1766, MS, MPA, 171 B.
hiring out their slaves to guarantee they received the proper care from their temporary masters. The Sulpician in charge of Bohemia, Fr. Ambrose Marechal, hired out the slave blacksmith James for $100 for the year 1798. The contract stipulated that:

Besides his [James] Lodgings, washing & cloathing which Mr. T.J. Morton will provide for, the Latter consisting in two pairs of shoes, one pair of stocking, one pair of woolen trowsers, & Jacket for winter, two pair of linen trowsers & two shirts for summer. It is moreover agreed that Sd James Morton will Let the Boy have three days to work for himself in harvest...in case James should be sick with serious complaint Mr. Mareshal shall be at the Expence of a Doctor & a deduction will be made from the hire calculable to the Length of the sickness. 64

Thus, through contracts like these Jesuits and other members of the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen protected the health of their slaves and made sure they received adequate food, shelter, and clothing while they were being hired out.

Jesuits limited the education of their slaves to the learning of catechism and the acquisition of various specialized skills. As we have seen before, Jesuits took the religious education of their slaves quite seriously. Some slaves, more the exception then the rule, became skilled workers, e.g., carpenters, blacksmiths, millers, millers, millers.

64 Agreement between Fr. Ambrose Marechal and James Morton, Jan. 11, 1798, MS, MPA, 103 P 5.
weavers, and seamstresses. Still the Jesuits felt it was unnecessary to teach their slaves how to read and write since they would have no practical use for these skills. 65 Thus, the Jesuit slave was not unlike the average bondsman who according to Kenneth Stampp "lived in a world without schools, without books...; knew less of the fine arts and aesthetic values than he had known in Africa." 66

The Jesuits recognized the importance of good family life among their slaves and encouraged husbands and wives to be faithful to one another. In his record of the forty births at St. Thomas' between the year 1749 and 1776, Fr. George Hunter carefully noted down both the names of the mother and the father of the slave child. 67 The Newtown Account Book in 1788 listed the black slave women Flory, Dina, and Becke and alongside their names inscribed "George's wife," "Harry's wife," and "Michael's wife." 68 In 1826, Fr. Francis Neale of St. Thomas' sacrificed his best black worker to preserve family unity:


66 Stampp, op. cit., p. 361.

67 Old Records, St. Thomas', 1749 to 1776, on the cover of the manuscript, MS, MPA, 4 1/2.

68 Account Book, Newtown, 1788, MS, MPA, 171 B.
I find it necessary to inform your Reverend that this family must lose her best Negro hand for labor—the reason is his wife belongs to another person. This master has ordered her and her children to be sold. I cannot buy her; too much is demanded $500 for her & her three children...I shall be obliged to sell our man not to separate man and wife. 69

In 1836 upon his approval of the sale of the Maryland Jesuit-owned slaves, Fr. Roothaan asked that, as far as possible, husband and wives should not be separated nor children from their parents. Similarly he directed that if a slave has a spouse on another plantation, efforts should be made to bring them together and under no circumstance should one be sold to a distant plantation. 70 The Maryland Jesuits made serious efforts to follow these directives. According to Fr. Grivel:

All our people [the slaves] who had married out of our farms, have been sold to the masters of their husbands or wives, or to the next neighbours of them, so that husbands & wives are together, but some children who could not be sold with their mothers have been sent with the others to Louisiana. 71

Fr. General Roothaan also wisely ordered that the slaves

69 Fr. Francis to Fr. Dzierozynski, Jan. 10, 1826, MS, MPA, 207 M 5.


71 Fr. Grivel to Mr. C.C. Lancaster, May 4, 1839, MS, MPA, 212 G 9.
be sold directly to reliable plantation owners and not to people such as slave traders who would separate the slave families indiscriminately. 72 The Maryland Jesuits complied with the General's orders and sold 272 of their slaves to the one time Catholic governor of Louisiana Henry Johnson and to another well-to-do Louisiana planter named Jesse Batey. 73 Johnson took good care of the former Jesuit slaves and according to the reports of a Louisiana priest in 1840 did not and would not sell any of these slaves. 74

Like many masters in the South, the Jesuit manager required his slaves to ask permission to marry. 75 A slave named Henry of Mr. Boswell and and a slave named Cristina of St. Thomas' obtained permission to marry from their respective masters on July 18, 1829. 76 The slave's request for permission to marry safeguarded the master's interest.


73 Judge, op. cit., pp. 400-1.

74 Fr. Fidele Grivel to Mr. C.C. Lancaster, May 30, 1840, MS, MPA, 213 W 3a.

75 Stampp. op. cit., p. 341.

lest some undesirable slave marry one of his slaves and cause trouble for the plantation. In 1814, Fr. Francis Neale of St. Thomas' convinced one of his slave women, Nelly, not to marry Harry, a slave of questionable character who lived across the river.77 The Jesuits allowed their slaves to marry slaves of other plantations to avoid inbreeding among their own slaves. They even went as far as exchanging slaves with other masters for this reason as in the case of the handing over of St. Thomas' slave woman Anne for Joseph Heard's slave woman Shirley on January 16, 1823.78 Fr. Francis Neale hoped to achieve the same purpose on October 4, 1825, when he asked Fr. Dzierozynski to encourage Fr. Aloysius Muss of White Marsh to send him two single males and two unmarried women.79

Despite the religious pressures of the Jesuit fathers, the family life of the Jesuit-owned slave was frequently unstable. In the last half of the eighteenth century, there had been a rash of sexual promiscuity among

77Ibid., p. 201.
78Account Book, St. Thomas', Jan. 15, 1823, MS, MPA, 172 F.
79Fr. Francis Neale to Fr. Dzierozynski, Oct. 4, 1825, MS, MPA, 207 N 1.
the slaves at Newtown. There were five mulattoes probably sired by one or more of the white tenants and some children who had the same mother but a different father. Because of this, Fr. Walton sold, exchanged or sent away to another Jesuit house as many as twenty-three slaves from Newtown between the years 1776 and 1780.80 In his report on the status of the Maryland Mission to the General Congregation of 1820, Fr. Kenny observed that the slaves "live morally lost, as they scandalize Catholics and heretics alike" and "there are many families, and in like manner people of either sex, among whom crimes of fornication and adultery are not rare."81 In 1831 Fr. Hardy complained to Fr. Kenny that most of his slaves at St. Joseph's in Talbot County were immoral. He further added that the numerous Methodists, free blacks, and careless black Catholics in the area ruled out any hope for the moral rehabilitation of his slaves.82 In June of 1831, Fr.

---


81Fr. Peter Kenny, Relatio De Statu Missionis S.J., In S. Americae Foederatae facta Congregationi Generali Congregatae in Domo Professorum, Romae, Oct., 1820, Kenny Papers, translated by Peter Finn, the author, MS, MPA, X T 3.

82Fr. Hardy to Fr. Peter Kenny, 1831, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W 13.
Kenny reported that two of the three married men at Bohemia were living adulterously with other men's wives. One of these slaves named Tom snuck out every night from Bohemia and had intercourse with a woman other than his wife in the same house where his wife, a free black, and his widowed mother resided. Later he claimed to have married a virtuous girl in Wilmington, Delaware, without the consent or knowledge of Brother Heard or Fr. Epinette.83

Though it, perhaps, would be unfair to say that the Jesuit-owned slave was generally promiscuous and his family life was usually unstable, still the general comments about the immorality of the slaves made by Fr. Kenny who had visited every Jesuit farm in 1819 and 1820 and then again in the 1830's show that on different farms and at different times family instability became a way of life for a significant number of the slaves. Why had the Jesuits failed to influence many of their slaves to lead a more stable family life and a more morally upright personal life? As Kenneth Stampp saw it, the instability in the slave family was built right into the slave system itself. As on other plantations throughout the South,

83Fr. Peter Kenny, Observations made by Reverend Fr. Kenny, Visitor, on the slaves at Bohemia, June, 1831, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X P 5.
the father in the slave family was neither the main provider nor the authority figure for his wife and children. More often than not, the Jesuit manager filled both these roles. Both the mother and the father worked all day. Consequently the only time they had to spend with their children was at night and on Sundays and holydays. The slave mother on the Jesuit farms rarely made her family's clothes nor did she usually nurse her children or her husband when they were ill. All these elements contributed to the instability of many Jesuit slave families and partially explained the Jesuits' failure to influence the moral and family life of their slaves.84

Fr. Kenny wrote Fr. McElroy from Dublin in 1822. In that letter he mentioned how the title system, the high rents and the absentee landlords were making life miserable for the Irish peasant. He, having spent two years visiting the Jesuit farms in Maryland, went on to say that "Your slaves are better provided for than a great portion of our peasantry."85 Kenny could have taken one step further and said that the Jesuit-owned slave experienced better

---

84 For a fine discussion of the Negro slave family see Stampp, op. cit., pp. 340-9.

living conditions than the slave on the average southern plantation. He was generally better fed, sheltered, and cared for than the average bondsman in the South. As a result, he could usually hope to live longer than his slave counterparts. Still, like any other southern slave, the young Jesuit-owned slave occasionally grew up in the midst of a very unstable family situation. His father was neither the real provider nor the true authority figure. On occasion, the Jesuit-owned slaves suffered many of the same degradations his fellow slaves experienced—whippings, poor diet, inadequate medical care and little or no education. Most importantly, like all other slaves, he was deprived of the freedom his white masters enjoyed. This leaves us wondering whether the Jesuit-owned slave was content with his status. At the same time, one cannot help but question the actions of the Jesuit slave masters who in a hypocritical fashion allowed others to whip their slaves and sometimes neglected to provide sufficiently for their physical needs. In the end, these priests who had fought so strenuously for religious freedom in the eighteenth century blinded themselves to the black man's need for freedom and his right to determine the course of his own life.
CHAPTER III

THE SLAVE: MANIFESTATIONS OF HIS DISCONTENT AND HIS SEARCH FOR FREEDOM

Father Hughes in his second volume of The History of the Society of Jesus in North America entitled a small section of his book "The Contentment of Negroes." There he cited an incident involving the Jesuits' slaves, referred to by Fr. John Carroll, then prefect apostolic of Maryland. Carroll wrote that while other slaves, in hopes of attaining their freedom, were crowding onto British cruisers, raiding the Maryland Plantations during the Revolution, the Jesuits' slaves in their devotion to the priests hid themselves in the woods to avoid being captured by the British. Some who were caught refused, even under torture, to board the British ships.1 Such a sign of devotion and the fine treatment the slaves received from the Jesuits over the years left no doubt in Hughes' mind that the Jesuit-owned slave was, and had no reason to be other than, content with his status.

