

‘LABOURS IN THE CAUSE OF HUMANITY IN EVERY PART OF THE GLOBE’  
TRANSATLANTIC PHILANTHROPIC COLLABORATION AND THE  
COSMOPOLITAN IDEAL, 1760-1815

by

Amanda Bowie Moniz

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(History)  
in The University of Michigan  
2008

Doctoral Committee:

Professor David J. Hancock, Chair  
Professor Susan M. Juster  
Professor Michael P. MacDonald  
Associate Professor Susan Scott Parrish

© Amanda Bowie Moniz

---

2008

To my grandmother, Ida Paul Cohen, who taught me to read

## **Acknowledgements**

This dissertation could not have been written without support from many quarters. First and foremost, I owe many thanks to my committee members. I entered graduate school planning to study the nineteenth-century United States, but my adviser, David Hancock, changed those plans by bringing the eighteenth century and the Atlantic world alive for me. He taught me how to do research and has motivated me by continually demanding that I do the best I can. But of all his contributions to my work, the most important and an ongoing one is showing me how to craft a mass of details into a narrative, and for that I am very grateful. In many long conversations, Susan Juster helped me think about the key issues I was grappling with. Early on she understood my intellectual and stylistic goals, and her encouragement and enthusiasm about my study have meant an immense amount to me. Michael MacDonald made the crucial suggestion that I look into the humane society movement. He too has guided me as I explored the big questions about the rise of humanitarianism and has inspired me with the sense of irony and the humanity he brings to the study of people in the past. Susan Scott Parrish's scholarship has been a model for me, and I very much appreciate her questions and comments about my work.

My history training began under the many excellent history professors at Brown University. I am especially thankful for the guidance of Gordon Wood and Abbott Gleason. Each in his own way is a model for me. Another important teacher at Brown was Martha Burns, who has become a friend. I am very grateful to her for advice and

encouragement over the years. Likewise, Barbara DeWolfe at the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan is a wonderful mentor and friend.

Commentary from and conversations with Anne Boylan, Christopher L. Brown, Bruce Dorsey, Sarah Knott, John Lauritz Larson, Matthew Mulcahy, Johann Neem, Daniel Richter, Renate Wilson, and Brad Wood have sharpened my thinking. I am obliged too to the people who offered ideas when I presented my work at the American and Atlantic history workshops at the University of Michigan; the German Historical Institute-University of Texas at Arlington Young Scholars' Forum; the Institute of Historical Research in London; the Library Company of Philadelphia; the Massachusetts Historical Society; the Pennsylvania Historical Association Annual Meeting; the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture; the University of Delaware History Workshop in Technology, Society, and Culture; and the University of Paris 7 – Denis Diderot Atlantic World Conference.

Especially deep thanks go to Cathy Matson and Conrad Edick Wright. As Director of the Program in the Early American Economy and Society at the Library Company of Philadelphia, Cathy has nurtured and guided this project, and she helped me when I was struggling with early chapter drafts. Conrad's influence has been greater than I had initially realized. His work on the history of charity in New England planted questions in my mind that have shaped my intellectual agenda. He generously read and commented on the entire dissertation, and I have gained much from his counsel.

One of the things that makes David Hancock such a special adviser is that he makes an effort to foster relationships among his whole cohort of students. I have learnt and begged favors from Katie Cangany, Jonathan Eacott, and Suzi Linsley, and

especially Jeff Kaja and Dan Livesay, who have read several chapters and papers for me. I owe an especially big debt of gratitude to Michelle Craig McDonald. She has been a mentor to me from the first term of graduate school. I am glad that both she and Roderick McDonald, who has helped me with the Caribbean connections in my study, have become close friends to me. This profession would be much less fun without them. For their assistance, support, and friendship, many thanks to other Michigan colleagues: Rebecca Brannon, Tamar Carroll, Ellen Hartigan-O'Connor, Kate Luongo, Will Mackintosh, Mary O'Reilly, Jennifer Palmer, and Jessica Thurlow.

I have been lucky to have met many of my peers from other universities. Conversations with Rick Bell, Kate Carté Engel, Charlie Foy, Brad Jones, Vassiliki Karali, Karla Kelling, Julie Kim, Jen Manion, Caleb McDaniel, and Rob Parkinson have enriched this study and taught me much about early America. Through the Social Science Research Council Program on Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector, I met scholars studying philanthropy in various fields. I benefited much from our discussions in Los Angeles and Florence. How to thank Matthew Osborn and Jessica Roney? They have suggested sources and commented on my work, but gelato at Capogiro's and lunch on Capitol Hill mean so much more.

This dissertation could not have been undertaken without the support of many institutions. I am thankful to the following institutions: the American Historical Association for its Albert A. Beveridge Grant; the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History; the Massachusetts Historical Society for an Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship; the New England Regional Fellowship Consortium for a Colonial Society of Massachusetts Fellowship; the Program in Early American Economy and Society Fellowship of the

Library Company of Philadelphia; the Social Science Research Council Program on Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector; and the University of Michigan, including the History Department, the Rackham Graduate School, and the Joan B. Kessler Award fund.

My research has been made possible and has been enjoyable because of the staffs at many libraries and archives. I am indebted to the staffs at the following institutions: the Boston Athenaeum; the British Library; the Francis A. Countway Medical Library; the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; the Library Company of Philadelphia; the Library of Congress; the Maryland Historical Society; the Massachusetts Historical Society; the New Hampshire Historical Society; the New York Academy of Medicine; the New-York Historical Society; the New York-Presbyterian Hospital/Weill-Cornell Medical Center Archives; the New York Public Library; the Pennsylvania Hospital Archives; the Royal Humane Society; and the Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine. I am particularly grateful to Jim Green and Connie King of the Library Company and Stacey Peeples of the Pennsylvania Hospital.

I can't overstate my gratitude to Lorna Alstetter, Sheila Coley, and Kathleen King. They have answered countless questions, sorted out problems, and always been a welcoming presence in the History Department.

Special thanks to my friends and family for all sorts of things, but especially to Nuna Kim and Nils Hennig for discussions about medical philanthropy today; to Jenny Couzin-Frankel and Rich Frankel for living through the last year or so of grad school with me; to Kathryn and Richard Lenter and Jeanne Paul and Tom Nicely for making Michigan my second home; to Debby and Marc Fuller for putting me up and understanding what grad school was about; to Ida Paul Cohen and Ralph Cohen for their

support; and to my parents Judy and J. Webb Moniz for fostering my interest in history by moving us to London and taking us to seemingly every stately home and church of note in England, and to my sister Suzanne Moniz for being there with me.

Why David Lenter encouraged me to get a Ph.D. after he lived through my senior thesis remains a mystery to me. But he did and for that, I am immensely grateful.

Without his support, this experience would have been a lot harder and much less fun.



## Table of Contents

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	ix
List of Appendices	x
Abstract	xi
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Border Crossings: Philanthropists in an Improving Age	30
Chapter Two: The Little Picture: Instigators and the Spread of Institutions	71
Chapter Three: The Patriot of the World	115
Chapter Four: Universal Good-will and Shipwrecked Mariners: How (Not) to Help Strangers	157
Chapter Five: No Improper Prejudices: Pursuing Impartial Charity Locally	205
Chapter Six: The Empire of Humanity	239
Chapter Seven: The Business of Philanthropy, or Think Globally, Act Locally	288
Chapter Eight: Change and Continuity	325
Conclusion	350
Appendices	359
Bibliography	372

## List of Tables

Table 1.1: Social Backgrounds of Instigators	52
Table 4.1: National Origins of Recipients of Aid from the Scots Society of Norwich, or Society of Universal Good-will, 1778-1787	182
Table 5.1a: Incidence of Deaths by Drowning among Christ-Church (Philadelphia) Parishioners Semi-decennially, 1760-1815	209
Table 5.1b: Deaths by Drowning Record in the Burial Records of Old Swedes Church Gloria Dei (Philadelphia), 1788-1815	210
Table 5.2a: Drowning incidents in the New York <i>Daily Advertiser</i> , January 1, 1786, through March 13, 1787	213
Table 5.2b: Drowning incidents in the (Charleston) <i>Columbian Herald</i> , January 1, 1786, through March 13, 1787	215
Table 5.3a: Philadelphia Humane Society Cases, 1782-1815	218
Table 5.3b: Massachusetts Humane Society Cases, 1786-1812	219
Table 5.3c: Royal Humane Society Cases, 1776, 1785	219
Table 5.4a: Philadelphia Humane Society Cases where Rescued or Rescuer was Black	226
Table 5.4b: Massachusetts Humane Society Cases where Rescued or Rescuer was Black	227
Table 5.5: Account of the number of patients discharged from the New-York Hospital, from January 31, 1797, to December 31, 1803	236

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix One: Genealogy of Founded and Attempted Humane Societies in the Anglophone World plus Miscellaneous Other Resuscitation Institutions	359
Appendix Two: Honorary Memberships	365

## Abstract

Working together, citizens of the Atlantic world expanded the scale and scope of philanthropic activity. This dissertation moves beyond questions about the economic motives behind the rise of humanitarianism. Instead, through a transatlantic and trans-associational study, with particular focus on medical philanthropy, it focuses on *how* philanthropists built a complex charitable infrastructure and found ways to help suffering strangers near and far. This study reveals that activists recast organized beneficence through targeted changes that they collected and crafted as a result of a cosmopolitan approach to the world common in their era.

Eighteenth-century philanthropists bequeathed to their successors an accelerating pace of growth, a vastly elaborated charitable landscape, and the expectation of a worldwide reach. The developments that made possible those legacies unfolded as the Consumer Revolution burgeoned, the globe became more integrated (giving rise to a pragmatic cosmopolitanism among many people), and Americans and Britons made and unmade the empire. Rather than a major transformation, expansion of humanitarian activity rested on measured change. Through focused and incremental innovations trafficked among people around the Anglophone Atlantic, philanthropists identified more and more discrete groups as objects worthy of charitable assistance, enlarged the universe of eleemosynary institutions, and found routine ways to extend charity beyond local or particularistic boundaries.

This dissertation studies that evolution through analyses of philanthropists' activities at both the transnational and local levels. It first examines the role of geographically mobile individuals in the collection, transmission, and introduction to urban Atlantic communities of new programs. This study then probes the pervasive impact of the Consumer Revolution on philanthropy through the international celebrity of English prison reformer John Howard. Attention then turns to activists' efforts to find ways to aid suffering strangers, both internationally and locally. Ambitious international ventures failed, but philanthropists built on the local mastery of impartial charity in the resuscitation movement to pursue a global smallpox vaccination undertaking in the early nineteenth century. The local realm was where activists focused most of their energies, and the study next explores how activists made charities succeed locally. It ends by assessing the impact of the French Revolutionary chaos on cosmopolitanism in philanthropy.

## Introduction

Yet contemporaries were surely wrong to think of people as being more or less humane at one period in history than at another. What had changed was not the sentiment of humanity as such, but the definition of the area with which it was allowed to operate. The historian's task is to explain why the boundary encircling the area of moral concern should have been enlarged . . .

Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*<sup>1</sup>

In 1798, Dr. John Crawford of Baltimore wrote to Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia to ask for materials about the Philadelphia Dispensary. When Crawford had been in Philadelphia a few years earlier, Crawford and Rush had talked about the idea of founding a dispensary in Baltimore. Now Crawford wanted plans of the Philadelphia Dispensary to use as he called for a dispensary in Baltimore. I read Crawford's letter in the Rush papers at the Library Company of Philadelphia and took it as mildly interesting evidence that personal connections among philanthropists (that is, activists) in different cities abetted the spread of institutions. Half a year later, I was reading the reports of the London-based Royal Humane Society at the Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine in London. In the reports for 1785-86, there is a letter about the formation of a humane society in Barbados as an addition to the General Dispensary set up there in 1786. The letter was signed by one John Crawford. Some quick research confirmed it was one and the same man. Then and there my study of "the rise of humanitarianism" started falling into place.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (Oxford, 1983), p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> John Crawford to Benjamin Rush, June 13, 1798, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, Library Company of Philadelphia (LCP). *Royal Humane Society (RHS) Reports 1785-1786* [London, 1787], p. 170.

John Crawford highlights the connections among the people, places, movements, and individual charitable organizations that made up the field of philanthropy in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. (By philanthropy, I mean organized humanitarian activity. I will use the terms “philanthropy,” “beneficence,” “charitable activity,” and “humanitarian activity” interchangeably.) But he is just one example, albeit a particularly good one, of a broader phenomenon that underlay two key developments in beneficence. Over the long eighteenth century, British and American charitable infrastructures grew ever-more elaborate and philanthropists found ways to aid suffering “strangers,” people formerly outside their arena of moral responsibility. To understand how and why those changes unfolded – to understand the “rise of humanitarianism” – we have to grasp the relationships among citizens of the Anglophone Atlantic world. In addition, we have to appreciate their local and varied philanthropic undertakings as constituting an organizational field, or a “recognized area of institutional life” in which change occurs due to the linkages and structure of the field as a whole: That idea would not have been foreign to eighteenth-century activists, who implied it with their use of terms such as “empire of humanity,” their keen interest in developments elsewhere, and their efforts to disseminate new ideas far and wide.<sup>3</sup>

This study adds to the exploration of the transformation of beneficence in European and European-settler societies that began in the late Renaissance/early Reformation era. Depending on who is doing the dating, the period from the 1690s to 1850 has been seen by contemporaries

---

<sup>3</sup> Stanley Wasserman and Katherine Faust, *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 3-6. On the idea of an organizational field, see Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell, “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields,” *American Sociological Review* 48 (1983): 147-160, pp. 148, 147.

and their historians as an Age of Benevolence.<sup>4</sup> That idea, however, is something of a red herring. Key intellectual and practical changes occurred earlier, during the late Renaissance and the Reformation era when Europeans grappled with the nature of the gift and the relation between donor and recipient.<sup>5</sup> Activists have been working out the ramifications of those ideas ever since. Yet how did philanthropy achieve the scale it now has and how did charitable action on behalf of strangers near and far become routine?