1Hughes, Text, op. cit., II, pp. 561-5.
Part I

Signs of Discontent among the Jesuits' Slaves

Tender handed brush a nettle
And it stings you for your pains
Grasp it like a man of mettle
And as silk it soft remains:

It is the case with common natures,
Treat them Kindly, they rebel;
But be rough as nutmeg graters,
And and rougues obey you well.²

Brother Mobberly inscribed this poem in his diary to illustrate the point that if a black salve is not properly disciplined he will not cooperate with the might even rebel against his white master. Mobberly observed how, year by year, slaves were growing more and more discontent, corrupt, and worthless because their masters were lax in disciplining them. Years before when "discipline flourished" the slave showed the proper subordination and respect towards his master. He condemned the present white generation for their soft attitude towards their slaves and for losing sight of the old adage: "The better a negro is treated the worse he becomes."³

---

²Quoted in Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, p. 141 MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.
³Ibid., pp. 140-1.
In another part of his diary Mobberly complained about the occasional dishonesty of the slave in taking his master's goose, chicken, pig, etc. A slave might also "borrow" his master's horse for the night and ride it to the brink of exhaustion. If the master should choose to whip his slaves for any such wrongdoing, he will be considered by them "a very bad man." They might show their displeasure with the master by carelessly or maliciously breaking the plantation's farm tools. The slaves might even go so far as rebelling against their master as they had done at St. Inigoes about 1814 when a group of slaves raided the estate's store house. In that minor skirmish, Brother Mobberly reported that "many [slaves] were whipped & others were sent to the Penitentiary in Baltimore for eight years."  

Brother Mobberly was not the only Jesuit who experienced difficulties with the slaves. Fr. Adam Marshall of St. Thomas' became disgusted with his overseer who permitted "disorder and idleness among the negroes."  

---

4Ibid., pp. 74-7; Stampp, op. cit., provides a fine discussion of the different forms of slave discontent and rebellion on pp. 86-140.

5Fr. Adam Marshall to Fr. Francis Neale, Sept. 22, 1820, MS, MPA, 205 G 10.
Hardy at St. Joseph's in 1831 implored Fr. Kenny to remove Fr. Marshall from his post as manager of that farm since he was not "able to rule the servants who seemed determined to oppose him right or wrong." Hardy added that the slaves' method of regular and continuous opposition was usually sly and underhanded. After the rumor spread among the slaves at Newtown that some of them would be sold, the atmosphere was rather tense there, and Fr. Havermans feared that the slaves would discontinue doing any work.

For a number of years the slaves of Bohemia were a constant problem for the Jesuits. About 1817, Fr. John Henry decided to sell five of his black slaves whom he described as "ungovernable" and "corrupt in their morals." He sold them to a Maryland planter and slave trader who was accustomed to selling slaves down south to New Orleans. Fr. Henry sent the five blacks on a mail stage en route to Chesapeake Bay where they would board a vessel to take them to Louisiana. On their journey, a Methodist preacher and magistrate stopped them in Centreville, jailed them, and charged Fr. Henry with the kidnapping of them. Brother

---

6Fr. Hardy to Fr. Peter Kenny, 1831, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W 13.
7Fr. Peter Havermans to Fr. George Fenwick, July 17, 1832, MS, MPA, 210 P 5.
Mobberly and a lawyer named Carmichel were able to straighten things out but not without paying a $110 jail fee and purchasing back the five slaves at the price for which Fr. Henry sold them. 8

In 1831 Brother Fenwick and Fr. Kenny accused the Bohemia slaves of being immoral and careless in the performance of their Catholic and Christian duties. 9 Fr. Kenny noted that all the adult slaves except for an old slave woman had not been to the sacraments in twelve years. According to Kenny and Fenwick, two of the slaves became drunk ten or twelve times during the year. One of them, a slave named Jim, opened up a tavern in his house and sold liquor to the Bohemia slaves and others of the neighborhood. Jimmy also gained the reputation of constantly getting into fights both on and off the estate. Honesty was not a virtue of the Bohemia slaves. Kenny mentioned that the slaves saw nothing wrong with taking "either from the farm or house what they may want or wish to have in either diet,

8 Brother Mobberly' Diary, ca. 1817, pp. 11-117, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.

9 Brother Fenwick, Account of Bohemia Farm and Value 1832, MS, MPA, 103 T 8 1/2; Fr. Peter Kenny, Observations made by Reverend Fr. Kenny, Visitor, on the Slaves at Bohemia, June, 1831, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X P 5.
Some ventured a few miles to Delaware on occasion to sell their stolen goods. In the end, the insubordination of the Bohemia slaves proved to be a major reason for their sale in 1832.

One of the outstanding signs of the Jesuit slaves' independence was their refusal to accept the standards of Christian morality and the religious practices of the Catholic Church. The sexual promiscuity, drunkenness, and dishonesty of some of the slaves revealed a disdain for the values of their Jesuit masters. Brother Fenwick of Bohemia and Fr. Hardy of St. Joseph's were disgusted with their slaves' neglect to attend the sacraments. In response to the slaves' immorality and carelessness in the practice of their religion on all the farms, Fr. Kenny asked the superiors of the Maryland Mission in 1820 "to devise more effectual means to promote morality & the frequentation of the Sacraments," since "the Crimes, that are reported of our slaves & their neglect of duties the most sacred to a Christian, are a reproach to a Society, that taught Sanctity to Savages." Some of the slaves' rejection of

10Ibid.
11Brother Fenwick, Account of Bohemia Farm and Value, 1832, MS, MPA, 103 T 8 1/2; Fr. Hardy to Fr. Peter Kenny, 1831, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W 13.
12Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline,
Christian morals and Catholic practices revealed that they were not mindless, submissive creatures willing to accept all their master told them.

When given the opportunity, the Jesuit-owned slave spoke out for his rights and the improvement of his living and working conditions. In his visit to the various farms in 1819 and 1820, Fr. Kenny listened to any complaints the slaves might have against their masters. In response to his talks with the slaves, Fr. Kenny set up some uniform guidelines for their treatment. He requested that their rations be fixed on all the farms and that the beating of pregnant women by cleric or hired layman cease together with the whipping of women in the priests' residences. At the request of some of the slaves, Kenny even asked whether they should be given a half day off on Saturday either for leisure or to work for themselves on their gardens. The Jesuit-owned slave had the unique opportunity of voicing his complaints and problems to a superior higher than his local master or priest manager and thus of improving his life style. It was a tribute to his sense of personal dignity that he seized this opportunity and

1820, p. 12, MS, MPA, X T 1.

13 Ibid., p. 11.
consequently influenced general policy on the treatment he would and should receive from his Jesuit masters.

The slave system as experienced by the Jesuit-owned slave did not completely snuff out his individuality. Certainly the rejection by some of the slaves of Christian and Catholic morals and practices and their willingness to speak up for their rights revealed that in significant areas they could be and were masters of their own existence.

Part II

The Jesuit Slaves' Search for Freedom

Negatively the Jesuit-owned slave manifested his underlying yearning for individuality and freedom in his different expressions of discontent. Positively he either modeled his life as much as possible on the life of the freeman or he tried different ways and means of attaining actual freedom from bondage.

Though the house slaves were generally more submissive then the average field hand, they also had more privileges and responsibilities. Since he was a trustworthy servant, he would be sent on long missions. In 1751, a Bohemia servant named Ralph went alone or with a father on errands to the store, the wharf or even as far as
Philadelphia. That same year, a Fr. Joseph Greaton sent another Bohemia slave with some money to St. Thomas'. A slave in charge of the stable hands frequently had the last word on the management of the stable and the handling of the horses. The stable hands also had the opportunity of picking up tips from the fathers. The cook took care of the kitchen and usually rationed out the slaves' food for the year. She and her children also had the privilege of eating the Fathers' food. In 1797, St. Thomas' gave Alesius, the servant of Bishop Carroll seven pounds and ten shillings for his half year's allowance. Alesius, thus, had the freedom to go out and purchase different things he might want. Newtown awarded its slave bricklayer Peter by buying him a canoe. These and other responsibilities and privileges helped the house servants and the fathers' favorites to adjust their life style in some ways to that of the freeman.

---

15 Ibid., pp. 195-6.
16 Account Book, St. Thomas', Jan. 5, 1797, MS, MPA, 172 E.
17 Account Book, Newtown, March 5, 1816, MS, MPA, 171 D.
Most of the slaves on the Jesuit farms earned money by doing extra jobs around the estate. Fr. Mosley of St. Joseph's paid his slave Tom eight shillings for mauling 300 logs in April and May of 1766. The slave Charles of St. Thomas' received fifteen shillings in August of 1797 for bringing timber across the creek. The slave midwife Henny earned one pound and ten shillings for delivering four babies at St. Thomas' in 1803. Old Billy obtained two pounds, five shillings at St. Thomas' in 1802 for some carpentry work. The Jesuits also paid their slaves at harvest time for cradeling and reaping. During the fall and winter, a slave might pick up some money ditching.

---

18 Fr. Joseph Mosley's Diary and Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph's, Talbot, April 2 and May 8, 1766, MS, MPA, 62 b-M.
19 Account Book, St. Thomas', Aug. 28, 1797, MS, MPA, 172 E.
20 Ibid., 1803.
21 Ibid., Sept., 1802.
22 Examples of this can be found in Account Book, St. Thomas', Aug. 18, 1802, MS, MPA, 172 E; Account Book, St. Thomas', July 3, 1822, MS, MPA, 172 F; Account Book, Newtown, 1791 MS, MPA, 171 B; Account Book St. Inigoes, July 30, 1807, MS, MPA, 170 D.
23 Account Book, St. Thomas', Sept. 9, 1793; Dec. 23, 1793, Dec. 25, 1793; Aug. 8, 1794, MS, MPA, 172 E.
Other farm tasks, such as plowing, mending fences, skinning livestock, clearing land, and digging wells also provided the Jesuit-owned slave with money.

Jesuit-owned slaves also earned money by selling different useful items, they had made, to the fathers. A slave at St. Thomas' named Old Billy sold horse collars, iron files, mats, iron screws, and oars to the fathers.

Over the course of years, the slaves made and sold shingles, coats, shoes, brooms, towels, horse collars, screws, pails, baskets, and rowboats to earn some spending money for themselves and their families.

Their own gardens, livestock, oyster digging, and fishing provided the Jesuits' slaves with their largest source of income. Brother Mobberly claimed that from the sale of thirty to fifty bushels of sweet potatoes, of 200

---

24 Ibid., Oct. 12, 1798; July 11, 1801; Sept. 1, 1806; Jan. 9, 1796; Fr. Joseph Mosley's Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph's Talbot, May 20, 1766, MS, MPA, 62 b-M.

25 Account Book, St. Thomas', Jan, 8, 1802; Sept. 19, 1803: May 6, 1803; Feb. 27, 1805; March 4, 1805, MS, MPA, 172 E.

26 Ibid., June 17, 1801; July 17, 1804; Dec. 30, 1807, Dec. 29, 1815; May 16, 1820; July 15, 1821; Aug. 7, 1821; Account Book, Newtown, Dec. 12, 1769, Oct. 22, 1785; Dec. 2, 1785; March 1, 1797, MS, MPA, 171 B; Fr. Joseph Mosley's Diary and Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph's, Talbot, April 21 and Sept. 28, 1765, MS, MPA, 62 b-M.
chickens, and of oysters to passing ships on Sundays and holidays, the average Jesuit slave family made from eighty to one hundred dollars per year. 27 Though Brother Mobberly, who had a few times tried to prove the unprofitability of owning slaves, might have exaggerated, the account books show that the Jesuit-owned slave could accumulate a good supply of spending money over the course of a year. A slave woman at St. Thomas' named Cookey sold thirty-five head of sheep for seventy dollars in 1806. 28 Benedict was paid nine dollars and sixty cents for 160 pounds of pork in 1823. 29 Old Jenny of Newtown made fifteen shillings in October of 1785 for selling her chickens. 30 The sweet potatoe was the major but not the only crop grown in the garden of the Jesuit-owned slaves. In 1793, for instance,

27 Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, pp. 132-3, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.

28 Account Book, St. Thomas', May 28, 1806, MS, MPA, 172 E.

29 Ibid., Dec. 18, 1823, 172 F.

30 Account Book, Newtown, Oct. 27, 1785, MS, MPA, 171 B; For other examples of Jesuit-owned slaves selling live-stock see Account Book, St. Thomas', Aug. 8, 1794; Jan. 31, 1797; Jan., 21, 1801; June 20, 1801; Jan. 16, 1802; Nov. 9, 1802; June 27, 1803; Jan., 7, 1804; Feb. 14, 1801; March 24, 1804; May 1, 1804; April 12, 1806; MS, MPA, 172 E; Fr. Joseph Mosley's Diary and Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph's, Talbot, Aug. 7, 1766; Nov. 11, 1766, MS, MPA, 62 b-M.
The slaves Ben and Bob sold thirty bushels of turnips to the fathers of St. Thomas'. The Jesuit Fathers also purchased cotton, tobacco, hay, corn, cucumbers, molasses, onions, walnuts, and chestnuts from their slaves.

Such earnings gave the slaves some financial freedom to purchase certain luxuries such as Sunday clothes and rowboats. Still, this limited financial freedom was not enough for some of the slaves and a few sought to change their status.

One way the slave could hope to attain his freedom in Maryland was through manumission, but the Jesuits usually frowned on this practice. From their own experience, the Jesuits felt that their slaves enjoyed better living conditions than many of the free blacks who lived nearby their estates and did odd jobs for them. In 1810, Brother Mobberly noted in the St. Inigoes Account Book that Free Nacy had died "in great poverty & want--I forgave

---

31 Account Book, St. Thomas', Dec. 17, 1793, MS, MPA, 172 E.

32 Ibid., Sept. 3, 1793; Dec. 17, 1793; Jan. 28, 1797; Nov. 19, 1801; Feb. 19, 1802; Jan. 26, 1803; Oct. 16, 1805; Dec. 17, 1805; Feb 12, 1806; March 7, 1806; March 17, 1806; April 1, 1801; Fr. Joseph Mosley’s Diary and Account of the Establishment of St. Joseph’s, Talbot, Oct. 25, 1765, MS, MPA, 62 b-M.
the debt." 33 That same year, free blacks Jesse and Gabe owed St. Inigoes twenty-six dollars for shoes, corn and money they had borrowed. 34 Likewise, freemen Dick, Gabe and Charles were in debt to the estate in 1812 for about twenty seven dollars. 35 They all seemed to have lacked currency since they paid off their debts by doing different jobs around the farm. From these records the free blacks with whom the Jesuits and their slaves associated were barely managing to feed and clothe themselves. In relation to this point, James Wright, in his study of the free black in Maryland, pointed out how the average free-man materially lived on about the same level as the average slave and oftentimes on a lower level. 36

In 1801, the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen reprimanded Fr. Brosius of the Conewago estate in Pennsylvania for manumitting his slave Peter. The members of the Corporation signed a resolution stating that this act "would prove a precedent not a little injurious to that subordination which ought ot be preserved among the

33 Account Book, St. Inigoes, Aug. 10, 1810, MS, MPA, 170 E.
34 Ibid., Dec., 1810.
35 Ibid., Jan. 1, 1812; April 10, 1812, 170 F.
36 Wright, op. cit., pp. 239-60.
other slaves belonging to the Corporation..." They further suggested that Peter purchase his freedom instead.37 Despite this, the Corporation did institute a policy about this time whereby Jesuit-owned slaves who were sold were freed in a certain number of years. Thus, the Corporation sold a nineteen year old slave named Regis for $320 in 1816 and written into the sale was a clause which provided for his manumission in twelve years.38 Similarly, Bohemia sold three slaves in 1832 who after a period of nine and one half years for one and ten years for the other two were to be freed.39 The Jesuits were not very consistent in implementing this policy. Archbishop Carroll complained to Francis Neale in 1805 that he and Fr. Fenwick "were surprised and mortified to learn that in direct contradiction to the humane decision of the Corporation, sale of Negroes for life have been made and are making from the

37Quoted in Zwinge, "Jesuit Farms," op. cit., 41 (April, 1912): 220-1. Zwinge noted on page 221 that among those who signed this resolution were "Bishop Neale, Fathers Walton, Molyneux, Ashton, all old time Jesuits, and Father Sewall."

38Sale of Negroe Slave Boy Regis, 1816, MS, MPA, 99 R 3.

39Brother Fenwick, Account of Bohemia Farm and Value, 1832, MS, MPA, 103 T 8 1/2.
When the 272 Jesuit-owned slaves were sold in 1838 they were sold as chattel for life.

Some Jesuit-owned slaves managed to purchase their freedom. In 1797, Bohemia blacksmith Patrick Barnes won his freedom by doing extra work and by posting a $125 bond stating that he would not live within ten miles of Warwick Chapel. Soon after, state police jailed him probably because he had lost or Fr. Marechal had neglected to get him his freedom papers. Subsequently, in a friendly trial, he successfully sued Marechal for his freedom. In 1801 a slave named Jack purchased his freedom from Fr. Brosius at Conewago. On September 19, 1803, a black woman named Nancy bought her daughter from St. Thomas' for eighteen pounds, fifteen shillings and then set her free.

---

40Archbishop John Carroll to Fr. Francis Neale, Oct. 3, 1805, MS, MPA, 203 T 8, no. 61.

41Contract between Fr. Abbe Marechal and Patrick Barnes, Aug. 17, 1797, MS, MPA, 103 P 3.


43Ibid., p. 221.

44Account Book, St. Thomas', Sept. 19, 1803, MS, MPA, 172 E.
With the aid of a sympathetic lawyer, some slaves at St. Thomas' sued for their freedom in 1794. In response to this, the Fathers of St. Thomas' borrowed close to seventeen pounds from the General Fund of the Corporation "to retain or stop the mouth of lawyer from speaking in favor of the Negroes who have sued for their freedom." Attorney Clement Wheeler received altogether approximately twenty-three pounds in 1794, 1798, and 1799 for defending the priests' rights to their slaves in court.

Some of the slaves sought their freedom by running away. In 1767, St. Inigoes found its runaway slave Abraham in the woods on the verge of starvation. A Mr. Barnes received fifteen dollars from Fr. Marechal of Bohemia in 1797 for apprehending his runaway slave Stephen. According to the inventory of St. Joseph's in 1803, a twenty-four year old slave named Thom had run away "on Friday the eighth of this present month of April."

---

46 *Ibid.*, March 8, 1798; Jan. 23, 1799; March 17, 1799.
47 *Notebook-Almanac of Fr. Arnold Livers, S.J.*, Nov. 16, 1767, MS, MPA, 6.2 1/2-L.
49 *Inventory of St. Joseph's Farm, Talbot County, 1803*, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W 10.
At St. Inigo's a hired slave named Nace had left the plantation in December of 1806 without permission and by January 1 of 1807 has not as yet returned. In 1809 the Corporation promised a reward and the payment of all damages to anyone who might capture the slave Tom who had escaped from White Marsh that year. When it came time to sell the slaves in 1838, a White Marsh slave named James ran off with three of his children and hid with them somewhere in the city of Baltimore.