Revamping philanthropic practices is an ongoing process, and interaction among actors across the field of social welfare has been one of its constant features. For at least the past five hundred years, the trade in ideas around Europe and then across the Atlantic has been a factor in developments in beneficence and social policy.<sup>6</sup> To appreciate the changes in any one period, it is important to recognize them as part of a long-term evolution in which new ideas are often old ideas that have been revived – because short of radical redistribution of resources the problem of inequality endures – and that perpetual frustration with the limits of philanthropy is a major

---

<sup>4</sup> Donna T. Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth-Century* (Princeton, 1989), p. 11; Barbara L. Bellows, *Benevolence Among Slaveholders: Assisting the Poor in Charleston 1670-1860* (Baton Rouge, 1993), pp. 19-20; Robert A. Gross, "Giving in America: From Charity to Philanthropy," in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, eds. Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie, quotation p. 30; Thomas L. Haskell, "Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility, Parts 1 & 2," *American Historical Review* 90 (1985): 339-361, 547-566, p. 339; David Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660-1960* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), p. 11; Conrad Edick Wright, *The Transformation of Charity in Postrevolutionary New England* (Boston, 1992), p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> John Bossy, *Christianity in the West 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 143-150; Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison, Wisc., 2000), pp. 109-110, 114-120; Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor & Stuart England* (London, 1998), pp. 8-10. Ole Peter Grell stresses the importance of Protestantism to changes in poor relief reform. Ole Peter Grell, "The Protestant Imperative of Christian Care and Neighborly Love" in *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe*, eds. Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham (London, 1997).

<sup>6</sup> Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes, eds., *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform: from the 1690s to 1850* (New York, 1998); Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham, "Reformation and Changes in Poor Relief in Early Modern Northern Europe" and Paul Slack, "Hospitals, Workhouses, and the Relief of the Poor in Early Modern England" in *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe*, pp. 4, 26-28, 237, 245-247; Joanna Innes, "The State and the Poor: Eighteenth-Century England in European Perspective" in *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany*, eds. John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth (London, 1999), pp. 262-280; Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998); see also the other volumes on health care and poor relief edited by Grell and his co-editors.



reason for the continual exchange and reworking of ideas. Today's "venture philanthropists" promise greater results by borrowing from the practices of venture capitalists, just as "scientific philanthropy" of the early twentieth century proffered optimal outcomes by adopting the principles of the reigning intellectual framework of science.<sup>7</sup>

Often what is old is new again in philanthropy. Nevertheless, modern philanthropy differs from medieval charity. Charity in the medieval era was a reciprocal act: In exchange for a donor's gift, the recipient was expected to pray for the benefactor's soul. By the twentieth century, beneficence had become a professional activity associated with vast amounts of money; the most well-known philanthropists and philanthropic foundations operate on a global scale. The critical moment in the trajectory from charity to philanthropy came in the sixteenth century. Christian humanist thinking and the Europe-wide movement for religious reform led activists to remake poor relief by rationalizing the provision of welfare and bringing it under lay control. The conceptual and applied shift from charity as a religious act to "modern philanthropy" with its pursuit of enterprising, coordinated solutions to systemic problems, then, dates to the early-modern period. Although that fundamental change occurred in the sixteenth century, activists in later centuries have diversified charitable infrastructures beyond recognition.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Hugh Cunningham, Introduction to *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform*, p. 9. On venture philanthropy, see Michael Edwards, *Just Another Emperor? The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism* (2008), pp. 20-23. On scientific philanthropy, see Barbara Howe, "The Emergence of Scientific Philanthropy, 1900-1920: Origins, Issues and Outcomes" in *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, ed. Robert Arno (Boston, 1980).

<sup>8</sup> Robert Gross makes the good point that charity has never fully disappeared and that the "mutual bonds" that characterize charity are essential to the "practical effectiveness and moral purpose" of philanthropy. Gross, "Giving in America," quotation p. 48. On medieval charity, see Miri Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1987); Joel Rosenthal, *The Purchase of Paradise: Gift Giving and the Aristocracy, 1307-1485* (London, 1972); see also Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990). Scholars disagree on when philanthropy became professionalized. The beginnings of that development lie in the eighteenth century when some activists, such as Thomas Clarkson, made philanthropy their vocations. Different scholars make claims for various points in the nineteenth century, while others date professionalization to the twentieth-century philanthropic foundations. Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill, 2006), p. 439. Paul S. Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Cambridge, Mass.,

The late eighteenth century was another critical moment in the evolution of philanthropy. The activists of that era bequeathed to their successors an accelerating pace of growth, a vastly elaborated charitable landscape, and the expectation of a worldwide reach. The developments that made possible those legacies unfolded as the Consumer Revolution burgeoned, the globe became more integrated (giving rise to a pragmatic cosmopolitanism among many people), and Americans and Britons unmade the empire. Rather than a major transformation, expansion of humanitarian activity rested on measured change. Through targeted and gradual innovations trafficked among men and women around the Anglophone Atlantic, philanthropists identified more and more discrete groups as objects worthy of charitable assistance, enlarged the universe of charitable institutions, and found routine ways to extend charity beyond local or particularistic boundaries.

### *Writing about Philanthropy*

Some of the aspirations and accomplishments of my subjects were inspiring, but I do not write in a celebratory vein. Acting on concern for people outside one's community, as some commentators at the time observed, could mean ignoring ills nearer to home. Moreover, as so many scholars have argued, philanthropy is an exercise of

---

1978), p. 86; Friedman and McGarvie, *Charity, Philanthropy and Civility in American History*, p. 17. On developments in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century welfare provision, see Grell and Cunningham, *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe*; Joanna Innes, "The 'Mixed Economy of Welfare' in Early Modern England: Assessments of the Options from Hale to Malthus (c. 1683-1803)" in *Charity, Self-Interest and Welfare in the English Past*, ed. Martin Daunton (New York, 1996), pp. 139-140; Robert M. Kingdon, "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva," *American Historical Review* 76 (1971): 50-69; W.K. Jordan, *The Charities of London, 1480-1660* (London, 1960); W.K. Jordan, *The Charities of Rural England, 1480-1660* (London, 1961); W.K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660* (London, 1959); Slack, *Poverty & Policy in Tudor & Stuart England*; David Underdown, *Fire From Heaven: The Life of an English Town in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1992). This view is influenced by Paul Clemens's argument that change in mid-Atlantic consumer culture in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was evolutionary, but that "the sum of the process was revolutionary." Paul G. E. Clemens, "The Consumer Culture of the Mid-Atlantic, 1760-1820," *William and Mary Quarterly* 62 (2005): 577-624, p. 578.

economic, social, and political power that legitimates inequality by ameliorating some of its most glaring effects. The well-off define the universe of alternatives for the redistribution of wealth (although beneficiaries may play roles in shaping institutions), and through their largess benefactors exercise influence over weaker members of society by offering resources with conditions such as expecting the needy to behave deferentially or to attend educational programs that reflect the values of donors. That perspective is summed up as the social control thesis. (It is worth pondering, however, that we extol the coercion inherent in beneficence with the adage proclaimed on posters and bumper stickers, “Give a man a fish and he’ll eat for a day. Teach a man to fish and he’ll eat for a lifetime.” How do you teach a man to fish? Make him go to fishing class.) But besides providing means for social control, philanthropy also alleviates real, *day-to-day* suffering, a point we historians who chart negative effects over years or decades should not forget.

Although I think it is critical to keep in mind the opportunistic and malign aspects of the exercise of power through the redistribution of resources, one of the goals of this dissertation is to move the study of philanthropy beyond dissections of economic motivations and power relations. The causes and nature of the “rise of humanitarianism” in the eighteenth century have been the focus of historiographical debate for decades. Two central questions have concerned historians, to wit, what was the connection between the development of capitalism and humanitarianism, and was the impact of philanthropic activity good or bad. To generalize grossly, the dominant and overlapping answers have been: activists used beneficence to advance and legitimate the market economy and the effect of their endeavors was to promote the interest of the middle

classes for docile, disciplined behavior from the lower classes.<sup>9</sup> Studies in the social control school of thought range from Clifford Griffin's almost paranoid analysis of reform organizations in the early nineteenth-century United States to David Brion Davis's nuanced and sympathetic explication of the beginnings of the American and British antislavery movements. The findings of these scholars have been eye-opening. Particularly disturbing are studies, such as David Rothman's and Andrew Scull's studies of asylums in Jacksonian America and eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England, that reveal how well-intentioned endeavors can become harmful and entrenched. Likewise, Cassandra Pybus's recent article on the Sierra Leone settlement highlights how philanthropists' own agendas and moral certitude could lead to the callous treatment of

---

<sup>9</sup> For studies that explore (with greater and lesser degrees of nuance) the self-interested economic motives and social control effects of philanthropy and reform, see, for examples, John K. Alexander, *Render Them Submissive: Responses to Poverty in Philadelphia, 1760-1800* (Amherst, 1980); Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America*; David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca, 1975); Mary E. Fissell, *Patients, Power, and the Poor in the Eighteenth-Century Bristol* (Cambridge, 1991), esp. chap. 4; Charles I. Foster, *An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837* (Chapel Hill, 1960); Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., New York, 1995); Clifford S. Griffin, *Their Brothers' Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1865* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1960); Tim Hitchcock, "Pauper and Preachers: The SPCK and the Parochial Workhouse Movement" in *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689-1750*, eds. Lee Davison, et al (New York, 1992); Michael Ignatieff, *Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850* (New York, 1978); Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837* (New York, 1978), esp. chap. 4; Louis P. Masur, *Rites of Execution: Capital Punishment and the Transformation of American Culture, 1787-1865* (New York, 1989); Michael Meranze, *Laboratories of Virtue: Punishment, Revolution, and Authority in Philadelphia, 1760-1835* (Chapel Hill, 1996); Raymond A. Mohl, *Poverty in New York, 1783-1825* (New York, 1971), pp. 159-265; R. J. Morris, "Voluntary Societies and British Urban Elites, 1780-1850" in *The Eighteenth-Century Town 1688-1820*, ed. Peter Borsay (London, 1990), pp. 340-346; David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston, 1971); Mordechai Rozin, *Rich and Poor: Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London* (Brighton, 1999); Andrew Scull, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in England, 1700-1900* (New Haven, 1993); Ian R. Tyrrell, *Sobering Up: From Temperance to Prohibition in Antebellum America, 1800-1860* (Westport, Conn., 1979); Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (1944; rpt. Chapel Hill, 1994). Michel Foucault is often taken as the most famous exemplar of the social control school, but Randall McGowan argues that that view misses Foucault's more subtle points about power. Randall McGowan, "Power and Humanity, or Foucault among the Historians" in *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body*, eds. Colin Jones and Roy Porter (London, 1994).

putative beneficiaries and the unwillingness to consider beneficiaries' views.<sup>10</sup> Yet histories in the social control tradition have often exaggerated the power of activists and overlooked the agency of the poor. Moreover, they do not adequately explain how developments in philanthropy unfolded.

There have been scholars who have challenged the social control thesis, and some scholars have said, or hoped, that it is behind us.<sup>11</sup> And, indeed, historians have probed other aspects of beneficence. Students of women's history and recently of the history of masculinity have used philanthropy to delve into the creation of public roles for women, women's role in the formation of class, and the construction of gender.<sup>12</sup> Historians of eighteenth-century British charity have examined how middling and elite groups engaged in or resolved political conflict through charitable organizations.<sup>13</sup> They and scholars of

---

<sup>10</sup> Griffin, *Their Brothers' Keepers*; Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*; Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*; Scull, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions*; Cassandra Pybus, "A Less Favourable Specimen": The Abolitionist Response to Self-Emancipated Slaves in Sierra Leone, 1793-1808," *Parliamentary History* 26 Supplement (2007): 97-112.

<sup>11</sup> For critiques or rejections of the social control thesis, see Lois Banner, "Religious Benevolence as Social Control: A Critique of an Interpretation," *Journal of American History* 60 (1973): 23-41; Jonathan Barry, "Urban Associations and the Middling Sort" in *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society and Politics in England, 1550-1800*, eds. Jonathan Barry and Christopher Brooks (New York, 1994); Bellows, *Benevolence Among Slaveholders*, pp. 73-74; James McElroy, "Social Control and Romantic Reform in Antebellum America: The Case of Rochester, New York," *New York History* 58 (1977): 17-46; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, esp. Appendix 1, pp. 199-206. According to Bruce Dorsey, the social control thesis had run its course by the 1970s. Recent works by Mark Kann and Simon Newman show it is alive and well. Bruce Dorsey, *Reforming Men & Women: Gender in the Antebellum City* (Ithaca, 2002), p. 3; Mark E. Kann, *Punishments, Prisons, and Patriarchy: Liberty and Power in the Early American Republic* (New York, 2005); for a recent Foucauldian interpretation of the Pennsylvania Hospital see, Simon P. Newman, *Embodied History: The Lives of the Poor in Early Philadelphia*, chap. 3 (Philadelphia, 2003).

<sup>12</sup> Anne M. Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism: New York and Boston, 1797-1840* (Chapel Hill, 2002); Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (Chicago, 1987), pp. 429-436; Dorsey, *Reforming Men & Women*; Lori D. Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (New Haven, 1990); Nancy A. Hewitt, *Women's Activism and Social Change: Rochester, New York, 1822-1872* (Ithaca, 1984); Clare Midgley, *Women Against Slavery: The British Campaigns, 1780-1870* (London, 1992); F. K. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1980).

<sup>13</sup> Bronwyn Croxson, "The Public and Private Faces of Eighteenth-Century London Dispensary Charity," *Medical History* 41 (1997): 127-149; Roy Porter, "The Gift Relation: Philanthropy and Provincial Hospitals in Eighteenth-Century England" in *The Hospital in History*, eds. Lindsay Granshaw and Roy

European charity in general also now emphasize the “mixed economy of welfare.” That is, rather than contrasting voluntary to legal provision of welfare, historians understand the universe of welfare services as a coherent system; that approach better captures poor folks’ perspective on the institutions available for them to use in their survival strategies.<sup>14</sup> Historians of British medical charities have explored, as aspects of medical history, the relations among donors, medical personnel, and patients; the development of the medical profession; the social character of medicine; and the impact on health and mortality of public and voluntary medical charity.<sup>15</sup> Those topics are less well developed for eighteenth-century America in part because of the much lower density of charities,

---

Porter (London, 1989); Adrian Wilson, “Conflict, Consensus and Charity: Politics and the Provincial Voluntary Hospitals in the Eighteenth Century,” *English Historical Review* 111 (1996): 599-619; Adrian Wilson, “The Politics of Medical Improvement in Early Hanoverian England” in *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French (Cambridge, 1990); Craig Rose, “Politics and the London Royal Hospitals, 1683-92” in *The Hospital in History*, eds. Lindsay Granshaw and Roy Porter (London, 1989).