The willingness of some of the Jesuits' slaves to show their discontent, to live as closely as possible the life style of a free man, and to seek ways of achieving actual freedom indicate that despite the relative security of the Jesuit plantation some were not at all pleased with their status as slaves. With no real hope of owning property, some of the slaves bravely sought to embrace the financially insecure life of the freeman in order to enjoy the freedom and independence which their white masters valued so highly.

---

50 Account Book, St. Inigo's, Jan. 1, 1807, MS, MPA, 170 D.
52 Fr. Grivel to Mr. C.C. Lancaster, Nov. 6, 1838, MS, MPA, 212 M 5a.
CHAPTER IV

THE PROFITABILITY OF THE SLAVE SYSTEM ON THE JESUIT FARMS

By 1839 the Jesuits had sold practically all their slaves. From that time onward free tenant farmers took over the cultivation of what used to be the home farms of the Jesuit estates. Jesuits had debated for a long time over the morality and profitability of selling their slaves and bringing in tenant farmers. As we shall now see, many years of financial difficulties had passed before they made their ultimate decision to sell all their slaves.

Though the farms seemed to have been making some profit in the eighteenth century, the Maryland Mission and later the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen remained in debt for many years during that period. According to the Full Account of Plantations of the Maryland Mission in 1765 the estimated gross income of all the farms together amounted to 696 pounds sterling. This figure, however, did not consider building repairs, clothes for the fathers and slaves, doctor's bills, quit rents and taxes. This financial report assumed that each slave fieldhand contributed as much as nine pounds sterling in work to a farm each
Despite this rather optimistic financial statement, the Maryland Mission could not meet the annual English Province tax of 200 pounds sterling in the years 1741 and 1759. Furthermore, on the eve of the Suppression in 1773, the Maryland Mission was in debt to the English Province for approximately 1400 pounds sterling. In 1790, Archbishop Carroll agreed to the proposal of Fr. Strickland, ex-Jesuit and Procurator in charge of the finances of the then defunct English Province of the Society of Jesus, "to forgive in the name of [the London] Office the debt of fourteen hundred pounds, provided Maryland will pay debt incurred since I [Fr. Strickland] entered upon Office, ... and quit all claims of reversion, and all other claims upon the Province." After 1790, the accumulated debt to the London Office rose to approximately 430 pounds sterling by 1811.

1 Full Account of Plantations of the Maryland Mission, 1765, MS, MPA, 202-A 12.
4 Ibid., no. 150 J, p. 641.
5 Ibid., no. 150 L, p. 641.
The different estates which supplied the money for the Province tax and later the General Fund experienced at various times during this period years of prosperity and financial difficulty. In the years 1755, 1756, 1768, 1769 and 1771 to 1778, St. Thomas' successfully paid its quota of 166 pounds currency per year. St. Thomas' continued to enjoy its relative prosperity throughout the eighteenth century since in 1798 it could afford to pay its yearly quota and still send $107 to Georgetown College. To help support the building of its new church in 1898, St. Thomas' sold a slave boy named John for $240. Fr. Walton received 420 pounds currency and 12,000 pounds of tobacco for the sale of twenty-one of Newtown's slaves in 1774. Though Newtown was for a while provided with a surplus of funds from this sale, in the long run the sale was probably disastrous since most of the slaves sold were under fifteen which gave Newtown an unusually high ratio of superannuated slaves later on and fewer births between 1806 and

6 Account Book, St. Thomas', 1755, 1756, MS, MPA, 172 B; Fr. George Hunter's Day Book Memoranda, 1768, 1769, MS, MPA, 172, C; Day Book, St. Thomas', May 18, 1771 to May 18, 1778, MS, MPA, 172 D.

7 Account Book, St. Thomas', 1796, MS, MPA, 172 E.

8 Ibid., Sept. 17, 1798.
When the Sulpicians took control of Bohemia in 1793 the estate was 925 pounds currency in debt. Between January 8, 1794, and March 10, 1795, they sold eleven of Bohemia's slaves for 345 pounds currency to help pay off the debt and make the necessary improvements on the property and buildings. The Sulpicians proved to be fine managers. When they handed the Bohemia estate back to the Corporation in 1799, the farm was netting $1000 annually and they were able to pay off 500 pounds currency of Bohemia's debt.

Despite this perennial debt to the London Office of the English Province, the priests of the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen managed to start Georgetown College and to build a new church at St. Thomas' before the beginning of the nineteenth century. By the turn of that century the Corporation had not yet experienced overwhelming financial difficulties. Between the years 1800 and 1838, the farms and the Corporation fell more and more into

---

10 Hughes, ed., Documents, op. cit., I, part II, no. 170 E, p. 748.
11 Ibid., no. 170 G. pp. 749-50.
12 Ibid., nos. 170 R & 170 S, pp. 754-5.
debt. During these years, the Jesuits turned to the sale of their slaves, one of their major investments, to help keep their farms and their Corporation financially solvent.

The first decade of the nineteenth century ushered in some important decisions on the sale of the Jesuits' slave. In 1803 the Corporation decided that managers could not sell unruly slaves or exchange slaves in cases of intermarriage without the consent of the Board of Trustees of the Corporation. If for some reason the local manager could not wait for the decision of the Trustees, he could act on the consent of the district representative of the Corporation. That same year, St. Thomas' received 101 pounds for the sale of a slave named Constant, property of the N.L. Sewall estate, which owed money to St. Thomas'.

The next year, the Corporation found it expedient to sell the supernumerary slaves of St. Joseph's in Deer Creek to pay off that plantation's debts. In 1807, Newtown obtained $1350 for the sale of some of its slaves.

14 Account Book, St. Thomas', April 22, 1803, MS, MPA, 172 E.
16 Account Book, Newtown, Dec. 29, 1807, MS, MPA, 171 E.
Corporation asked its Agent in 1808 to look for and try to sell any excess slaves at Newtown, White Marsh or St. Inigoes to help pay off its various debts. Its Annual Statement for that year listed the sale of a slave named Frank from St. Inigoes for $213 and a slave named George for $300.

Financial affairs worsened for the farms and the Corporation in the second decade of the nineteenth century. To alleviate the situation, the Corporation continued its sale of slaves. In 1810, it sold a slave named Matt from St. Inigoes for $212 and a slave named Peter and his family also from that estate for $636. The Corporation received a total of $300 in 1811 and 1812 for the sale of White Marsh's slave named Ned. In 1814, members of the Corporation resolved to sell gradually the majority of the slaves for a definite term of years and to invest the money.

---


18 Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen, Annual Statements, 1808, MS, MPA, 196 B.

19 Ibid., 1810.

20 Ibid., 1811, 1812.
accruing from these sales in the different estates.\textsuperscript{21} Between the years 1814 and 1816, the Jesuit Fathers of Maryland made $1475 on the sale of seven of their slaves.\textsuperscript{22} Despite these sales, the Corporation had a deficit of $1052.28 in 1816.\textsuperscript{23} Still, the Corporation did not adhere to its policy of 1814 until a number of years later when the majority of the slaves were sold in 1838. During these years, it discovered that it was difficult to find tenants to farm their lands. According to the former Jesuit slave, Aunt Louisa, all the tenants except for one had left St. Inigoes in 1818 and the slaves were cultivating the land formerly occupied by the tenants.\textsuperscript{24} This meant, of course, that slave labor became more essential than ever for the running of the estates.

The financial troubles of the Corporation from 1810 to 1820 were a reflection of the difficulties faced by the individual farms during this period. In 1814, the members

\textsuperscript{21}Hughes, ed., \textit{Documents, op. cit.}, I, part II, no. 179 V, p. 879.

\textsuperscript{22}Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen, \textit{Annual Statements}, 1814, 1815, 1816, MS, MPA, 196 B.

\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid.}, 1816

\textsuperscript{24}A note of Fr. Zwinge in Rent Book, St. Inigoes, 1818, MS, MPA, 170 G.
of the Corporation voted that $830 should be taken from the
General Fund and from the various farms to give financial
relief to White Marsh. They further resolved that if money
could not be raised from one or a number of the farms, White
Marsh was to sell its slaves for a certain number of years
to pay its debts. 25 Newtown sold some of its slaves in 1814
and 1816 for a total of $1500. 26 St. Thomas' ran at a
deficit between $1300 and $1500 in 1810. Fr. Neale had
expressed a hope that the crop that year would pay for this
debt, but Fr. Marshall ordered that some of the money
derived from that crop would have to go to the Corporation
and suggested that St. Thomas' pay off only a third of the
debt. Marshall then advised Neale to buy only the necessary
farm tools that year. 27 In 1810 and 1811, St. Thomas'
received $351 on the sale of some female slaves which helped
to decrease the debt. 28 St. Thomas' seemed to have

179 W, pp. 879-80.

26 Account Book, Newtown, March 10, 1814; Mary 24,
1814; April, 1816, MS, MPA, 171 D.

27 Fr. Adam Marshall to Fr. Francis Neale, Sept. 16,
1810, MS, MPA, 203 M 7.

28 Account Book, St. Thomas', Jan., 1810; March 13,
1810; July 3, 1810; April 1, 1811; June 7, 1811; Sept. 30,
1811, MS, MPA, 172 E.
continued its sale of slaves in 1816 since Fr. Neale obtained from Fr. Fenwick legal papers which allowed the slaves to be sold for a certain term of years and prevented the purchaser from selling them to someone in Georgia.\(^{29}\)

Conditions did not improve at St. Thomas', however. Bishop Marechal wrote in 1818 that St. Thomas' Manor "is kept in bad order and wants repairs. There are about 3000 acres of land but badly cultivated. Hence it runs in debt."\(^{30}\)

During the War of 1812, St. Inigoes suffered the loss of $1800 worth in various articles and $2000 in damages.\(^{31}\)

Despite these losses, St. Inigoes managed to send $1850 worth of produce to Georgetown College every year.\(^{32}\)

In 1815 Brother Mobberly wrote his first piece on the necessity and profitability of selling all the slaves and bringing in free white labor to work the farms. In his letter of 1815, to Fr. Grassi, the Superior of the Mission,

---

\(^{29}\)Fr. Enoch Fenwick to Fr. Francis Neale, May 24, 1816, MS, MPA, 205 Z 23.


\(^{32}\)Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, p. 137, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.
he argued that St. Inigoes could save at least $334.46 a year if it freed or sold its slaves and brought in 14 hired hands to do the necessary jobs around the estate. In his calculations, he estimated the cost of food, clothing, medical expenses and wood for the forty-three blacks to amount to $1834.26 per year. Mobberly calculated that you could hire ten laborers for $800 a year, a milk maid for forty dollars per year, a house cook for forty dollars per year, and a cook for the workmen for another forty dollars per year. While St. Inigoes spent $1233.56 per annum for food and wood for their 43 slaves, they would only have to spend, according to Brother Mobberly, $499 for the same for the fourteen hands. St. Inigoes would also relieve itself of the responsibility of clothing its workers and paying the county and direct taxes on slaves. If the fourteen hands managed to produce as much food as the slaves, there would be much more corn and pork left over to be sold since the fourteen hands would not possibly consume as much food as the forty-three slaves. Besides the financial argument Mobberly added that the blacks were becoming more and more difficult to govern and that the Jesuits had "their souls to answer for."33

33Brother Joseph Mobberly to Fr. J. Grassi, Feb, 5, 1815, MS, MPA, 204 K 3.
Five years later, in 1820, Mobberly developed his argument against having slaves a litter further. As before, he argued that slaves were becoming more discontent with their status and more corrupt in their morals. Again, he emphasized that it would be cheaper to bring in hired hands to do the work and increased his estimation of the cost of upkeep for forty-three slaves from his $1800 mark in 1815 to $2000. He then offered the other alternative of dividing up the land, building good strong houses and recruiting tenant farmers to cultivate the land. According to Mobberly, the slave system in Maryland necessitated the planting of corn, used to feed the slaves, and the staple crop of tobacco. Both crops exhausted the soil more quickly than wheat, and corn especially required more work than wheat. He praised the Pennsylvania farmer who because he planted wheat enjoyed more profits than the Maryland corn and tobacco planter. Unlike the Maryland planter, the Pennsylvania farmer, who hired free laborers to cultivate his land, did not have to deal with troublesome slaves or incompetent overseers. To conclude,

34 Brother Mobberly's Diary, 1820, p. 81, MS, GCA, 4.4 1/2 I.
35 Ibid., p. 139.
Mobberly reasserted the economic wisdom of getting rid of the slaves and regretted that slavery had ever been introduced to the United States. 36

By 1820 the Maryland Mission seemed on the verge of financial crisis. In August of that year, Fr. Adam Marshall, Procurator of the Mission, complained:

Our affairs wear an alarming appearance; a heavy and empty treasury; immense tracts of land resembling rather an Indian hunting ground than lands inhabited by men acquainted with the arts of civilized life. All our plantations in a wretched condition & many as I am informed in debt. And even your Most Rev'd Arch Bishop treatening us with a law suit!! bravo! 37

In December Marshall informed Fr. Francis Neale that he had visited all the farms except St. Joseph's and that new measures would have to be taken to save them and the Corporation from financial ruin. He also mentioned that Fr. O'Bryen, a secular priest sent by Archbishop Marechal to serve in a Jesuit parish, complained that he was not receiving his usual salary. Marshall informed that he would be paid with the interest accruing from the sale of the Jesuit property Arabia Petria in Harford County, Maryland.

36Ibid., pp. 79-85.

37Fr. A. Marshall to Fr. Enoch Fenwick, Aug. 14, 1820, Ms., MPA, 205 G 6. Archbishop Ambrose Marechal of Baltimore made a number of unsuccessful attempts during his vicariate (1817-1828) to take possession of White Marsh and some of the other Jesuit property for his See. For a discussion of the Jesuit-Marechal controversy see
Marshall decided to pay O'Bryen since the Corporation had already begun the process of showing Marechal and his clergy "that they have no right to claim anything from us." 38

In a letter to Fr. De Barth, S.J., Fr. Peter Kenny reported that the Board of Trustees of the Corporation were leaning towards parting with the slaves and renting out the lands. Kenny warned that a change such as this should not take place suddenly without the assurance that it would produce a better financial state of affairs. 39 In his Ordinations on Religious Discipline in that same year, Kenny prayed for the day when the Maryland Jesuits could get rid of their slaves and bring in tenants "without injury to the property." He then continued:

Such an event will relieve this mission of an immense burden & the Whole Society of the odium, which is thrown on it by people, who speak without consideration of the knowledge of the actual state of things in this country. 40

---


39 Fr. Peter Kenny to Fr. L. De Barth, April 24, 1820, MS, MPA, 205 H 3.

40 Fr. Peter Kenny, Ordinations on Religious Discipline, 1820, p. 12, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X T 1.
The years between 1810 and 1820 saw the Jesuits, in the midst of financial difficulties, beginning to discuss the feasibility of selling all their slaves and bringing in tenant farmers. Still, by 1820, they showed a reluctance to take this step. They wanted to be absolutely sure that such a radical change would not end in ultimate financial collapse for the Corporation. Thus, the financial outlook for the 1820's did not seem at all bright.

Under its Master of Novices, the Belgian Jesuit Fr. Van Quickenborne, the novitiate at White Marsh was experiencing grave financial difficulties in 1822. In May of that year, Fr. Charles Neale, the elderly Superior of the Mission, encouraged all at the novitiate to maintain a policy of economic austerity or face the consequences of financial ruin. He accused Fr. Van Quickenborne and others of placing the novitiate in financial jeopardy. He then suggested that the novices give up drinking beer at mealtime and take water instead. He sternly concluded his remarks by warning that if any of the novices did not like to live the life of poor people they should leave the novitiate immediately.\(^41\)

On June 4, Neale ordered that

\(^41\)Fr. Charles Neale to Fr. A. Marchall, June 4, 1822, MS, MPA, 206 W 2.
the novices wear their own clothes and that White Marsh fire its blacksmith and printer to save money. Lay brothers, according to Neale's orders, were not to be accepted to the novitiate unless they were able "to get their living and something more."42 Things became so bad at White Marsh that the novices had no meat to eat in September of 1822.43 With the permission of Fr. General Fortis, the Maryland Jesuits closed the novitiate at White Marsh in 1823, due to financial distress and did not reopen a novitiate until 1827 at Georgetown.44 The year 1823 also marked the date when Fr. Van Quickenborne left with seven Belgian novices, three coadjutor brothers, and six slaves from White Marsh to begin a Missouri Mission of the Society of Jesus.45

The Jesuit run Seminary for secular priests at Washington also suffered from the financial drought of the Corporation during these years. In 1822, Fr. Charles Neale asked Fr. General Fortis' permission to allow the Jesuits to accept

42Ibid., June 4, 1822, MS, MPA, 206 W 8.
43Garraghan, op. cit., I, p. 32.
45Garraghan, op. cit., I, p. 79.
tuition from the students there. Fortis refused since such a practice violated the rules of the Society of Jesus. Five years later, the Jesuits closed the Seminary due to lack of funds.46

In November of 1822, a memorial of Fr. Charles Neale to Fr. Benedict Fenwick indicated that the Mission's debt amounted to $31,776.47 whereas its annual income was only $5956.47 According to the Procurator's report of 1824, Bohemia, which fed $2500 into the General Fund in 1824, was the only farm prospering that year. St. Inigoes gave $300, St. Thomas' $900 and White Marsh, of course, was incapable of giving anything that year.48 To help supplement the income of the General Fund, the Corporation sold some Negroes from Bohemia in 1824 for $320.49

In the midst of the financial difficulties of the 1820's, Brother Mobberly wrote a letter to Fr. General Fortis in December of 1824 suggesting that the Maryland

46 Ibid., pp. 33-4


49 Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen, Annual Statements, 1824, MS, MPA, 196 B.
Mission get rid of its slaves. On the basis of his twenty years experience with them, Mobberly accused the slaves of being lazy, ungovernable, and irreligious. Furthermore, the ideas of the Quakers, Methodists, and Presbyterians on liberty have corrupted them into believing that all who owned slaves would not be saved. In the end, Mobberly argued that the ownership of slaves by the Maryland Mission was highly impractical. The suggestion of Mobberly, as before, had fallen on deaf ears, and the General, at that time, virtually did nothing about the issue.

Between 1824 and 1830, the financial state of most of the farms grew worse. Brother Robert Fenwick of St. Joseph's in Talbot County reported to Fr. Dzierozynski in 1826 that he would not be able to pay the $100 for a hired slave, the still, and the taxes, that year, unless Dzierozynski, as Superior, gave him the money. Three years later, Fr. Samuel Newtown, also of St. Joseph's, informed Dzierozynski that the debt of the farm would only increase for some time and that the creditors were growing more and more impatient.

---

50 Brother Mobberly's Diary, Dec., 1824, p. 27, MS, GCA, 4.5 V1.
51 Brother Robert Fenwick to Fr. Dzierozynski, June 9, 1826, MS, MPA, 207 M 4.
52 Fr. Samuel Newtown to Fr. Dzierozynski, June 19,
In February of 1825, Fr. Francis Neale of St. Thomas' complained to Fr. Dzierozynski that only five of the sixty slaves on the farm were capable of working in the fields. He asked Dzierozynski to send him at least three working hands. He then told him that he did not know how he was going to pay the $200 doctor's bill for the past year and some other debts. By October of that year, Fr. Mudd of White Marsh still had not yet sent Neale the field hands he needed. By July of 1827, the debt of St. Thomas' stood at $347.41. As a result of these and other problems, St. Thomas' contributed only $300 to the General Fund in 1825 and 1826, $240 in 1827 and nothing in 1828 and 1829.

Bohemia which had contributed $2,500 a year to the General Fund, gave only $760 in 1825, $310 in 1826, $500 in 1827, nothing in 1829 and 1829, and $160 in 1830. Likewise, the Corporation received nothing from Newtown from 1829.