<sup>14</sup> Joanna Innes explains this idea well. Innes, “The ‘Mixed Economy of Welfare.’” See also Marco van Leeuwen, “Histories of Risk and Welfare in Europe during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries,” in *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Northern Europe*, eds. Ole Peter Grell, Andrew Cunningham, and Robert Jutte (Aldershot, 2002), p. 59. Colin Jones explains how political attacks on welfare in the 1980s and 1990s prompted historians to rethink the dichotomy of public versus voluntary poor relief. Colin Jones, “Some Recent Trends in the History of Charity” in *Charity, Self-Interest and Welfare in the English Past*.

<sup>15</sup> Jonathan Andrews, “‘Hardly a Hospital but a Charity for Pauper Lunatics’?: Therapeutics at Bethlem in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries” in *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State*, eds. Jonathan Barry and Colin Jones (London, 1991); Anne Borsay, *Medicine and Charity in Georgian Bath: A Social History of the General Infirmary, c. 1739-1830* (Aldershot, 1999); W. F. Bynum, “Hospital, Disease and Community: The London Fever Hospital, 1801-1850” in *Healing and History: Essays for George Rosen*, ed. Charles E. Rosenberg (New York, 1979); W. F. Bynum, “Physicians, Hospitals and Career Structures in Eighteenth-Century London” in *William Hunter and the Eighteenth-Century Medical World*, eds. W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (Cambridge, 1985); Lisa Forman Cody, “Living and Dying in Georgian London’s Lying-in Hospitals,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78 (2004): 309-348; Robert Kilpatrick, “‘Living in the Light’: Dispensaries, Philanthropy and Medical Reform in Late Eighteenth-Century London” in *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French (Cambridge, 1990); Susan C. Lawrence, *Charitable Knowledge: Hospital Pupils and Practitioners in Eighteenth-Century London* (Cambridge, 1996); Francis M. Lobo, “John Haygarth, Smallpox and Religious Dissent in Eighteenth-Century England” in *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French; Roy Porter, “Cleaning up the Great Wen: Public Health in Eighteenth-Century London” in *Living and Dying in London*, eds. W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (*Medical History Supplement* No. 11, 1991); Porter, “The Gift Relation”; Kevin Siena, *Venereal Disease, Hospitals and the Urban Poor: London’s ‘Foul Wards,’ 1600-1800* (Rochester, 2004); E. G. Thomas, “The Old Poor Law and Medicine,” *Medical History* 24 (1980): 1-19; John Woodward, *To Do the Sick No Harm: The British Voluntary Hospital Movement to 1875* (London, 1974).

but also because the reform movements of the Jacksonian era have dominated scholarly attention. In addition, scholars have explored the rise of humanitarianism from the perspective of sympathy. Ideas about sympathy helped eighteenth-century men and women explain the place of universal benevolence – or goodwill to all humankind – in the economy of sentiments. Those ideas are integral to understanding developments in philanthropy. But because they allowed people to explain away the possibility of acting on universal benevolence as impractical, conceptions of sympathy do not explain how contemporaries changed beneficent practices.<sup>16</sup>

In spite of these other lines of analysis, historians, at least in the United States, have a hard time analyzing philanthropy outside of the Foucauldian framework of power relations, perhaps out of concern for being taken for dupes of philanthropists if we do not reiterate repeatedly that we recognize the role of self-interest in beneficence. Discussion, then, often boils down to a debate over whether activists were on balance good or bad, with a new work on prison reform taking the firm position that early nineteenth-century prison reformers were bad. By contrast, a recent dissertation on benevolent organizations in early national New York faults the limitations of the social control thesis by arguing

---

<sup>16</sup> The growing body of work on sensibility and sympathy includes: Andrew Burstein, “The Political Character of Sympathy,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 21 (2001): 601-632; Nicole Eustace, “The Sentimental Paradox: Humanity and Violence on the Pennsylvania Frontier,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 65 (2008): 29-64; Norman Fiering, “Irresistible Compassion: An Aspect of Eighteenth-Century Sympathy and Humanitarianism,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37 (1976): 195-218; Karen Halttunen, “Humanitarianism and the Pornography of Pain in Anglo-American Culture,” *American Historical Review* 100 (1995): 303-334; Sarah Knott, “Sensibility and the American War for Independence,” *American Historical Review* 109 (2004): 19-40; John Mullan, *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in Eighteenth-Century* (Oxford, 1998); Evan Radcliffe, “Revolutionary Writing, Moral Philosophy, and Universal Benevolence in the Eighteenth Century,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 54 (1993): 221-240; Laura M. Stevens, *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia, 2004); Janet Todd, *Sensibility: An Introduction* (London, 1986); on how the goal of universal benevolence could be explained away as impractical, see Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, ch. 1; Radcliffe, “Revolutionary Writing,” pp. 222-226.

for the importance of Calvinist and nationalist motives among activists, but does so within the parameters set by the model it contests.<sup>17</sup>

In a path-breaking article, Thomas Haskell tried to overcome another dichotomy in discussions of humanitarianism, that of ideas versus interests. Haskell challenged the social control thesis and, in particular, David Brion Davis's "penetrating and sophisticated" exploration of the role of class relations in the early antislavery movement. He argued that the expanding commercial economy spawned the rise in humanitarian sensibility through the lessons taught by market institutions such as contracts (promises). Market discipline, according to Haskell, changed people's perceptions of their moral responsibility and their capacity to effect events faraway and in the future. Thus, the rise of the market economy provided the critical cognitive shift that underlay the antislavery movement. Historians have responded warily to Haskell. He wanted to move us beyond binary ways of thinking about the connection between capitalism and humanitarianism, but could not.<sup>18</sup>

The problem with Haskell's argument is that it is, surreptitiously, an amoral analysis of philanthropy. I have become convinced, however, that it is impossible to think about this subject outside of moral frameworks: When we debate beneficence we are debating the ethics of capitalism or other disparities in power. The language of the topic points to that reality, but can muddy the issue. Many of the terms used to describe

---

<sup>17</sup> Kann, *Punishments, Prisons, and Patriarchy*; Amy Margaret Godfrey, "Divine Benevolence to the Poor: Charity, Religion and Nationalism in Early National New York City, 1784-1820" (Ph.D. diss, Northern Illinois University, 2007).

<sup>18</sup> Haskell, "Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility," p. 343; for David Brion Davis's and John Ashworth's critiques of Haskell's argument, see Thomas Bender, ed., *The Antislavery Debate: Capitalism and Abolitionism as a Problem in Historical Interpretation* (Berkeley, 1992). Brown, *Moral Capital*, p. 152, n. 64; Kathleen D. McCarthy, *American Creed: Philanthropy and the Rise of Civil Society 1700-1865* (Chicago, 2003), p. 53; William Caleb McDaniel, "Our Country is the World: Radical Abolitionists Abroad" (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2006), p. 137.



redistributing resources are value-laden and positive. “Philanthropy,” “charity,” and “beneficence,” are rooted in Greek or Latin words for love and good. The words associated with people on the receiving end of these activities – “poor,” “enslaved,” “distressed,” “suffering,” “lunacy” – evoke misery and wretchedness. These words, then, immediately raise issues that lead people to moral reckoning. But rather than making Manichean judgments, we should recognize that the intertwining of social control and relief of real and immediate suffering make the moral calculus of philanthropy complex.

One way to re-conceptualize the issue of the morality of beneficence is to recognize the symbiotic relationship between philanthropy and failure. There are three components to that relationship. First, charitable endeavors are predicated on the failure in the distribution of resources. Not everyone can win in a competitive economy, and philanthropy both legitimates and ameliorates the resulting inequalities of wealth. Second, philanthropy always fails; although it has real successes, it never achieves enough and therefore the leaders and supporters of charitable organizations – fickle optimists – forever seek new and purportedly better programs or more businesslike practices or greater accountability. The search for new and better ways of doing things is a result of real frustrations and problems and of vain hopes that ignore the basic condition that beneficence is based on unequal wealth and can never achieve enough. Third, philanthropy needs to fail or it would put itself out of business. Although there is little danger that they will succeed to the point of eliminating themselves, charitable organizations remain in operation, employing people and engaging in other economic activity, thanks to the existence of poverty.<sup>19</sup> That view sounds gloomy, but it is meant to

---

<sup>19</sup> My thinking about failure in general has been influenced by Julian Hoppit, *Risk and Failure in English Business 1700-1800* (Cambridge, 1987); Bruce Mann, *Republic of Debtors: Bankruptcy in the Age of*

temper both praise for and criticism of philanthropists.

A more prosaic point about a failure in beneficence is that many of the plans proposed by eighteenth-century activists never came to fruition. Some scholars have pointed out the value of unsuccessful projects.<sup>20</sup> Endeavors that misfired provided activists with helpful learning experiences in how to organize people, raise money, manage conflicts, or set viable goals. But failed projects also might teach discouraging lessons, and if a stillborn undertaking meant one less middling effort to control the lives of the poor, it also could mean one less option in poor folks' survival strategies.

\* \* \*

Because I start from an interest in the interdependence of far-flung philanthropic actors (individuals and institutions), I have paid attention to efforts that faltered as part of my investigation of how activists transmitted ideas and elaborated charitable infrastructures. Several studies have shaped my thinking about how and why activity changes. Christopher Brown's study of the beginnings of the British abolition movement has been an especially important influence. His book fostered my interest in how new goals becomes possible. Just as it was not a foregone conclusion that people would take unease with slavery and turn that feeling into a movement, it was not inexorable that eighteenth-century men and women would resolve the difficulties of aiding suffering strangers in other ways.<sup>21</sup> Anne Boylan's study of the emergence of women's voluntary organizations, Richard Newman's study of changing tactics in American abolitionism,

---

*American Independence* (Cambridge, Mass., 2002); Scott Sandage, *Born Losers: A History of Failure in America* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005). In reviews of recent books on non-governmental and governmental aid to developing countries, Nicholas Kristof and Jeffrey Sachs remind us that recognition of the failures, misuse, and power dynamics of aid must be balanced by recognition of successes. Nicholas D. Kristof, "Aid: Can It Work?," *New York Review of Books* 53:15, October 5, 2006; Jeffrey D. Sachs, "How Aid Can Work," *New York Review of Books* 53: 20, December 21, 2006.

<sup>20</sup> Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 103-104.

<sup>21</sup> Brown, *Moral Capital*.

and Conrad Edick Wright's study of the growth of voluntary associations in post-revolutionary New England made me mindful of issues of the organization and operation of charitable enterprises. Donna Andrew's history of eighteenth-century London charities, along with Wright's book, spurred me to study philanthropy across movements.<sup>22</sup>

It was through Daniel Rodger's study of transatlantic developments in social policy in the Progressive era, however, that I first encountered the study of social welfare from an Atlantic perspective; there does not exist a comparable book for the eighteenth century. Rodgers's analysis of how ideas spread riveted my attention to the building of social welfare infrastructures in transnational context. Yet my work differs in a fundamental way from his, and from that of many other students of humanitarianism because I ground my study in analysis of neither rising social need nor economic motivations for activism. I do not assume there is a logical, linear relationship between the nature of a problem and the nature of a solution. As other historians have pointed out, the existence of suffering alone did not lead people to take action and a community's particular social needs did not necessarily shape responses.<sup>23</sup> Thanks to the interactions in the Anglophone Atlantic community, solutions, sometimes seeking problems, spread even if they did not always succeed.

---

<sup>22</sup> Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*; Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill, 2002); Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*; Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*. In thinking about the associations as a technology, I have also benefited from Johann Neem, "The Transformation of Civil Society in Massachusetts, 1780s-1840s" (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 2004). (The idea of voluntary associations as a technology is Neem's.)

<sup>23</sup> Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*. Peter Clark studies the transmission of British clubs and societies of all types to North America and the West Indies, but Britain, not the Anglophone Atlantic community, is his unit of analysis. Peter Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800: The Origins of an Associational World* (Oxford, 2000). Brown, *Moral Capital*, pp. 1-3; Andrew Cunningham, "Some Closing and Opening Remarks" in *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Southern Europe*, eds. Ole Peter Grell, Andrew Cunningham, and Bernd Roeck (Aldershot, 2005), p. 3; Slack, "Hospitals, Workhouses, and the Relief of the Poor in Early Modern England"; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, p. 101.

This view is not to present my subjects as absented-minded philanthropists who accidentally developed intricate charitable infrastructures that buttressed their class interests. Rather, my perspective is shaped by a belief in the agency of poor and degraded people. This is a study of philanthropists' activities, not poverty. Therefore, it is about middling and elite people and, due to the limitations of the sources I began with and of time, the voices of the lower sorts are rarely heard here. My analysis, however, is deeply informed by studies of the lives of the poor, particularly Tim Hitchcock's *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London*, that have highlighted the ways that the lower sorts shaped institutions. Recognizing the modicum of power that the lower sorts had means cutting activists down to size.<sup>24</sup>

Put another way, heeding the limitations of their power humanizes philanthropists. Studies of beneficence often lose sight of the lives of people in the past because of their focus on class dynamics. Classes, not individuals, have done things in these studies. That approach has sometimes exaggerated the power of philanthropists over the poor. Activists looked down on or pitied the lower sorts, but they knew they needed to appeal to the preferences and expectations of the targets of their projects. In addition, the focus on class relations does not adequately illuminate human experiences, so we have not fully understood how people translated humanitarian sensibility into deeds. As Christopher Brown's dissection of Thomas Clarkson and other men involved in the beginnings of the British abolitionist movement underscores, to understand how people changed charitable activity, we have, among other things, to appreciate the

---

<sup>24</sup> Tim Hitchcock, *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London*, esp. chs. 6 and 7 (Hambleton, 2004). This thinking is also shaped by work that emphasizes the agency of the enslaved in effecting their freedom and in shaping the antislavery movement. See, for instance, Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*, esp. chs. 3 and 4; Shane White, *Somewhat More Independent: The End of Slavery in New York, 1770-1810* (Athens, Ga., 1991).

idiosyncrasies and petty agendas of individuals.<sup>25</sup>

There is another reason to focus on the lives of individuals. Focusing on the lives of individuals in the interconnected Atlantic world takes the study of philanthropy outside of national historiographies.<sup>26</sup> The stories of individuals provide a human way to make sense of large-scale, Atlantic world trends. They also illuminate direct links among the far-flung communities in which charitable organizations operated. This emphasis adds nuance to our understanding of the founding of institutions by turning attention away from local factors, such as changing economic conditions and declining deference, to cosmopolitan considerations such as the emulation of faraway peers. In addition, following certain people around the Atlantic allowed me to uncover the unanalyzed phenomenon of philanthropic instigators, people who introduced unfamiliar institutions into communities. Paying heed to personal motives and personalities helps explain why institutions spread to new communities when they did and whether those institutions succeeded in getting planted.

There is an irony in the national or regional perspectives of historians of philanthropy: It ignores the cosmopolitanism of people in the eighteenth century. The genesis of this dissertation lay in my surprise that few studies of philanthropy made the

---

<sup>25</sup> Brown, *Moral Capital*; on Clarkson, see pp. 433-442; see also p. 20

<sup>26</sup> Examples include: Alexander, *Render Them Submissive*; Donna Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*; Bellows, *Benevolence Among the Slaveholders*; Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*; Borsay, *Medicine in Georgian Bath*; Croxson, "The Public and Private Faces of Eighteenth-Century London Dispensary Charity"; Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*; Fissell, *Patients, Power and the Poor*; Jordan, *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660*; Kilpatrick, "Living in the Light"; McCarthy, *American Creed*; Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*; Porter, "The Gift Relation"; Owen, *English Philanthropy*; Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England*; M. J. D. Roberts, *Making English Morals: Voluntary Associations and Moral Reform in England, 1787-1886* (Cambridge, 2004); Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*; Ronald Walters, *American Reformers 1815-1860* (New York, 1978); Woodward, *To Do the Sick No Harm*. Some works pay glancing attention to the international arena, but do not challenge the primacy of the nation-state as the unit of analysis. See, for instance, Mohl, *Poverty in New York*.

Anglophone Atlantic community the unit of analysis. There are exceptions, especially among studies of antislavery, prison reform, and religious philanthropy. There are also some excellent recent collections that aim to break down national barriers in the study of European charity and reform by comparing developments in various countries, but they mainly ignore developments across the Atlantic. Those works, then, either focus on particular movements or are comparative, rather than transnational, studies. By contrast, Michael Kraus studied eighteenth-century humanitarianism both in transatlantic context and across movements, as do I. His work surveyed key connections and influences across the Atlantic, but did not explore how those interactions changed over time.<sup>27</sup>

Living in an era of intense globalization also influenced my interests, as it has motivated scholars in many fields to think anew about cosmopolitanism in the present and the past.<sup>28</sup> In recent years, historians and literary scholars have deemed early-modern or antebellum merchants, craftsmen, pirates, enslaved people, abolitionists, American Patriots, United Irishman, and assorted writers, among others, to be citizens of the

---

<sup>27</sup> Exceptions include: Cindy Burgoyne, “‘Imprisonment the Best Punishment’: The Transatlantic Exchange and Communication of Ideas in the Field of Penology, 1750-1820” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Sunderland, 1997); Eamon Duffy, “The Society of [sic] Promoting Christian Knowledge and Europe: The Background to the Founding of the Christenumgesellschaft” in *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, eds. Martin Brecht, et al (Gottingen, 1982); Betty Fladeland, *Men and Brothers: Anglo-American Antislavery Cooperation* (Urbana, 1972); Foster, *An Errand of Mercy*; Katherine M. R. Lloyd, “Peace, Politics & Philanthropy: Henry Brougham, William Roscoe and America 1808-1868” (Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1996); David Turley, “The Anglo-American Connection” in *The Culture of English Antislavery, 1780-1860* (London, 1999). Merle Curti’s study of American philanthropy abroad is not a transnational study because the nation-state remains the unit of analysis, but neither is it written from the perspective of American exceptionalism. Curti makes clear that American philanthropy is part of a European tradition. Merle Curti, *American Philanthropy Abroad* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1963). Comparative works include: Barry and Jones, eds., *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State*; Cunningham and Innes, eds., *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform*; Grell and Cunningham, eds., *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe*; Grell, et al, eds., *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Northern Europe*. Michael Kraus, *The Atlantic Civilization: Eighteenth-Century Origins* (Ithaca, 1949), chap. 6.

<sup>28</sup> James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, eds., *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant’s Ideal* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997); Carol A. Breckenridge, Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha and Dipesh Chakrabarty, eds., *Cosmopolitanism* (Durham, 2002); Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen, eds., *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* (Boston, 1996); Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen, eds., *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice* (Oxford, 2002).

world.<sup>29</sup> The institutions of the British Empire, along with the burgeoning market economy, brought people in those groups into contact with others from different racial, religious, and national groups and made pragmatic cosmopolitan behaviors a necessity. *Philosophes* idealized being nothing more or less than a citizen of the world, but I understand cosmopolitanism based on the practices of the many citizens of the Atlantic community who participated ably, whether or not willingly, in different communities – ethnic, religious, local, regional, national, and transnational. One of the goals of this dissertation is to contribute to the exploration of various ways of crossing borders in the eighteenth century.<sup>30</sup>

Inspired by the work of scholars in other disciplines, historians are increasingly using elastic, on-the-ground definitions of cosmopolitanism to explore how people in the past approached living in heterogeneous communities and a globalizing world.<sup>31</sup> While a broad and versatile concept runs the risk of becoming analytically incoherent, it has several advantages. First, it avoids the geographic confines that make little sense for some topics and therefore helps overcome the limits of the Atlantic framework, because

---

<sup>29</sup> Hancock, *Citizens of the World*; Leonard Rosenband, “The Competitive Cosmopolitanism of an Old Regime Craft,” *French Historical Studies* 23 (2000): 455-476; Linebaugh and Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra*, pp. 164-165; Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves* (Cambridge, Mass., 2003), p. 6; McDaniel, “Our Country is the World”; Philipp Ziesche, “Cosmopolitan Patriots in the Age of Revolution: Americans in Paris, 1788-1800” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2006); Kevin Whelan, “The Green Atlantic: Radical Reciprocities between Ireland and America in the Long Eighteenth Century” in *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire 1660-1840*, ed. Kathleen Wilson (Cambridge, 2004), p. 227; Christopher Iannini, “‘The Itinerant Man’: Crevecoeur’s Caribbean, Raynal’s Revolution, and the Fate of Atlantic Cosmopolitanism,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 61 (2004): 201-234.

<sup>30</sup> On philosophes’ cosmopolitanism, see Thomas J. Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought* (Notre Dame, 1977). On other types of cosmopolitanism, see Margaret Jacob, *Strangers Nowhere in the World: The Rise of Cosmopolitanism in Early Modern Europe* (Philadelphia, 2006); Pauline Kleingeld, “Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60 (1999): 505-524; Vertovec and Cohen, “Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism” in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Vertovec and Cohen.

<sup>31</sup> See, for examples, Jacob, *Strangers Nowhere in the World*; Louise Blakeney Williams, “Overcoming the ‘Contagion of Mimicry’: The Cosmopolitan Nationalism and Modernist History of Rabindranath Tagore and W. B. Yeats,” *American Historical Review* 112 (2007): 69-100.

unlike with the idea of the Atlantic world, the concept of cosmopolitanism has no spatial unit. Rather, the unit of analysis is usually an individual or groups of individuals. Second, a capacious conception helps us recognize that there was a range of ways of practicing cosmopolitanism. Layers of communities – local, regional, imperial or national, Atlantic, and global – shaped everyone’s life, and people called on different skills or approaches as members of those different communities. Third, a flexible understanding allows us to see that cosmopolitanism was as least as much a practice in recognition that people were divided into distinct groups as it was an ideal of identifying as nothing more or less than as a citizen of the world. People in the eighteenth century generally did not strive to be global citizens. But many did try to rise above partiality and, most important, many tried to make living in an interconnected, mobile world easier by finding ways to interact with people who differed from themselves. Migrating, trafficking in ideas, aiming to stay current with peers elsewhere, and tolerating differences underlay developments in philanthropy from the spread of institutions to efforts to find ways to aid suffering strangers.

Besides the integration of the Atlantic world, the dismantling of the “first British Empire” gave rise to cosmopolitan practices as Americans and Britons redefined their ties; the making and unmaking of empire was a crucial context for changes in beneficence. This analysis builds on Christopher Brown’s and Eliga Gould’s work but extends beyond antislavery and British conservatives, respectively. I examine how imperial disunion fostered philanthropic cooperation and goals and, conversely, how humanitarian collaboration helped repair the transatlantic breach.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Brown, *Moral Capital*; Eliga Gould, “American Independence and Britain’s Counter-Revolution,” *Past and Present* 154 (1997): 107-141.



In addition to the integration of the Atlantic community and the imperial divorce, the Consumer Revolution was a key force in changes in beneficence. Debates about the connection between capitalism and humanitarianism have generally focused on changes in modes of production or, in Haskell's formulation, on contractual relations, rather than on the impact of the Consumer Revolution on activists' and supporters' expectations. Recently, David Brion Davis has written that "consumer demand . . . elevated British respect for wage labor" and thus made Britons sympathetic to antislavery agitation. Davis's argument is compelling, but the Consumer Revolution prompted new manifestations of moral responsibility for another reason too. Over the eighteenth century, consumers' demand for novelty in commercial leisure activities including philanthropy helped drive the diversification of charitable infrastructures. Choice among institutions became more and more common for middling donors and their putative beneficiaries. Looking at philanthropy through the lens of the Consumer Revolution opens new perspectives, besides changing class relations, on the connection between capitalism and humanitarianism.<sup>33</sup>

For decades, historians have studied the "rise of humanitarianism" as a major transformation. Viewing changes in charitable activity through the perspective of many failures, individuals' personal agendas, the pragmatic nature of eighteenth-century cosmopolitanism, and the Consumer Revolution, however, downgrades "the rise of humanitarianism." That is, those four themes highlight the mundane nature of developments in beneficence. As they encountered new models and as they could sell them to supporters, philanthropists made a host of incremental and measured changes

---

<sup>33</sup> David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of New World Slavery* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 247, 248.

community-by-community.<sup>34</sup> Providing medicines to the laboring poor, rescuing the drowning, segregating fever patients, selling cheap soup, vaccinating against smallpox: each focused effort elaborated local charitable infrastructures. Moreover, the dissemination of detailed information – samples of forms, building layouts, and recipes – built structures that gave a worldwide reach to activists’ undertakings. This study reveals that eighteenth-century men and women transformed organized beneficence through targeted and gradual innovations that they collected, crafted, and marketed as a result of the cosmopolitan approach to the world common in their era. The fact that we continue to build on their foundation is a testament to their success, and failure.

### *Sources*

This study starts with a cohort of American and British men involved in philanthropy in America and Britain. Their lives, however, took some of them to Europe, the East Indies, and the West Indies, and their connections linked more of them to those places. These men were chosen because of their varied activities and because their transatlantic ties promised to shed light on the evident but under-explored transnational aspects of the development of charitable infrastructures. Letters, writings on an array of topics, biographies, eulogies, and the records of organizations in which they participated make up the core of sources I used to explore these men. From those individuals, I worked outwards to their colleagues locally and faraway. By starting with a group of people, rather than a particular movement, I have been able to study the field of philanthropy as a whole. Thus, I have been able to appreciate the different roles in the

---

<sup>34</sup> This view is influenced by Seymour Drescher’s argument that acceptance of British Caribbean slave emancipation rested on its being presented as an experiment. Seymour Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation* (Oxford, 2002), p. 234.

economy of philanthropy, such as instigators, managers, and collaborators, and to examine how each role contributed to the elaboration of charitable infrastructures.

Although I began with a group of people and followed their interests, I have focused much attention on certain movements. Because studies of abolition, prison reform, and lunatic asylums set the terms of debate about the rise of humanitarianism in the eighteenth century, we became mired in an irresolvable dispute about the genuineness of Enlightenment humanitarianism. In an effort to re-direct attention away from motives and towards other issues, I have highlighted different movements. The most important is the little-studied humane society movement for the rescue and resuscitation of drowning victims. Beginning in Amsterdam in 1767, the movement spread around Europe and the Anglophone Atlantic world over the next few decades. The dispensary movement is another focus of the study. Dispensaries (free out-patient clinics for the poor) also spread around the British Isles and United States in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (as they did in Central Europe, although the sources examined thus far have not revealed any connections between the founding of dispensaries in Anglophone communities and in Central Europe.) The cause of smallpox vaccination is a third movement that I highlight. Building on Edward Jenner's discovery of vaccination, published to the world in 1798, medical men and others disseminated vaccine matter and vaccination techniques around the globe. The records for these movements consist of organizational minutes, printed publicity materials, newspapers and periodicals, and philanthropists' personal records. The organizational records are erratic. For instance, the Massachusetts Humane Society left a cache of printed reports, but no minutes, whereas the Philadelphia Humane Society left minutes but fewer printed records. The

London-based Royal Humane Society left both, but the minute book for most of the period of this study is missing (alone among all of the Society's minute books.)

In addition to those movements, I have studied the records of a range of other charitable organizations. These include: hospitals, especially New York Hospital; a charity that aided foreigners in England, the Scots Society, or Society of Universal Goodwill, of Norwich, England; the Society for the Bettering the Condition of the Poor, an English group; and immigrant-aid organizations. I have also examined some materials relating to antislavery, prison reform, and lunatic asylums. My goal with all of these personal and organizational sources has been to understand the spread of institutions and ideas and the development of ways to go beyond local or particularistic boundaries in charity. I have thus excluded denominational charities and mutual-aid societies, critical though they were to the provision of welfare, and I have likewise excluded Freemasonry, which had a universal outlook and extended charity beyond its members, but was a fraternal group and thus distinct from associated-philanthropy organizations, most of which were formally open to anyone who could pay the subscription.