---
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53 Fr. Francis Neale to Fr. Dzierozynski, Feb. 28, 1825, MS, MPA, 207 R 5.
54 Ibid., Oct. 4, 1825, MS, MPA, 207 N 1.
55 Hughes, ed., Documents, op. cit., I, part I no. 114 L, p. 284
56 Ibid., no. 114 D. p. 380.
1826 to 1829. St. Inigoee's donations were erratic. In 1825, it donated $150 to the General Fund, in 1826, $300, in 1827, nothing, in 1828 $1000, and in 1829 and 1830, $500. White Marsh, which had offered nothing to the General Fund from 1822 to 1827, contributed $420 in 1828 and $480 in 1829. By 1830, White Marsh, according to Fr. Aloysius Mudd was able to pay off its present debt of $700 and, in Mudd's words, "will be enabled to maintain 12 novices together with the lay-brothers & servants absolutely necessary for the Service of the house." By 1830, White Marsh which had been on the brink of bankruptcy in the early 1820's began to show signs of new life while the other farms, except perhaps St. Inigoee's, were undergoing grave financial difficulties.

Jesuits and non-Jesuits of the day asked themselves why the farms had declined so greatly between 1810 and 1830. Brother Mobberly felt it was, to a significate degree, due to the growing discontent of the slaves. According to Mobberly, it became more and more difficult to get any work out of the slaves, and, at the same time, a

57 Ibid., Oct. 4, 1825, MS, MPA, 207 N 1.
58 Fr. Peter Kenny, Statement of Fr. Aloysius Mudd to Fr. Peter Kenny on the Eligibility of White Marsh as a Novitiate, July 29, 1830, MS, MPA, 209 M 9a.
good deal of money was being invested in their upkeep. Mobberly also suggested the possibility of soil exhaustion due to the constant replanting of corn and tobacco. Other Jesuits of the day, Fr. Charles Neale and Fr. Francis Neale, felt that the financial crisis of the Mission was a direct result of the mismanagement of the foreign Jesuits such as Fr. Anthony Kohlman who was Superior from 1817 to 1821 and the Belgian Fr. Van Quickenborne who was Master of Novices and manager of White Marsh.59 Richard McSherry, a layman and brother of the first Provincial of the Maryland Province, Fr. William McSherry, wrote his brother in 1828 and said that he thought that:

the Jesuits have managed their affairs very badly in this country, what it is owing to I cannot tell, but think very bad policy to place foreigners as superiors who know nothing of the country or its institutions. They have an immense property which yields then nothing. I do not think it becoming that clergymen who ought to be engaged in teaching or mission should be farmers, if their property was all rented out it would produce twenty times the income & the fathers could be better employed.60

Richard McSherry pointed out a very real problem. The Jesuit priest was frequently torn between his ministry and

59Garraghan, op. cit., I, pp. 30-1.
60Richard McSherry to Fr. William McSherry, Nov. 27, 1828, MS, MPA, 208 G 6.
his work as a plantation manager. It was, perhaps, im-
possible to do both well. Years later, the Jesuit histori-
an Fr. Thomas Hughes argued that the Jesuits were so consi-
derate to their slaves that they were unable to reap the
profit from slavery that other slave holders enjoyed. 61

Whether it was soil exhaustion, the discontent of the
slaves, the mismanagement of foreign and native American
Jesuits alike, or the overconsiderateness to the slaves
that caused the gradual decay of the Jesuit estates,
the fact remained—the Jesuits of Maryland were in the
midst of a serious financial crisis by 1830. A solution
to this crisis demanded strong leadership and change.
Fortunately for their financial survival, the Jesuits were
able to find both in the 1830's.

In early 1831, Fr. Kenny, as Visitor, informed the
General that he and some of the Maryland Jesuits thought
it best to sell all the plantations and slaves. In
reply, Fr. General ordered that the plantations be kept,

61Hughes, ed., Documents, op. cit., I, part I, no.
114 K, p. 384.
but "let them be improved and made fruitful." In his decision, the General, perhaps, showed a lack of appreciation for the seriousness of the economic crisis in Maryland at the time, yet the decision would in years to come prove to be the best. Many years later, as we shall see, the farms were running at a sizeable profit.

In 1831 the Maryland Jesuits began discussing a controversial experiment. Some wanted to sell all the slaves at Bohemia and bring in tenant farmers. Before 1831, the Jesuits sold their slaves primarily to pay off debts. Though the sale of the Bohemia slaves would fulfill this function, it also would make Bohemia a testing ground to see whether renting all the land, the home farm included, would be more profitable than having slaves. The Master of Novices at White Marsh, Fr. Grivel, was definitely opposed to the idea. He felt that a sale of all the slaves at Bohemia would result in the abandonment of the cultivation of the crops, since it was practically impossible to find tenant farmers. Grivel further argued

---

that most free whites in Maryland owned land or could easily acquire some. The Jesuit opponents of the sale of the slaves would use this same strong argument four years later at the Provincial Congregation of 1835. 63 Fr. Hardy told Fr. Kenny that year that St. Joseph's was running at a deficit of $200 to $250 per year, but by erecting new buildings and by improving the management it could make a profit of at least $200 per year. Thus, by 1831, some Jesuits still believed that poor management alone and not the expense of the slave system was responsible for their financial difficulties. 64

Despite the cries of opposition, the Corporation decided to go ahead with the plan of selling the Bohemia slaves. In January of 1832, Brother Fenwick drew up an account of the assets of the estate. Among the slave population at Bohemia, there were five males over eighteen and two females over sixteen and one under. According to Fenwick's calculation, the sale of all the people would

63 Judge, op. cit., p. 393.
64 Fr. Hardy to Fr. Kenny, 1831, MS, MPA, 103 1/2 W 13.
bring in $1050. Between January 23 and February 5 of 1832, Bohemia sold five of its slaves for a total of $730.50.65 Brother Fenwick sent two of the women slaves, Lucy and Betsey, to St. Joseph's in exchange for a male slave named Tom of that estate and kept on a boy named Bill.66 Bill remained a slave at Bohemia until 1852 and Sam until 1859.67

On October 26, 1832, Fr. Kenny declared that the Bohemia experiment had worked. He told Fr. McElroy that "There is no farm that gives more efficient help to the provincial fund than this. [Bohemia] & we must see, that the system so long pursued with effect be kept up."68 Meanwhile, in the summer of 1832, seeing that the Bohemia experiment was working, all except one of the consultors of the Mission recommended with some hesitation that:

the state of public feeling on the subject of slavery & the other disadvantages attending the

---

65 Brother Fenwick, Account of Bohemia Farm, and Value, 1832, MS, MPA, 103 T 8 1/2.
system be accurately & in detail made known to the General with a View of obtaining his Sanction for the adoption of some arrangement that will gradually liberate his mission from such servants and substitute free labourers in their place.\textsuperscript{69}

The wariness and hesitancy in making this recommendation contributed to the delay of the General's decision on this matter. Some still felt that such a sudden and drastic change on the farms would end in the financial destruction of the Corporation. Others felt that the slave system could be quite profitable if given another chance. That summer, Fr. Peter Havermanns of Newtown claimed that this farm under the slave system could make as much as $2,500 a year whereas if he rented out its land it would clear only $600 or $700.\textsuperscript{70}

Also in 1832, St. Thomas' was preparing to sell some of its slaves to a Mr. John Lee and a Mr. Horsey, both Louisiana planters who promised to provide a Catholic priest for the slaves. Apparently the sale fell through that year since no records exist of any sale of Jesuit-

\textsuperscript{69} Fr. Peter Kenny, Measures Proposed and Discussed in Visitation Consultation, Aug. 28, 1832, Kenny Papers, MS, MPA, X M 1.

\textsuperscript{70} Fr. Peter Havermanns to Fr. George Fenwick, July 17, 1832, MS, MPA, 210 P 5.
owned slaves from St. Thomas' around that time until 1835.71

The year of 1833 was a year of important changes for the Jesuits of Maryland. On February 2, 1833, Fr. General Roothaan raised the Maryland Mission to the full status of a Province. He also appointed Fr. William McSherry, Procurator of that Mission since August 14, 1832, to be the first provincial. The day before the erection of the new Province, Roothaan in his Ordinatio de Minervali granted Georgetown the permission to accept tuition fees from its students. This decision could not have been made at a more propitious moment since Georgetown was in serious financial trouble at the time and would remain so for the next few years. By 1835 the debt of the College had risen to $30,000 and in 1837 McSherry wrote the General asking for $20,000 to keep the College alive. Still, this decision which provided the College with a steady flow of income must have helped somewhat to alleviate the crisis and provided Georgetown some financial security.

---

71 Fr. Kenny to Fr. Francis Neale, St. Thomas', Sept. 10, 1832, MS, MPA, 210 N 1; Fr. Kenny to Fr. J. McElroy, Nov. 23, 1832, MS, MPA, 210 M 5.
During the first three years of his office, Fr. McSherry did a financial study of three of the four major Jesuit slaveholding estates—St. Thomas', Newtown and St. Inigoes. Of the 4,600 acres at St. Thomas', approximately 3,400 were rented out for a total of $1,800. Unfortunately, a large amount of this money supported the home farm which was cultivated by the slaves. Only sixteen of the forty-five slaves were capable of work in 1833. Consequently, for some years prior to 1833, St. Thomas' provided the General Fund only with debts. McSherry estimated that the slaves could be sold for a total of $16,000 which would bring in $1,000 interest per year and the land the slaves vacated would produce another $1,000 if rented out.

At Newtown only seventeen of the thirty-six were capable of work. McSherry noted that for nine years up until 1835 nothing had been paid to the General Fund from

---

72 Judge, op. cit., p. 381; Daley, op. cit., pp. 283-5.
Newtown except $600 in 1833 and $700 in 1834. If farmed by free labor, Newtown could hand over $2,950 per year to the General Fund. McSherry also calculated that he could get $25,000 for the sale of the slaves which could produce as much as $1,500 interest per year if wisely invested. 74

Fr. McSherry suggested keeping only 200 or 300 acres—enough to support two priests—of the 3,000 acres of St. Inigoes and selling the rest. Of the ninety slaves at that farm only forty-five could work. The $1,900 worth of crops produced each year was used to support the slaves, repair the buildings, and buy agricultural tools. After all was paid for, St. Inigoes managed to contribute with some delay only $600 per year. 75 Also by 1835, the novitiate at White Marsh was $20,000 in debt and moved to Frederick, Maryland, that year, where Fr. John McElroy, S.J., had erected St. John's Literary Institute in 1828.