### *Chapter Outline*

This study explores developments in philanthropy through analysis at both the transnational and local levels. Chapters One and Two focus on the role of instigators, or initiators, of new projects. By collecting and disseminating ideas, instigators helped expand the ways that the versatile associated-charity model could be combined with the rising wealth of middling folks and, moreover, they helped expand the potential for the philanthropic sector of the economy to satisfy the expectations of change held by increasingly consumer-oriented publics. The growth of humanitarianism came about, in

part, from quickening circulation of models of charitable projects. Chapter One examines the types of people who became instigators and analyzes the mindset that underlay their and other philanthropists' activities. The eighteenth century saw the growing density of charitable institutions around the Atlantic, but we have understood how institutions spread to new communities only in general terms. To deepen our understanding, Chapter Two focuses closely on that issue. It argues that because founding associated-philanthropy ventures was a local and middling-sorts-up process, geographically mobile individuals originated the formation of charitable organizations and influenced when and where charitable institutions came to new communities. Chapter Three shifts attention to the interplay between philanthropic leaders and consumers. It uses the celebrity of English prison reformer John Howard to explore the pervasive impact of consumer culture on philanthropy. In addition, this chapter complicates our understanding of Howard by revealing him to be more than a severe, ascetic martyr to his cause. Rather, Howard was a publicity-conscious man of his times.

The next three chapters analyze efforts – some failed, some successful – to build charitable institutions that aided suffering strangers. There were both transnational and local manifestations of that endeavor. Chapter Four analyzes the undertakings by the Scots Society or Society of Universal Good-will of Norwich, England, and the Massachusetts Humane Society to go beyond geographic boundaries in charity. Both groups succeeded with their local endeavors, but their international ventures failed. Those initiatives reveal that imperial disunion fostered experimentation with how to help faraway strangers. Finding ways to overcome the problem of how to provide charitable aid to unknown people was easier at the local level. By the end of the eighteenth century,

the urban charitable infrastructure included organizations that provided aid impartially, that is, without regard to some or all the categories of local residence, religion, ethnicity, and race. Chapter Five examines reasons behind that development, and it argues that while humane societies were not founded from catholic motives, they were, by far, the most impartial charities. By the end of the century, humane societies and certain other charities on both sides of the Atlantic celebrated their liberality – highlighting, then, the still-new nature of cosmopolitan beneficence. Building structures for engaging in long-distance beneficence towards strangers rested on that base. Chapter Six analyzes the “empire of humanity” – the transnational network through which activists extended their philanthropy beyond their local arenas in the wake of the American Revolution. The fullest realization of the possibilities of networked activity occurred in the humane society coalition thanks to its incremental, inter-connected endeavor and the widespread belief in the power of the written word. For all the boasting of humane society advocates, the movement helped relatively few people, as shown in Chapter Five. Activists, however, drew on the structures built by the humane society movement to pursue a global program of smallpox vaccination at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Chapter Seven returns attention to the local arena of charitable activity, exactly the place where local managers needed to focus. For philanthropic organizations to run effectively, they had to focus on the local. Effective leadership of charitable organizations was a different task in the economy of philanthropy and took different skills than the intellectual leadership provided by instigators or collaborators. Chapter Eight asks how the disarray in the Atlantic world wrought by the French Revolution and subsequent wars affected various types of cosmopolitanism in philanthropy. In some

ways, cosmopolitan practices and liberal aspirations waned over the first decade and a half of the nineteenth century. In addition, key changes included a resurgence of religious philanthropy and the emergence of women's organizations. But much stayed the same and those continuities left a lasting legacy of a great scale and a global scope in philanthropy.

### *Forerunners and Alternatives*

In the early eighteenth century, access to private charitable aid generally depended on ethnic, religious, occupational or personal ties. (By private charitable aid, I mean to exclude relief provided through the poor laws. The distinction between "private" and "public" is anachronistic. Moreover, that division ignores the compelling concept of the "mixed economy of welfare" as a way to think holistically about the institutions the poor used in their survival strategies. Nevertheless, I will sometimes use the terms "private" versus "public" or "voluntary" versus "legal" to distinguish relief provided by voluntary organizations from relief provided through the poor laws.) During the first half of the century, British and American charitable ventures to help people at a distance aimed to bolster international Protestantism and the British Empire or were confined with particularistic communities, such as German Pietist networks or the Society of Friends. Even there, within the Society of Friends, later so well known for their humanitarian activity on behalf of Indians and people of African descent, helping faraway co-religionists was a new development of the mid-eighteenth century (which laid the base for Quaker philanthropy towards non-Friends).<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Eamon Duffy, "Correspondence Fraternelle: The SPCK, the SPG, and the Churches of Switzerland in the War of the Spanish Succession" in *Reform and the Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford, 1979); Duffy, "The Society of [sic] Promoting Christian Knowledge and Europe"; Renate Wilson, "Halle Pietism in Colonial Georgia," *Lutheran Quarterly* 12 (1998): 271-301;

There were other methods and efforts by members of the Anglophone Atlantic community to help sufferers who were at a distance or who were strangers. In theory, trusts offered another way to dispense charity beyond local limits. Donors could, of course, endow charitable institutions outside their communities. Trusts as a method of charity, however, were on the wane and generally conservative in aim in the eighteenth century, so that method of practicing charity does not merit much attention here.<sup>36</sup>

By contrast, charity briefs became important for dispensing charity at a distance. Charity briefs were fundraising instruments issued by the Crown or colonial governors to allow authorized parties to take up collections in churches or house-to-house. In the Tudor, Stuart, and early Georgian eras, charity briefs raised funds for church rebuilding or repair, for ransoms of British captives of the Barbary States, and for the relief of victims of various types of disasters. During the early modern period, most disaster relief was raised locally, but increasingly in the eighteenth century, communities around the British Atlantic used charity briefs to collect money for victims of catastrophes in other parts of the British Atlantic. In addition, briefs were issued to representatives of the colonial colleges for fundraising in Britain. By mid-century, however, they were falling out of favor. In their place came ad hoc associated philanthropy, or public subscription committees in various British Atlantic communities to raise monies – in large amounts –

---

John Van Horne, Introduction to *Religious Philanthropy and Colonial Slavery: The American Correspondence of the Associates of Dr. Bray*, ed. John Van Horne (Urbana, 1985); Stevens, *The Poor Indians*; P. J. Marshall, “Who Cared about the Thirteen Colonies? Some Evidence from Philanthropy,” in *A Free though Conquering People’: Eighteenth-Century Britain and Its Empire*, ed. P. J. Marshall (Aldershot, 2003), p. 60; on mid-century British Christian mercantilist philanthropy, see James Stephen Taylor, *Jonas Hanway Founder of the Marine Society: Charity and Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1985). Renate Wilson, *Pious Traders in Medicine: A German Pharmaceutical Network in Eighteenth-Century North America* (University Park, 2000); Sydney V. James, *A People Among Peoples: Quaker Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963).

<sup>36</sup> On eighteenth-century English charitable trusts, see Owen, *English Philanthropy*, chap. 3; on the conservatism of eighteenth-century trusts, see p. 71.



to relieve sufferers of fire, hurricanes, and similar calamities in other parts of the British Atlantic. If the briefs for British captives familiarized Britons, however hostilely, with Islam and North Africa, the disaster relief efforts bound members of the British Atlantic more closely into one community. Relief efforts for far-flung disasters extended the scope of people's charity and did so time and again. Those efforts, then, lay an important base for later developments, although they differed from cosmopolitan philanthropy in their emphases on the partial ties of Britishness or Protestantism.<sup>37</sup>

Collections for refugees, colleges, hospitals, and disaster victims provided ways both to realize the Christian injunction to emulate the Good Samaritan and to strengthen the bonds of British community, but they were ad hoc. By the end of the eighteenth century, however, men and women were institutionalizing various forms of cosmopolitan philanthropy. (By cosmopolitan philanthropy, I mean to encompass either aid provided locally without regard to ethnic, religious or occupational ties or aid provided to strangers at a distance.) There remained particularistic charities, and supplicants often needed recommendations from charities' subscribers – personal ties – to receive aid. But by the end of the late Georgian era, the Anglophone Atlantic world's philanthropic landscape included ecumenical charities, charities that aided migrants, the antislavery movement, and non-religious philanthropic movements that aimed for worldwide reaches. Moreover, new types of institutions aided newly discovered categories of sufferers. Philanthropists came to direct their attentions, for good and bad, to, among others,

---

<sup>37</sup> On charity briefs and their use to various ends, see Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 84; Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600-1850* (New York, 2002), pp. 75-81, 105; Matthew Mulcahy, *Hurricanes and Society in the British Greater Caribbean, 1624-1783* (Baltimore, 2006), pp. 143-144, 147-148, 152-164; Marshall, "Who Cared about the Thirteen Colonies?" pp. 59-64; on the shift to the use of subscriptions to raise funds for disasters sufferers, see Mulcahy, *Hurricanes and Society*, pp. 148-151.

prisoners, the insane, enslaved people, and lying-in women, not to mention fallen women, the victims of venereal disease and, more respectably, the sick laboring poor. Children – whether orphaned, unschooled, unchurched, or delinquent – too had organizations devoted to them. Cosmopolitan philanthropy was pursued in various and distinct ways, but had become part of the institutional structure of beneficence, and the charitable landscape was becoming denser and increasingly focused. *How* “the area of moral concern” both grew and became more targeted is the development I seek to understand.

## Chapter One

### Border Crossings: Philanthropists in an Improving Age

Of all the many egotistical philanthropists of the long eighteenth century, the Massachusetts-born Loyalist and nobleman of the Holy Roman Empire, Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford, stood in a class of his own. Being an insufferable narcissist, however, did not preclude making good observations. “[M]any improvements, and more *refinements*, have been introduced into” Britain, Rumford pointed out, by “[t]hose whose avocations call them to visit different countries, and those whose fortune enables them to travel for their amusement or improvement.” But he rued that the English poor had not benefited more from foreign foods from abroad and therefore offered information to the store of philanthropic knowledge about a foodstuff, maize, from his natal land.<sup>1</sup>

Border crossing, as Rumford recognized, brought communities new resources and unfamiliar institutions. The “agendas and alternatives” of Progressive-era social politics, Daniel T. Rodgers has argued, were steered by the Atlantic crossings of “those [people] who ‘puzzle’” (while the agendas were executed by different actors). Likewise, philanthropic agendas and alternatives of the long eighteenth century were shaped by instigators who crossed geographic and communal borders, although the eighteenth-century modes of learning differed from the formal and, especially, professionalized nature of Progressive-era exchanges.<sup>2</sup> Studies, however, often slight the tasks of

---

<sup>1</sup> Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford, *Essays, Political, Economical, and Philosophical*, vol. 1 (of 3 vols.) (London, 1796), p. 246.

<sup>2</sup> Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*, pp. 25, 60-69, 33-52.

introducing innovations and instigating the formation of new ventures.<sup>3</sup> Yet those tasks are especially important when enterprises are newer and less familiar. Because of the geographic scope of this study, an exploration of instigators and their roles in the building of charitable infrastructures is possible.

Why does it matter how novel undertakings were introduced into communities? One reason is that the formation of new philanthropic programs did not necessarily proceed from need. That is not to say that poor folks did not figure out how to manipulate institutions as part of their survival strategies, but that the reason for the organization of charitable aid in particular ways and the tapping of sources of relief by putative beneficiaries proceeded on distinct, though connecting, tracks.<sup>4</sup> The role of instigators, then, demands attention in its own right. The great growth in beneficence rested on their role in the economy of philanthropy.

“Instigator” is an anachronistic term. “Institutor” is perhaps a better word,

---

<sup>3</sup> My interest in the issue of loci of innovation has been influenced by Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*; Rosenband, “The Competitive Cosmopolitanism of an Old Regime Craft”; and Walter W. Powell, Kenneth W. Koput, and Laurel Smith-Doerr, “Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation: Networks of Learning in Biotechnology,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41 (1996): 116-145. The biographer of the mid-eighteenth-century London philanthropist Jonas Hanway pays some attention to this issue. Taylor, *Jonas Hanway Founder of the Marine Society*, pp. 15-16, 70, 72, 79. For the role of exiles and immigrants in transfer of new models of health care and poor relief in sixteenth-century Europe, see Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham, “Reformation and Changes Welfare Provision in Early Modern Northern Europe” in Grell and Cunningham, eds., *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe*, pp. 4, 13, 15, 26, 27, 28.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, most of the children placed in the London Foundling Hospital were not true orphans, but were placed there by a parent, usually the mother. Many of the children were born to unwed mothers who were motivated to put their children in the Foundling by social pressure and the difficulty of finding jobs while caring for children, but other women were motivated by destitution. Alternate ways of aiding some of those women might have been to provide cash assistance; a Foundling Hospital was not the necessary solution to the problem these families faced. In some cases, parents reclaimed children when they could. On the Foundling, see Ruth McClure, *Coram’s Children: The London Foundling Hospital in the Eighteenth Century* (New Haven, 1981), esp. pp. 139-140, 247. On poor people’s use (or rejection) of charitable institutions in their survival strategies, see, for instance, Hitchcock, *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London*, esp. chaps. 6 & 7; Gary B. Nash, “Poverty and Politics in Early American History” in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith (Philadelphia, 2004), pp. 18-21; Ruth Wallis Herndon, “Who Died an Expence to This Town’: Poor Relief in Eighteenth-Century Rhode Island” in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith (Philadelphia, 2004), pp. 144-145; and Karin Wulf, “Gender and Poor Relief in Colonial Philadelphia” in *Down and Out in Early America*, ed. Billy G. Smith, 178-179; Anne Stott, *Hannah More: The First Victorian* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 106, 114-116.