74 Ibid., Newtown, ca. 1835, MS, MPA, 99 L 1a.
75 Ibid., St. Inigoes, ca. 1833, MS, MPA, 99 L 11.
with the annual financial aid of $400 per year from the Maryland Assembly. Because of these financial reports and the rising debt of Georgetown and the rest of the Province, McSherry became more and more convinced of the wisdom of selling the slaves and renting out all the lands.

Meanwhile, Fr. General Roothaan was becoming more aware of the financial crisis in Maryland. In a letter of consultation addressed by the General to a Cardinal in 1835 relating to the Jesuits' obligation to supply a pension fund for the Archbishop of Baltimore, he noted that the Maryland Jesuits:

have large farms; but hardly the fourth part is cultivated for want of capital. The produce is in great part consumed by the ever-increasing number of slaves...Meanwhile schools and churches are ever being erected...And the Fathers have constant need of the financial help which is supplied from Europe, whether by the General or by other benefactors.

In July of 1835, the Provincial Congregation in its eighth postulatum recommended that some of the twenty country

76 Judge, op. cit., p. 383.
missions scattered throughout Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania be shut down and that some of the Province's property be sold. By this, the Jesuits hoped to relieve the Province of a financial burden and concentrate its efforts in building colleges in cities such as Richmond, New York, and Philadelphia. In August of the same year, McSherry informed the General that he might have to proceed with the closing down of some of these missions due to financial necessity. In the second postulatum of the Provincial Congregation of 1835, the Maryland Jesuits asked that the slaves be sold and that the farms be turned over to experienced farmers. They argued that for many years the management of the slaves and the farms had been a tremendous distraction to their spiritual and ministerial duties and threatened to destroy the spiritual lives of the fathers managing the estates. In response to these


79 Judge, op. cit., p. 386.
requests at the Congregation, Fr. Roothaan asked for time to deliberate on these matters. 80

To relieve the financial difficulties of the Province temporarily, McSherry had already begun to sell slaves from St. Thomas' and St. Inigoes before the Congregation of 1835 had convened. The Province obtained $6,100 for the sale of fourteen slaves from St. Thomas', the Provincial's residence, and $7,182 for the sale of eleven blacks from St. Inigoes to Henry Johnson in partnership with Thomas Jennison, both Louisiana planters. McSherry handed over $1,500 from the sale of St. Inigoes' slaves to Fr. Carberry to pay off the debt of that estate and kept the rest for the Province Arca, the General Fund. McSherry also made some minor sales to the neighbors of the various estates. The slaves purchased for St. Thomas' and St. Inigoes must have been among the best since the average selling price of each individual slave ranged between $425 and $650. Even

80 Ibid., pp. 384, 390; Acta Primae Congregationis, Provinciæ Marylandiæ Societatis Jesu, 1835, secundum postulatum, MS, MPA, Liber Continens Acta Congregationum Provincialium, Pars Prima, 1832-1836. According to Judge on page 397, those in favor of selling the slaves were Frs. Mulledy, McSherry, Gabaria, Ryder, Fenwick and Vespre; those opposed were Dzierozyński, Grivel, Dubuisson and Young.
after these sales, there were still 272 slaves before the final sale in 1838. 81

By 1835 and 1836, the sentiment to sell all the slaves was still not unanimous among the Maryland Jesuits. Fr. Vespre, Procurator of the Province, wrote in his Memoir of the Congregation of 1835 that if the slaves were sold their faith would be seriously endangered. He also argued that if the U.S. Government should ever decide to free the slaves, they would follow the policy of the British in the West Indies by indemnifying the planters for their financial loss. Finally, he suggested that the sale of the slaves by Catholic priests would scandalize both Protestants and Catholics. 82

Still deliberating on the matter in 1836, Fr. General Roothaan warned McSherry, in so many words, that it was better to suffer financial disaster than to have all our souls--both his and the Maryland Jesuits--perish with the sale of the slaves. 83

81 Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen, Annual Statements, 1835, 1836, 1838, MS, MPA, 196 B.

82 Judge, op. cit., pp. 394-5.

83 Ibid., p. 395.
On October 8, 1836, Fr. Dubuisson, former Socius and assistant to Fr. Kenny, wrote McSherry from Rome that he had given Fr. General observations on the sale of the slaves and that Fr. General could not as yet authorize their sale. In his Memoriale on the sale of the slaves, in 1836, Dubuisson, who was against the sale, discussed the pros and cons of such an action.

Dubuisson prefaced his remarks to the General by indicating that there were two distinguished Louisiana planters—one a Catholic, the other a Protestant—willing to purchase all the slaves and promising to let them have free exercise of their religion. He then pointed out to the General that the Bohemia experiment had succeeded but this was for the most part due, in his mind, to the fine administration of Brother Heard. Possible dangers of slave insurrections and discontent among the Jesuits' slaves favored the sale of the slaves. The inability of the farms to supply sufficient revenues for the Province and for the debt of Georgetown emphasized the urgent need

---

84 Fr. Stephen Dubuisson to Fr. William McSherry, Oct. 8, 1836, MS, MPA, 211 H 10.
for a sizeable amount of cash that could accrue from the sale of the slaves. The Fathers' preoccupation with the management of the slaves and farms seemed dangerous to their spiritual lives. Dubuisson showed some skepticism for the last argument since those who presented this argument were not managers of plantations, for the most part, and, if the method of administration on the farms could be improved, the Fathers would have more time for their spiritual duties.

In the negative, Dubuisson argued that with the sale of the slaves the farms would cease to be places of rest for the older fathers, for those unacquainted with the English language, and for those whose temperament prevented them from teaching in the College. He also stressed that the blacks vehemently objected to being sold down South. Abolitionists would jump at the first opportunity to criticize the Jesuits for selling their slaves, and this would result in causing great scandal. Finally, the money received at this time from the sale might not be accredited by the banks in the United States which are experiencing great difficulty at the moment.

Dubuisson also cautioned the Maryland Jesuits not to free the slaves since they were not equipped to handle
the life of free men and would be exposed to many dangers. \(^85\) No doubt, the arguments of Dubuisson against the sale helped delay the decision of the General.

In his correspondence with the General in 1836, Fr. McSherry did not let the General forget the serious financial crisis of the Province. In late August of that year, he threatened that, if the slaves could not be sold, he might soon have to close the novitiate and the scholasticate. \(^86\) Realizing the intensity of the financial crisis, Fr. General Roothaan yielded to the pressure of McSherry and the majority of the leaders in the Maryland Province and, on October 26, 1836, approved the sale of the slaves on the following conditions:

1. That the slaves have the free exercise of the Catholic religion and the opportunity of practicing it. Therefore
   a. they are not to be sold except to proprietors of plantations so that the purchasers may not separate them indiscriminately and sell them.
   b. It must be stipulated in the sale that the Negroes have the advantage of practicing their reli-


gion, and the assistance of a priest.

c. Husbands and wives must never be separated, nor children from their parents, quantum fieri potest.

d. If a servant, male or female, have wife or husband on another plantation they are to be brought together, otherwise they are by no means to be sold into a distant place.

e. Those who cannot be sold or transported on account of old age or incurable diseases must be provided for as justice and charity demand.

2. That the money received from the sale be in no way spent in making purchases, nor in paying of debts, but it must be invested in capital which fructifies...

Of everything that is done in this matter your Rev. will inform me, as upon it depends the subsistence of the Province, namely for the Novitiate and the Scholasticate. Therefore, act with consideration, consultation and prayer, in order that the business may proceed for the good of the Province and the Glory of God.87

In early 1837, Fr. Vespre, the Province Procurator, listed twenty safeguards to be followed in the sale of the slaves. Though they are generally a reiteration of the conditions of Roothaan, he did add a few extra guidelines. He encouraged an advertised public sale of the slaves. He thought that the slaves should be sold to planters in

Louisiana, where there are many churches and priests. If the money from the sale should be invested in ground rents, as the General had suggested, they should be purchased only in larger cities and away from areas in those cities where industry could possibly develop. Finally, after consultation, Fr. McSherry could feel free to choose avenues of investment other than ground rents. 88

By 1837, practical obstacles lay in the path of the sale of the slaves. The Panic of 1837 in the North American Banks delayed the possibility of any sales. McSherry expressed to the General that he could hope to make only a tenth of what he could have made the year before for the sale. In August of 1837, McSherry complained that the income from the farms was far less than normal that year. 89 Feeling the pressure of all these difficulties and suffering from bad health, Fr. McSherry left his post as Provincial in October of 1837 to become Rector of Georgetown, Fr. Thomas Mulledy, then assumed the position of Provincial and faced the task of selling the slaves.

89Ibid., pp. 290-2.
In May of 1838, Mulledy sold a boy from St. Thomas' for $450. The major sale of 272 of the slaves took place on June 19, 1838. On that day, Henry Johnson and Jesse Batey agreed to pay $115,000 for them. The first $25,000 would come with the delivery of the first fifty-one slaves which were to be sent as soon as possible. The remaining $90,000 would be paid over a ten year period at six percent interest per year. Johnson and Batey also promised to mortgage their plantations and slaves to secure payment for their notes. Fr. Mulledy was able to keep his promise to send the rest of the slaves with their beds, clothing and other belongings between October 15 and November 15. On November 11, 1838, he wrote with a great sigh of relief: "Thank God I have succeeded in getting on board ship all the negroes except those who are married off the farm--Gov. Johnson wished, very prudently, to leave those to see if he could purchase their wives or husbands,

---


91 Zwinge, "Jesuit Farms," op.cit., 41 (Sept., 1912): 283-4; Judge, op.cit., pp. 400-1; Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen, Annual Statements, July, November, 1838, MS, MPA, 196 B.
As we have seen in Chapter II, the Maryland Jesuits did their best to comply with Fr. Roothaan's conditions on the sale of the slaves, regarding the practice of their religion, the separation of families, and the treatment of the elderly. Some older slaves and slaves who had run away to avoid being sent to Louisiana still remained at White Marsh, St. Joseph's and St. Inigoes. According to the financial statement of Georgetown College in 1841, there were still two slaves working there. Governor Johnson reported in April of 1839 that the slaves he had purchased were in good health and content with their situation.