because contemporaries used it. But “instigator” lacks precision. It can mean either an initiator of a new venture or a person who did the hard work of building an enterprise. (Those roles might or might not be filled by the same person.) Likewise, “entrepreneur of charity,” used by Paul Langford in reference to a number of Britons who were philanthropic opinion-makers in various capacities, is not precise enough. “Instigator” confines the focus to the basically unanalyzed role of initiating projects and thus directly stimulating growth in humanitarian activity. By contrast, “border crosser” is a capacious term that encompasses people who crossed borders of religion, locality, ethnicity, region, nation (in the eighteenth-century sense of a people), and empire. Scholars across disciplines use and critique the term “border crosser” and similar terms when studying the dislocations, adaptations, and identities of migrants. Here it is chosen because it comprehends various types of (not necessarily juridical) boundaries and because it evokes the phenomenon Rumford described.<sup>5</sup>

This chapter explores the intellectual and social backgrounds of instigators and the types of ideas they collected. Sensibility, curiosity, pragmatic cosmopolitanism, and belief in improvement, were defining traits for middling and elite people that underlay developments in philanthropy. To put their ideas into practice, activists embraced the associated philanthropy method. The flexibility of that method allowed self-selected

---

<sup>5</sup> Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England, 1727-1783* (Oxford, 1989), p. 485. On border crossers, see, for examples, Natalie Zemon Davis, *Trickster Travels: A Sixteenth-Century Muslim Between Worlds* (New York, 2006); Ambreen Hai, “Border Work, Border Trouble: Postcolonial Feminism and the Ayah in Bapsi Sidhwa’s *Cracking India*,” *Modern Fiction Studies* 46 (2000): 379-426; Hilda Llorens, “Dislocated Geographies: A Story of Border Crossings,” *Small Axe* 10 (2006): 74-93; Maria de la Luz Ibarra, “Buscando La Vida: Mexican Immigrant Women’s Memories of Home, Yearning, and Border Crossings,” *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 24 (2003): 261-281. For a cogent critique of scholars’ (over)use of the term “border crosser” and similar terms, see Pablo Vila, *Border Identifications: Narratives of Religion, Gender, and Class on the U.S.-Mexico Border* (Austin, Tx., 2005), pp. 4-6; Pablo Vila, *Crossing Borders, Reinforcing Borders: Social Categories, Metaphors, and Narrative Identities on the U.S.-Mexico Frontier* (Austin, TX, 2000), pp. 6-9.

mobile men from the urban middling-elite ranks to collect and transmit new ideas as they traveled and moved around the world. Those ideas extended from new perspectives to new methods for existing programs to new movements.

Instigators gathered and introduced new institutions and ideas to the Atlantic world public at large and to individual communities. By doing so, they played a vital role in the expansion and acceleration of beneficence. A focus on instigators is not great-man history. Rather it forms part of an analysis, to better explain burgeoning eleemosynary activity, of how charities were founded.<sup>6</sup> Access to innovations, by no means all of which were adopted, fueled growth in the philanthropic sector of the Anglophone economy, with some good, some pernicious, and many self-serving effects. Part of the rise of humanitarianism was an evolution in types of programs – solutions that sometimes found problems, rather than vice versa. The measured and targeted logic of that eighteenth-century faith, improvement, and the appeal of novelty to consumers joined with the social needs of individuals to spawn more and more charitable establishments. Border-crossers were well placed to feed those factors by collecting and transmitting intellectual resources and by initiating the formation of institutions in particular communities. The “rise of humanitarianism” is in part the story of the activities of instigators.

### *Curiosity, Cosmopolitanism and Improvement*

Instigators, like many of their peers in the urban middling-elite, approached the world with a great curiosity, a willingness to cross borders, an attentiveness to what they saw in new places, and a penchant for collecting all good ideas. As travelers and

---

<sup>6</sup> For the essentials of the debate over the rise of humanitarianism, see Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*; Haskell, “Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility”; for the Davis-Haskell debate including contributions by John Ashworth, see also Bender, ed., *The Antislavery Debate*.

migrants gathered ideas and resources, they brought incremental innovations to charitable activity. Over the long run, a host of piecemeal changes extended the reach of philanthropy. Instigators' and their peers' embrace of sensibility, their interest in new ways of doing things, the pragmatic cosmopolitanism their experiences taught them, and the widespread eighteenth-century faith in improvement underpinned the evolution of Anglo-American organized beneficence.

The pace of growth in humanitarian activity accelerated in the second half of the eighteenth century, but that growth rested on ideas about universal benevolence that had been debated for decades. To heal divisions in the British polity after the Civil Wars and to counter gloomy views about human selfishness propounded by the likes of Thomas Hobbes and Bernard Mandeville, moral philosophers from the late seventeenth century onward argued for the natural compassion of human beings. By the mid-eighteenth century, there was widespread agreement that people were innately sympathetic and pained by the suffering of others. The idea of universal benevolence, however, remained in dispute. David Hume and Jonathan Edwards took extreme positions: Hume rejected that universal benevolence existed based on the view that to feel for another, one needed a relationship with that person. Edwards, on the other hand, believed that “general benevolence” followed from love of God; anything less than universal benevolence fell short of true virtue. Many moral philosophers shunned those poles and instead endorsed the idea that people *felt* universal benevolence. Due to “the weakness of [man’s] powers,” however, benevolent actions should be confined to a man’s “family, his friends, his country,” in Adam Smith’s words. Practical considerations and the primacy of responsibility for family, friends and neighbors demanded those limits, many thinkers

agreed. The idea of irresistible compassion may have laid the base for humanitarianism, but that idea does not explain how people translated benevolence (feeling) into beneficence (action). Particularly, given the stress on the impracticality of carrying out universal benevolence, it does not explain how people found ways to engage in philanthropy at a distance.<sup>7</sup>

Ideas about universal benevolence underlay developments in philanthropy, but the adoption of all manner of novel programs proceeded too from intellectual currents that drew people's attention to new and different ways of doing things. For starters, the middling-elite ranks from which instigators, activists, and supporters came were broadly fascinated by the world and its peoples. Congregational minister Jeremy Belknap, for instance, traveled from Dover, New Hampshire, to Philadelphia in 1785 and on his journey he attended Jewish worship three times, twice in Newport and once in Philadelphia. "[Jews] worship with their hats on," Belknap discovered on his first visit to a synagogue, in Newport. On his way back north, Belknap again attended a service at the Newport synagogue and noted in his diary that the Newport congregants behaved more decorously than their Philadelphia co-religionists. The Philadelphia Jews' whispering during a religious service disturbed Belknap's Protestant sensibilities, but another facet of Philadelphia's religious life impressed him. There Belknap found a religious diversity

---

<sup>7</sup> This paragraph draws on: Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 38-40; Fiering, "Irresistible Compassion"; Halttunen, "Humanitarianism and the Pornography of Pain in Anglo-American Culture"; Knott, "Sensibility and the American War for Independence"; Mullan, *Sentiment and Sociability*; Radcliffe, "Revolutionary Writing, Moral Philosophy, and Universal Benevolence in the Eighteenth Century"; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*; Todd, *Sensibility*; Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York, 1991), chap. 12. On Hume, see Fiering, "Irresistible Compassion," pp. 209-210; Radcliffe, "Revolutionary Writing, Moral Philosophy, and Universal Benevolence," p. 222. On Edwards, see Radcliffe, "Revolutionary Writing, Moral Philosophy, and Universal Benevolence," p. 222; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 42-45. On Adam Smith's views, see Fiering, "Irresistible Compassion," pp. 210-212; Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, pp. 10-11; Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759; Prometheus books edition, New York, 2000), quotation p. 348. On the idea that universal benevolence was impractical, see Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, chap. 1; Radcliffe, "Revolutionary Writing," pp. 222-226.



that he had not encountered at home. “The many Religious distinctions in [Philadelphia],” he mused, “have doubtless some ill effect on the Tempers of Some of the people,” but, he concluded, for the most part Philadelphians lived tolerantly with others. They even “frequently assist[ed] each other, Persons of various denominations, to build churches & Schools.” Philadelphia’s water pumps, the meals served at the city’s almshouse, and the use of umbrellas by Quaker women captured his attention too.<sup>8</sup>

Like Belknap, surgeon John Crawford gathered ideas about unfamiliar practices as he moved about the world from his native Northern Ireland to the East Indies to Barbados and eventually to Baltimore. Crawford, also taken with umbrellas, would have liked to follow the East Indian practice of using that technology to guard against the sun. Alas, in the West Indies “the scarcity of hands renders this useful practice inconvenient,” he lamented, “in the first [umbrellas] are carried by a Servant; in the last we are obliged to carry them ourselves, which in squally weather proves often very troublesome.” To Crawford’s way of thinking, the use of umbrellas could not be adopted easily. But other ideas could be transferred: In the hospital under his control in Barbados, he implemented a rice-based dietary regimen suggested to him by a friend in Bengal.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Jeremy Belknap, *Journal of a Trip to Philadelphia in 1785*, Jeremy Belknap Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society (MHS), Boston. On Protestant ideas about sacred space and about disorderly speech that would have conditioned Belknap’s reaction to whispering at the Philadelphia synagogue, see Susan Juster, *Disorderly Women: Sexual Politics & Evangelicalism in Revolutionary New England* (Ithaca, 1994), pp. 18-26, 86, 88-96; see also Edwin Scott Gaustad, *The Great Awakening in New England* (1957; reprint Chicago, 1968), pp. 6, 70-73. Christian visitors to synagogues were not unusual. Similar to, but harsher than, Belknap’s reaction, members of the German Reformed Church in Philadelphia referred to the “clamor” of Jewish services (and thus did not want a synagogue next to the church.) William Pencak, *Jews and Gentiles in Early America* (Ann Arbor, 2005), pp. 95-96, 129, 222.

<sup>9</sup> “A Letter Addressed to Lieutenant General Mathew on the means of preventing the method of treating and origins of the Diseases most prevalent and which prove most destr[uctive] to the Natives of Cold Climates visiting or residing in Warm Countries by John Crawford, M.D.,” Box 130, Manuscript Collections of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland (MS 3000), p. 73, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, (MdHS). The Maryland Historical Society gives a tentative date of 1793 for Crawford’s letter to Mathew, but Julia Wilson’s date of 1795 seems more likely. See Julia Wilson, “Dr.

Even when these men did not travel, they were collectors of the world's knowledge. "Man . . . can circum-navigate the globe, and please his taste with the produce of every clime," Rev. John Lathrop of Boston marveled in a sermon, "Or, by the use of letters, man may abide at home, and yet collect both knowledge and wealth from nations the most distant, and the least acquainted with each other." London physician John Coakley Lettsom lived by that view, dispatching seeds and roots to his correspondents and asking to be repaid in kind. Likewise Philadelphia doctor Benjamin Rush, who learned – not always approvingly – from travelers he met in Philadelphia about Hinduism and Laplanders and Persians' diet and the plague in Constantinople and dysentery in Peking, not to mention about the lack of suburbs in Madrid.<sup>10</sup>

The types of people who were so curious about the world often embraced a pragmatic cosmopolitanism that over time spurred changes in charitable operations. Recently, the historian Margaret Jacob has urged attention to the day-to-day practices, rather than idealizations, of cosmopolitanism. "This benign posture," she has noted, "whether toward foreigners or disbelievers in one's own religion, did not come about – then or now – automatically, or even easily." Jacob, however, overstates the difficulty of becoming a citizen of the world, of crossing borders. For men and women who lived in foreign places (including the Englishman Thomas Cogan, who, in a decidedly non-exotic example of "going native," reportedly sometimes identified himself as a Dutchman),

---

John Crawford, 1746-1813," *Bulletin of the School of Medicine University of Maryland* 25 (1940): 116-132, p. 129.

<sup>10</sup> John Lathrop, *A Discourse Before the Humane Society, in Boston: Delivered On the Second Tuesday of June, 1787* (Boston, 1787), p. 12. John Coakley Lettsom to Benjamin Rush, September 8, 1783, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, f. 3, LCP; Lettsom to Thomas Parke, February 3, 1789, Scientists, Etting Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP), Philadelphia; Lettsom to Sir Mordaunt Martin, July 11, 1791, in Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Late John Coakley Lettsom, M.D.; LL.D; F.R.S; F.A.S.; F.L.S.; &c. &c. &c. With a Selection from his Correspondence*, 3 vols. (London, 1817), vol. 2, p. 53. *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush: His 'Travels Through Life' together with his Commonplace Book for 1789-1813*, ed. George Corner (Princeton, 1948), pp. 209-210, 220, 243, 245, 258.

reinvention and border crossing was both feasible and/or appealing.<sup>11</sup> Most of these instigators of charitable ventures did not cross cultural borders in such determined or thoroughgoing ways as the Europeans in India who converted to Islam and acculturated to Mughal society. Yet many surmounted some of their biases and endorsed liberality to get along in a multicultural world. Of course, most of these men would have been steeped in intellectual traditions of toleration and the search for universal rules to explain human nature and structure human activities. But for many well-off Anglo-American men in the eighteenth century, cosmopolitanism was more a practical way of managing experiences and less so the psychological construct that Thomas Schlereth finds the cosmopolitan ideal to have been for the *philosophes*. Being a citizen of the world, as philanthropic instigators and their peers understood it, meant the ability to participate in various and diverse communities (local, national, international, religious) and to rise above prejudices or partial sympathies. Philanthropists' cosmopolitan interactions with and attitudes towards their peers would lay the base for endeavors to aid suffering strangers.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Jacob, *Strangers Nowhere in the World*, pp. 3-4. "Memoir of Thomas Cogan, M.D., One of the Founders of the Royal Humane Society," *The Annual Biography and Obituary, for the Year 1819* (London, 1819), p. 83. Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998), chap. 1; Colley, *Captives*; William Dalrymple, *White Mughals: Love and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century India* (New York, 2003); Maya Jasanoff, *Edge of Empire: Lives, Culture, and Conquest in the East, 1750-1850* (New York, 2005).