The second part of the General's conditions on the

---

92 Fr. Thomas Mulledy to Fr. John McElroy, Nov. 11, 1838, McElroy Papers, MS, MPA, 212 M 6.

93 Fr. Grivel to C.C. Lancaster, Nov. 6, 1838, MS, MPA, 212 M 5a; Fr. Grivel to C.C. Lancaster, Feb. 3, 1839, MS, MPA, 212 3a; Fr. Grivel to C.C. Lancaster, Feb. 29, 1840, MS, MPA, 213 Z 6b & c.

94 Financial Statement, Georgetown College, July 3, 1841, MS, MPA, 56 W 3.

95 H. Johnson, Governor of Louisiana, to Fr. McSherry, April 27, 1839, MS, MPA, 212 G 7A.
investment of the funds from the sale was partially violated by Fr. Mulledy. Instead of investing all the money and keeping it as a fund for the future support of the Province, the novitiate, and the scholasticate, Mulledy loaned some money to Georgetown and contributed another $8,000 to the extinction of the long debated Archbishop's pension. This put an end to Archbishop Eccleston's and his predecessors' claims to a yearly pension from the Society of Jesus--a pension that had originally been granted freely to Archbishop Carroll and Archbishop Neale which in later years their successors in the See of Baltimore claimed as their right.96 In the final analysis, through the sale of the slaves the Jesuits of Maryland were able to solve the financial crisis of the 1830's.

In the 1840's, the Maryland Jesuits discovered that tenant farming was indeed more profitable than slavery on their estates. Under the shrewd management of the Assist-

96 Judge, op. cit., pp. 401-4.
ant Procurator of the Province, Mr. Charles C. Lancaster, S.J., the farms provided more revenue than they ever had. The income from the farms in 1847 was $6,000, in 1849, $10,000 and by 1861, $16,000. In 1851, Lancaster eliminated the local Superiors as the local agents and took direct control of the farms. Instead of paying a certain set rent for each year, the tenant farmer under Lancaster's supervision gave one third of his crop to the Province on the farms in Southern Maryland and one half at Bohemia and Conewago, a farm in Pennsylvania. This encouraged the farmer to produce more each year so that his profit might increase. Under the former system on the home farms, the slave rarely had any incentive to produce a good crop and frustrated his priest masters and overseers alike. Thus, the change in the management of the farms and the collection of rents, and the renting out of all the lands to tenant farmers, in the end, proved more profitable for the Maryland Jesuits.97

The Maryland Jesuits, having suffered financial hardships for many years, found it economically expedient

to sell their slaves in 1838. The sale, undoubtedly, saved the Maryland Province from financial ruin in the 1830's and provided a steady source of income for years to come. Bishop Fenwick of Boston also felt that the extinction of slavery on the Jesuit farms would free the Society of Jesus from the condemnations of the abolitionists. 98 This was, perhaps, unrealistic since many an abolitionist would have condemned the Maryland Jesuits for selling their slaves down south instead of freeing them. Many of these abolitionists knew, as we know today, that the life style and working condition of the slaves in Louisiana were much worse than in Maryland. Indeed, the decision to sell their slaves down to Louisiana showed a tremendous lack of moral sensitivity on the part of the Jesuits.

Fr. Zwinge has argued that to have freed the slaves would have been cruel since most of them would not have been able to survive financially. Consequently, Zwinge felt that "the best for the Fathers and for the servants themselves was to sell them outright, and to distant plan-

98 Bishop Fenwick to Fr. G. Fenwick, Sept., 1838, MS, MPA, 212 N 2.
tations to keep them together as much as possible, to secure for them humane treatment and religious freedom."99

Neither the Jesuits of that time nor did Zwinge discuss the possibility of freeing the slaves and renting out the home farms to them. It was perhaps true that there would not be enough land for all of them. Yet, surely, some of them, who had worked on the farms for years and on their own vegetable gardens, knew enough about farming to bring in profit for themselves and for the Jesuits. Such a solution, however, would not have solved the immediate financial needs of the Province. Perhaps, also the mentality of the Jesuit of the time, which was no different in many cases from the mentality of his fellow southern slaveholders, prevented the possibility of that solution from ever being discussed. As he had done many times before, the Jesuit regarded his slave in an almost schizophrenic manner—as both person and property. On the one hand, he made provisions for the present and future humane treatment of the slaves in the sale and after the

sale, yet, on the other hand, the slave was his property and an immediate solution to his financial trouble. Though the sale proved economically wise, the Maryland Jesuits lacked moral sensitivity. Unfortunately, like many of their southern counterparts, they sacrificed justice and mercy for financial expediency.
CONCLUSION

When the Jesuits reached the shores of Maryland in the 1630's, they immediately faced the problem of financing their missionary efforts. To do this they turned to the most common money making activity, agriculture. Since they needed time for their ministerial apostolate, they acquired indentured servants in the seventeenth century to farm their lands and act sometimes as their missionary assistants. After their term of servitude had finished, some of these servants stayed on as tenant farmers, but many others preferred to go off and start their own farms. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Jesuits discovered that indentured servants were harder to find. The rapidly growing slave trade in that century provided the Jesuit estates with a new and permanent labor force. Thanks to the work of their slaves and tenant farmers, the Jesuits were able to support their missionaries, schools, and churches.

Most Maryland Jesuits failed to consider the morality of owning slaves. For them, as for many southern planters, the slaves served a necessary practical function. Brother Mobberly, who was sensitive to the criticisms of
Methodist, Quaker, and Baptist abolitionists on the question of the Jesuit ownership of slaves, wrote a whole treatise defending the institution of slavery. His scriptural, philosophical, scientific, and cultural arguments on behalf of the institution of slavery were not unlike the arguments of many other southern slaveholders in the nineteenth century, faced by the growing criticism of the abolitionists. In their practice of slavery and in Mobberly's defense of that institution, the Maryland Jesuits merely reflected the attitudes of their fellow southern slaveholders. Due to their position as priests and therefore upholders of Christian principles and in view of their own fight for religious freedom in the eighteenth century, the Jesuits' moral irresponsibility and culpability in this issue was, perhaps, even greater than their southern counterparts.

Both through preaching and through their example, the Jesuits encouraged other planters to treat their slaves more humanely and to care for their spiritual needs. The Jesuits' slave was generally better fed, sheltered, and cared for than the average bondsman in the South. The slaves frequently had opportunities of earning extra money by selling the produce from their own vegetable gardens and any pigs, chickens, or sheep they might have raised, or by doing extra work about the estate. Despite all this,
the Jesuit-owned slaves sometimes experienced many of the degradations attached to slavery in the South—poor diet, improper housing, clothing and medical care, whippings and the occasional separation of families. This, no doubt contributed to the instability of many slave families on the Jesuit estates where the master and not the father was the main provider and authority figure. Thus, on their own estates some Jesuits failed to provide the bare essentials of life for their slaves and consequently in the treatment of their slaves fell far short of living their Christian principles.

Not all the Jesuit-owned slaves were content with their status. Some took every opportunity to resist their masters. Others ran away, purchased, or sued for their freedom despite the fact that they would probably face many physical hardships as freemen.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the maintenance of the slave system on the Jesuit farms was becoming increasingly expensive. In the 1820's, the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen faced a tremendous debt and found it could not adequately support the novitiate and Georgetown from the decreasing income of the estates. By the 1830's, the financial crisis became even more serious. After many years of debate on the matter,
the Jesuits sold their slaves in 1838. This ended the financial crisis, but also left the Maryland Jesuits open to moral criticism for selling their slaves as mere chattel to Louisiana, where the conditions of the average slave's life was much worse.

As one of the greatest missionaries orders of the Catholic Church, the Society of Jesus has long had the reputation for its ability to adapt to many different cultures and also to reform when reform was needed. When the Jesuits came to Maryland, they found a land generally hostile to Catholicism. This hostility was still very real in the first half of the nineteenth century. Their status as virtual social outcasts hardly left them in a position to act as influential reformers on the issue of slavery. Instead, they were so influenced by the dominant culture in Maryland that they embraced many of the values of the southern planter and one of his most cherished institutions, slavery.

Because of their rejection by American Society, the Jesuits, perhaps, felt a need to conform to the ways and institutions of their fellow Maryland planters in order to prove they were not a threat to this society and in order to be accepted by it. They failed to show the same moral perception and courage as the Maryland Quakers, another
group of religious and social outcasts, who had virtually \(^1\) freed all their slaves by 1790 at great personal financial loss. Unlike the Quakers the Jesuits let financial expediency blind them to the moral issues involved in the ownership of slaves. Whereas the Quakers gradually recognized the evils of slavery and vigorously worked to abolish it, the Jesuits rather uncourageously yielded to the pressures of the dominant culture and did not act against this undemocratic and unchristian institution. In the final analysis, a combination of financial necessity and a need to be accepted by the Maryland planter led the Maryland Jesuits to adapt so well to the dominant culture that they lost their ability to perceive the evils of slavery and do something about them.

\(^1\)Kenneth L. Carroll, "Religious Influences on the Manumission of Slaves," Maryland Historical Magazine 56 (June, 1961): 183; Yearly Meeting at Baltimore, Minutes of the Yearly and Half Yearly Meetings of Friends in Maryland, fourth day of the sixth month, 1785, p. 145, Quaker Records in Maryland, microfilm copy, Maryland Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland, M 547; Thomas E. Drake in Quakers and Slavery in America (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1965) on page 82 mentioned that as a result of manumitting their slaves, some Quakers in southern Maryland were forced to leave their plantations and start their lives anew in the growing town of Baltimore or on farms in western Pennsylvania and Ohio.
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