<sup>12</sup> Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*; Roy Porter, *The Creation of the Modern World: The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment* (New York, 2000), chaps. 7 & 8; Henry May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, 1976); Roy Porter, "The Enlightenment in England" and Nicholas Phillippson, "The Scottish Enlightenment" in *The Enlightenment in National Context*, eds. Roy Porter and Mikalus Teich (Cambridge, 1981); Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff, *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983); Albert Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before its Triumph* (Princeton, 1977); J. G. A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays of Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1985). Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*, p. xiii. Likewise enslaved Africans practiced cosmopolitanism for practical reasons. Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, chap. 1. For different types of cosmopolitanism and various ways of conceptualizing cosmopolitanism, see Kleingeld, "Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany" and Vertovec and Cohen, eds., *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*.

Partiality toward one or another group was routinely criticized by gentlemen in the latter part of the eighteenth century, while being above narrow loyalties was praised. “Illiberal prejudices,” “A Citizen of the World” declared in an essay in the *New York Daily Advertiser*, “are the most contemptible principles of human nature.” Bigotry was injurious too. “Britain “ha[d] suffered much,” Dr. John Murray, president of the Scots Society, or Society of Universal Good-will, of Norwich, England, asserted in a 1782 speech, “but the cause of humanity a great deal more, from indulging, and, if I may be allowed the expression, the cultivating of religious and political prejudice.” Of course people had biases, but cosmopolitan types “confessed” to them, as John Coakley Lettsom did when he admitted to a correspondent he had a “prejudice in favour of my White brethren, and consequently a bias against a near [procreative] alliance with our Black fellow-creatures.” Impartiality, by contrast, drew plaudits. Late in life, as he recalled his experiences as a member of the Continental Congress, Benjamin Rush noted his impressions of various of his fellow Congressmen and criticized or lauded several men on the basis of their chauvinism or lack thereof. Samuel Adams, Rush thought, had “more of the prejudices of a Massachusetts man than the liberal sentiments of a citizen of the United States,” whereas Thomas Jefferson extended his benevolence to “all nations and religions.” (Rush overlooked Jefferson’s antipathy to people of African descent.)<sup>13</sup>

The ability to overcome prejudice, contemporaries attested, was fostered by living abroad. Reflecting on his days as a medical student in Edinburgh in the 1760s, Rush

---

<sup>13</sup> On popular rejection of prejudices, see Linebaugh and Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra. New York Daily Advertiser*, August 7, 1786; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775, Until It Received the Additional Name of the Society of Universal Good-will, in 1784. To Which Are Added the Articles, President’s Address, &c. &c.*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Norwich, n.d.), p. 94; Lettsom to Rev. James Madison, December 12, 1804, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, p. 580; *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, pp. 140, 145, 146, 151, 152, 161. Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes Towards the Negro, 1550-1812* (1968; New York, 1977), pp. 435-440.

wrote that “My intercourse with other sects while I was abroad had led me to consider all denominations of Christians with a more equal eye than I had done in early life, and had divested me of an undue predilection for either [i.e., any] of them.” John Murray, who spent years traveling as a British naval surgeon, felt similarly. From his experiences at “different periods and in different countries,” Murray believed in “the benignity of human nature,” and he had come to distinguish between nations or religions at odds – or at war – with his own and their individual members. The Spaniards he met during the War of Jenkins’s Ear, were “desirous of my private friendship, ambitious of my good opinions, and ready unasked to supply all my necessaries,” in spite of the conflict between their countries.<sup>14</sup>

The open-mindedness that Murray developed during his itinerant years was exactly the goal that DeWitt Clinton had in mind when he imagined, in a 1794 speech, an international university. In a speech about benevolence to his brethren in the Black Friars Society of New York, he projected the possible fruits of “the application of the benevolent principle to the conduct of nations.” Among them was “[a]n university, for the illumination of the world,” where “the European, the Asiatic, the African, and the American Literati will assemble and communicate to each other, the discoveries, the curiosities and the knowledge of their respective continents.” Better yet, “the prejudices of country will vanish before the talisman of merit.” Living in a pluralist setting, Clinton proposed, would undermine partial loyalties. Cosmopolitanism developed, contemporary thought held, when people encountered others unlike themselves.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, p. 79; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775, Until . . . 1784*, p. 94.

<sup>15</sup> DeWitt Clinton, *An Oration on Benevolence, Delivered Before the Society of Black Friars, in the City of New-York, at Their Anniversary Festival, on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 1794* (New York, 1795), pp. 16, 18.

Although Clinton hoped prejudices would actually “vanish,” being broad-minded did not necessarily mean *not* having any biases or loyalties to one or more subsets of humankind. Distinct from universalism, cosmopolitanism was at least as much a practice in recognition that people were divided into different groups as an ideal of identifying as a citizen of the world. There were good reasons to act above prejudice. Although religious or ethnic networks could and often did promote business or professional pursuits, elders counseled their children and pupils to engage in impartial behavior to further pecuniary interests. “I would not have you Indulge your self in the opinion of Parties [illegible] among us [e]specially religious Parties,” New York doctor John Bard chastised his son Samuel, then a medical student in Edinburgh, in 1763: “. . .it does not become one of your Profession, and it will always be [inconsistent?] with your Interest.” Two decades later, Benjamin Rush drew a similar conclusion as part of a string of advice he gave to a medical pupil about to set out in the world. “Go regularly to some place of worship. A physician cannot be a bigot. Worship with Mohamitans rather than stay home on Sundays.”<sup>16</sup> For doctors, at least, biases were bad for business.

Besides the financial benefits of cosmopolitan practices, knowing how to cope in diverse settings quite simply made life easier, as the Norwich, England, doctor and philanthropist John Murray, an Anglican Scot, suggested in a long letter of advice to his son, Jack, in 1774. Among other things, Murray gave his son, a fledgling merchant then living in New York City, tips on dealing with discussions of religion with skeptics or with members of different sects. Jack was to explain his own faith to them in a calm and straightforward manner, “shun disputes concerning religion,” and be aware that all sects

---

<sup>16</sup> John Bard to Samuel Bard, April 9, 1763, Bard Collection, New York Academy of Medicine (NYAM); Benjamin Rush to William Claypoole, July 29, 1782, in Lyman H. Butterfield, ed., *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1951), vol. 1, p. 284.

had errors. Finally, “[f]or the sake of improvement and occasionally to keep up conversation,” he was to “become acquainted with the tenets of every religion that exists or has existed, there is something good in them all.” In short, Jack should learn, as his father had during his years in the navy, to manage and even appreciate differences.<sup>17</sup>

In addition to the experiences of living in a mobile and diverse world, religious beliefs were credited as a source of liberality and of moral obligation to be universally benevolent. John Lathrop was “convinced it was the will of God there should be a great variety of religious opinions, and that there should be a variety of ways in which men offer worship to the One Supreme.” As a result, while he remained content with his religious upbringing, Lathrop rejected judging others based on their religious beliefs, but rather “love[d] good men of all sects and denominations, as ardently as [he] love[d] good men of [his] own.”<sup>18</sup>

Benjamin Rush and John Coakley Lettsom likewise rooted their cosmopolitanism in religious beliefs. From a historical vantage point, it is something of a chicken-and-egg question of whether belief in universal salvation gave rise to cosmopolitanism in other realms or whether Enlightenment ideals of cosmopolitanism shaped religious beliefs. Rush, a Pennsylvania Presbyterian, and Lettsom, a West-India Quaker who lived as an adult in London, were more tribally attached to their sects than perhaps either man would have cared to admit. Still, each also embraced universalist beliefs about God’s relation to

---

<sup>17</sup> Photoduplicate of a letter from Dr. John Murray to John B. Murray, July 31, 1774, Murray Family Papers, Box 5, New-York Historical Society.

<sup>18</sup> John Lathrop to John Coakley Lettsom, November 13, 1799, Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . John Coakley Lettsom*, vol. 2, p. 452. Although the Enlightenment project is usually understood as advancing universals, Lathrop’s way of thinking here bears similarities to the “border thinking” as the basis of “[e]pistemic diversity” that Walter D. Mignolo calls for in a recent essay on conceptualizing cosmopolitanism in the face of globalization today. Walter D. Mignolo, “The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism” in *Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Carol A. Breckenridge, Homi K. Bhabha, Sheldon Pollock, and Dipesh Chakrabarty (Durham, NC, 2002), esp. pp. 177-182.

humankind and eschewed living primarily within the confines of their groups. As Rush wrote, his belief in “the doctrine of universal salvation and final restitution . . . [had] bound [him] to the whole human race.” Similarly, Lettsom believed that all people were “equally children of one supreme beneficent creator” and that the global diversity of religions pleased God because it made divine mercy “accessible to every human traveller.” Those views hewed to Quaker thinking on the universal accessibility of God’s grace. Lettsom, however, saw his views as a forsaking of the “notions [he had been brought up with,] which encouraged ideas of a favourite people, of a little remnant, of a chosen few, and such like narrow principles.” Through avid reading, Lettsom explained, he learned to think for himself, realized that the Society of Friends “was in less proportion than a grain of sand to the great globe” and, therefore, “entertained more ample notions of the Universal Parent.”<sup>19</sup>

Lettsom was a famously vain man with a robust regard for his own virtue. But the way he lived his life evinced that he put into practice (with much self-congratulation) his “more ample” religious beliefs. Lettsom reveled in his self-image as a citizen of the world and encouraged others to think of him that way, as he revealed when he thanked a friend for the gift of a “gigantic turkey” that had fed a “a group of different nations and sects” – an Englishman, a German, “a Scotchman, an Irishman, a Dane, an American, a West Indian, a Papist, a Presbyterian, a Quaker, a No Religion, a Sandemanian, and a Staunch Churchman” – at a dinner party he hosted in 1792. Besides socializing across national and religious lines, Lettsom routinely attended non-Quaker worship services as part of his involvement in various charitable ventures. He summed up the views guiding

---

<sup>19</sup> Rush to Richard Price, June 2, 1787, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 419; Lettsom to Dr. William Cuming, March 2, 1785, in *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 1, p. 96.



his charitable activities when he volunteered to the turkey-gifting friend (in the context of a discussion of the Royal Humane Society, a rescue-and-resuscitation-charity): “He must be a niggard indeed, to set bounds to philanthropy.” Admitting that the Royal Humane Society (RHS)’s funds and thus its capacities were limited, Lettsom added: “but we do as much as we can; and annually, as our finances increase, extend our compassion and aid to distant parts.” Just the week before, Lettsom noted, he had successfully proposed that the RHS send one of its lifesaving apparatuses and lifesaving directions to Algiers.

(Cosmopolitanism, again, did not mean lack of all prejudices, but could mean caring for the stranger as for yourself, while still judging difference. Lettsom hoped that, as a result of the RHS gift, “our countrymen may gain the love of that barbarous people; and, by some happy resuscitations, rouse them from the dark apathy of fatalism.”)<sup>20</sup>

Rush, like Lettsom, socialized across boundaries and espoused catholic ideas of moral responsibility anchored in his Christian beliefs. His peers did much the same. Christian ideals of universal benevolence filled a well of inspiration that philanthropists drew from. But Christianity, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, had long enjoined care of suffering strangers. Lettsom’s comment, “*as our finances increases, [we] extend our compassion and aid to distant parts,*” is telling. People’s senses of their capacities to act, and to have an impact at a distance, were expanding, as Thomas Haskell has pointed out. He argues that the rise of humanitarianism in the century after 1750 emanated from “the changes the market wrought in *perception or cognitive style.*” (Italics in the original.) “[T]he emergence of a market-oriented form of life,” Haskell suggests, “gave rise to new habits of causal attribution that set the stage for humanitarianism.” That is to

---

<sup>20</sup> Lettsom to Sir Mordaunt Martin, April 27, 1792, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, pp. 62-63; Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 1, p. 155; Lettsom to Martin, June 6, 1790, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, pp. 27-28.

say, the market “taught people to keep their promises” (to wit, to be governed by contractual relations and to realize their power to shape the future) and “taught them to attend to the remote consequences of their actions.”<sup>21</sup>

More mundanely than changes in cognitive perception, however, greater access to models of charitable ventures coalesced with both the widespread appreciation for novelty and the prevailing elite faith in improvement to foster growth in the Anglo-American philanthropic sphere. The idea of improvement, and the belief that things were improving or improvable, captivated and motivated well-off eighteenth-century men and women on both sides of the Atlantic. The concept of improvement came originally from the realm of agriculture and referred to turning land to more profitable use. Over the early-modern period, and especially as the culture of scientific study burgeoned and widened, the concept broadened to apply to all manner of activities and comprehended a broad, optimistic outlook of progressive changes to use and make the world better. Improving their profits, their communities, their countries, the world, knowledge, others, and themselves fired the imaginations of landowners, farmers, planters, merchants, manufacturers, medical men, and other Enlightened gentlepeople. Their improving efforts ranged from using land more productively, running businesses better, founding new public institutions, and building faster transportation and communication systems to softening old enmities through commerce, learning more about . . . everything, updating and refining homes, adopting new comforts and new luxuries, and crafting projects to aid the poor and distressed and, finally, to the very personal agendas of becoming genteel.

---

<sup>21</sup> Haskell, “Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility,” p. 551.

Not everyone shared the belief in improvement, but among those who did evidence of progress animated expectations of still more.<sup>22</sup>

Philanthropic instigators came from the ranks of improvers, whose outlook guided their beneficence, as the constant use of the words “improve” and “improvement” underscore. Although they never defined those words, when well-to-do philanthropists talked about improvement, they had a clear sense of what they meant. And what they meant was controlled, incremental change to make the world more orderly and to promote the security, productivity, and the happiness – something they often stressed – of the poor. Philanthropists’ conception of improvement lay between the older meaning of the word, as taking advantage of or turning to profitable use, and the newer, vaguer sense of the word, as making better. The last thing that the “friends of order and humanity,” in Benjamin Rush’s words, wanted was radical overhaul of the social order in which they had, in many cases, risen.<sup>23</sup> Instead, well-off philanthropists favored measured, targeted

---

<sup>22</sup> This paragraph draws on extensive reading including: John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1997), pp. 56-57; Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York, 1992), chaps. 1-6; Joyce E. Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-1815* (Chapel Hill, 1993), esp. 92-93, 106-128; John E. Crowley, *The Invention of Comfort: Sensibilities and Design in Early Modern Britain and Early America* (Baltimore, 2001); Richard Drayton, *Nature’s Government: Science, Imperial Government, and the ‘Improvement’ of the World* (New Haven, 2000); John Gascoigne, *Science in the Service of Empire* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 65-66; Jack P. Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1988), pp. 109-111, 197-198; Hancock, *Citizens of the World*, esp. chap. 9; Porter, “Cleaning Up the Great Wen”; Porter, *The Creation of the Modern World*, esp. chap. 19; James C. Riley, *The Eighteenth-Century Campaign to Avoid Disease* (New York, 1987); David Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven, 1990); David Turley, “British Antislavery Reassessed” in *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1750-1850*, eds. Arthur Burns and Joanna Innes (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 182-184; Jenny Uglow, *The Lunar Men: Five Friends Whose Curiosity Changed the World* (New York, 2002).

<sup>23</sup> This analysis draws on extensive reading in sources related to philanthropy. See, for example, “Observations Recommendatory of the Philadelphia Society for Ameliorating the Miseries of Public Prisons,” *American Museum* (1787): 1, p. 457; [John Murray], *An Enquiry into the Origin, Progress, & Present State of Slavery: With a Plan for the Gradual, Reasonable, & Secure Emancipation of Slaves. By a Member of the Society of UNIVERSAL GOODWILL in London and Norwich* (London, 1789), esp. pp. 17, 22; John Howard, *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales, with Some Preliminary Observations, and an Account of Some Foreign Prisons* (London, 1777), pp. 40-75, 488; John Lathrop to Lettsom, November 9, 1790, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, pp. 444-445; John Coakley Lettsom, *Hints*

programs that broke humanity down into smaller and smaller subsets in efforts to ameliorate distress. Furthermore, in their preference for piecemeal improvement, philanthropists bore in on the nitty-gritty details that would both better the condition of the distressed and make them more useful citizens – that is, improve the poor in both the new and old senses.

Although they hoped that their activities would one day transform the world, they were deeply practical, not visionary, men. They pursued their goals of broad improvement by accumulating from far and wide ideas that held out focused and manageable possibilities. Instigators imbibed ideas about sympathy from moral philosophers, but their efforts to diversify charitable infrastructures rested more on curiosity, the appeal of novelty, pragmatic cosmopolitanism, and faith in progress. Those factors meant on ongoing attention to new ways of doing things and also meant that interest in projects could ebb and flow among supporters and activists alike.

#### *The Associated-Philanthropy Form*

Instigators followed in a centuries-old tradition of borrowing and exchanging models of charitable institutions in Europe and its colonies.<sup>24</sup> What differed in the latter

---

*Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science*, vol. 1 (of 3 vols.) (London, 1801), p. 101; “Papers Relative to a Sick & Lying-in Patients by the Humane Society,” Belknap Papers, Reel 161.A. (Reel 4), MHS; *RHS Reports 1795* (London, 1795), p. 1. Rush to Jeremy Belknap, August 19, 1788, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 447. N.B. The title of the Royal Humane Society reports changed many times. For the sake of simplicity and consistency, I am using *RHS Reports [Year(s)]* for RHS reports from 1776.

<sup>24</sup> On the spread and sharing of charitable models around early-modern Europe and America, see for example, Mary Lindemann, “Urban Growth and Medical Charity: Hamburg 1788-1815” in *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State*, eds. Jonathan Barry and Colin Jones (London, 1991); Innes, “The State and the Poor”; Paul Slack, *From Reformation to Improvement: Public Welfare in Early Modern England* (New York, 1999); Duffy, “The Society of Promoting Christian Knowledge and Europe”; Hitchcock, “Pauper and Preachers”; Renate Wilson, “Pietist Universal Reform and the Care of the Sick and the Poor: The Medical Institutions of the Francke Foundation and the Social Context” in *Institutions of Confinement: Hospitals, Asylums, and Prisons in Western Europe and North America, 1500-1950*, eds. Norbert Finzsch and Robert Jutte (Washington, DC, 1996); Grell and Cunningham, eds., *Health Care and Poor Relief in*

half of the eighteenth century – although beginnings of these developments can be found earlier – were three things: the idea of improvement; the practical cosmopolitanism of many residents of the Atlantic world; and the associated-philanthropy structure that tapped growing middle-class wealth and that grew with consumer society as it promoted both desire for novelty and expectations of commercial leisure activities. Over time, philanthropists’ brought those factors together to elaborate charitable infrastructures and extend the practice of charity beyond the local and partial (i.e. particularistic) ties that had usually delimited it.

The associated-philanthropy form was one of the defining traits of Georgian-era beneficence. Such charity, based on the joint-stock company structure of a group of subscribers supporting a venture, emerged in England at the end of the seventeenth century and was preferred to the previously common endowed form by which individual testators funded charitable foundations. Associated beneficence was favored over endowments because it gave donors greater control than trusts set up by testators did and, in addition, addressed the contemporary concern that trusts robbed heirs of their inheritances. Moreover, it both took advantage of rising middling wealth, and it gave middling people voices in community governance. By the second half of the eighteenth century, associated philanthropy thrived in England, and in the decades after the American Revolution, it became common in the United States. (Trusts did not fade away, but those founded in the eighteenth-century did not innovate with goals or methods. Rather, writes

---

*Protestant Europe, 1500-1700*; Grell, Cunningham, and Jutte, eds., *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Northern Europe*.

David Owen, endowments in this period “follow[ed] paths already explored and made familiar by donors of an earlier age.”)<sup>25</sup>

The new framework was more than just a change in financing mechanism. Associated philanthropy made it possible for individuals to collect ideas and to propose the founding of programs far and wide – whether workable or unlikely – that groups of people could then fund and try to implement. Furthermore, it created the need to keep attracting support, and, thus to keep the public engaged.<sup>26</sup> Dynamism, then, was built into associated philanthropy in a way it could never be with trusts (established by the wills of dead folks). As a result, there was an appeal to new resources. And, because, in addition, associated philanthropy, like the joint-stock model of empire building, was undertaken by self-selected individuals, border-crossers could play key roles in influencing what, when, and where charitable institutions were established. As people

---

<sup>25</sup> On English associated philanthropy, see Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, esp. pp. 44-49; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 482-490; Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 11-68, 97-133. On the growth of associated charity in Scotland, see Rosalind Mitchison, *The Old Poor Law in Scotland: The Experience of Poverty, 1574-1845* (Edinburgh, 2000), pp. 28-129, and in the Thirteen Colonies/United States, see Alexander, *Render Them Submissive*, chap. 7; Bellows, *Benevolence Among Slaveholders*, esp. chap. 2; Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, esp. chap. 1; James, *A People Among Peoples*, esp. chap. 11; McCarthy, *American Creed*, Part I; Mohl, *Poverty in New York*, Part III; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, esp. Part II. For the view that associationalism was nothing new in the eighteenth century, see Joanna Innes, “State, Church and Voluntarism” in *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform from the 1690s to 1850*, eds. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes (New York, 1998), p. 37. On charitable trusts in Tudor and Stuart England, see Jordan, *Philanthropy in England*. For an overview of eighteenth-century English philanthropy, see Owen, *English*, pp. 13-88, quotation about the nature of eighteenth-century endowments on p. 71. For overviews of English poor relief, see, Paul A. Fideler, *Social Welfare in Pre-Industrial England* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire, 2006); Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1998); James Stephen Taylor, “The Impact of Pauper Settlement 1691-1834,” *Past and Present* 73 (1976): 42-74; on English poor law, see Gareth H. Jones, *History of the Law of Charity, 1532-1827* (Cambridge, 1969). On poor relief in America, see, for instance, Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York, 1955), pp. 231-246, 391-393; Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776* (New York, 1955), pp. 122-128, 319-325; Smith, *Down and Out in Early America*, Part II, pp. 135-232.

<sup>26</sup> James Stephen Taylor notes that novelty attracted support to charities in mid-eighteenth-century London. Taylor, *Jonas Hanway*, pp. 71, 123. On the appeal of novelty to American and British publics in general, see T. H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped the American Revolution* (Oxford, 2004), p. 170, and J. H. Plumb, “The Acceptance of Modernity” in Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, *Birth of a Consumer Society* (Bloomington, 1982), pp. 316-334.

took previous experience and applied it in new places, humanitarian activity, like the British Empire (which philanthropy often bolstered), took hold by trial and error.<sup>27</sup>

### *Instigators*

Instigators were not a coherent group, but they shared certain traits. First, they were white men. Second, they came from middling-elite backgrounds. Third, they lived in urban areas. Fourth and most important, they lived geographically-mobile lives. Those attributes made it possible for them to collect and introduce novel ideas that expanded the scale and scope of charitable infrastructures.

The gender of instigators mattered. Increasingly from the late eighteenth century, women set up and ran charitable organizations, but the nature of initiating their groups seems to have differed from men's groups (which could have and did have female subscribers). For example, perhaps because gender norms frowned on women projecting themselves publicly, Hannah More credited a man, William Wilberforce, with first suggesting the charity schools More and her sister ran. Differently, the Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children, founded in New York in 1797, by Isabella Graham, her daughter Joanna Bethune, and Elizabeth Seton, grew organically from Bethune's earlier charitable work with the St. Andrew's Society, which aided people of Scots descent. Her work had led Bethune to realize that charities based on ethnic or religious ties failed to provide for some needy women. That realization led Bethune, Graham, and Seton to innovate by dispensing aid through the Widows' Society without regard to communal background; they had not, however, introduced a kind of

---

<sup>27</sup> Alison Games, "Beyond the Atlantic: English Globetrotters and Transoceanic Connections," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., 63 (2006): 675-692.

organization.<sup>28</sup> Although women such as Bethune, did initiate the founding of new charities, more men than women were crossing borders in ways that led them to spread models of unfamiliar institutions.<sup>29</sup>

Besides being men, instigators emerged from the dynamic, hard-to-categorize middling-elite section of the social structure. They generally came from middling backgrounds and usually had received formal educations. (See Table 1.1 on page 52-53.) While they eventually claimed genteel status and might rub shoulders with the true elite, by and large, they had to work. Many ended life as prominent and, sometimes wealthy, men, although some died in debt.<sup>30</sup> Although many of their names are now well-known, their fathers' occupations remind us that many of these men had moved up the social ladder: Improvement (which to Americans, at least those on upwards paths, involved a desirable social stratification) had personal meaning for these men.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> On the emergence of women-run charitable institutions, see Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*; Midgley, *Women Against Slavery*; Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England*. Stott, *Hannah More*, p. 105. Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, pp. 96, 101, 122.

<sup>29</sup> More research, however, is necessary to draw firmer conclusions about the similarities and differences between male and female instigators and the types of organizations they proposed. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's advocacy of smallpox inoculation to Britain in the early eighteenth century shows that in some situations women publicly endorsed new measures on their own authority. Genevieve Miller, *The Introduction of Smallpox Inoculation in England and France* (Philadelphia, 1957), pp. 69, 70, 75.

<sup>30</sup> John Crawford died in debt, see Wilson, "Dr. John Crawford, 1746-1813," p. 117.

<sup>31</sup> Jack P. Greene, *Imperatives Behaviors & Identities: Essays in Early American Cultural History* (Charlottesville, 1992), p. 192.



Table 1.1: Social Backgrounds of Instigators

Name	Dates	Father's Occ.	Relig.	Birthplace
John Bard	1716-1799	Judge	A (H)	New Jersey
Alexander Johnson	1716-1799	Publisher	A?	The Hague
John Murray	1721-1792	Tenant	A	S. Scotland
Thomas Cogan	1736-1818		C; U	Northamptonshire, England
William Hawes	1736-1808	Tavern keeper	P/A	London
Elisha Poinsett	1737-1803		H	Newport, Rhode Island
John Haygarth	1740-1827		A	Yorkshire, England
Thomas Percival	1740-1804	Merchant	D; U	Lancashire, England
Samuel Bard	1742-1821	Doctor	A (H)	Philadelphia
J. C. Lettsom	1744-1815	Planter	Q	British Virgin Islands
Jeremy Belknap	1744-1798	Leather dresser/ furrier	C	Boston
John Crawford	1746-1813	Presbyterian clergyman	(P)	N. Ireland
Benjamin Rush	1746-1813	Farmer and gunsmith	P/Un	near Philadelphia
Henry Moyes	1749-1807	Tenant	D	Fife, Scotland
Thomas Bernard	1750-1808	Royal governor	A	Lincoln, England
Andrew Bell	1753-1832	Wig-maker; baillie	A	St. Andrews, Scotland
Benjamin Thompson	1753-1814	Farmer		Woburn, Mass.
Benj. Waterhouse	1754-1846	Judge, legislator	Q	Newport, RI
John R. B. Rodgers	1757-1833	Clergyman	P	Delaware
Thomas Eddy	1758-1827	Merchant; ironmonger	Q	Philadelphia
Jedidiah Morse	1761-1826	Deacon; local offices	C	Connecticut
Andrew Brown	1763-1834	Weaver	P	near Lanark, Scotland
Charles Murray	d. 1808		(A)	(Scotland?)

Key:

Religion:

A=Anglican

H=Huguenot ancestry

C=Congregationalist

D=Dissenter

P=Presbyterian

Q=Quaker

U=Unitarian

Un=Universalist

Table 1.1, continued

Name	Education	Adult residence	Occupation	Other travel/residence
John Bard		Phila.; New York	Doctor	
Alexander Johnson		UP; Lon	Physician	
John Murray		Norfolk, England	Naval surgeon; doctor	WI/America as naval surgeon
Thomas Cogan		UP; Lon; Somerset; Devon; Southampton	Physician	
William Hawes		Lon	Apothecary, surgeon, physician	
Elisha Poinsett		England; Charleston	Doctor; druggist	EIC ship surgeon
John Haygarth	Cambridge; Edin; Lei; Lon; Paris	Chester; Bath	Physician	
Thomas Percival	Warrington; Edin; Lon; Lei	Manchester	Physician	
Samuel Bard	King's (NY); Lon; Edin	New York City	Doctor	
J.C. Lettsom	Lon; Edin; Lei	Lon	Physician	Europe; sojourn in WI
Jeremy Belknap	Harvard	Dover, NH; Boston	Clergyman	
John Crawford	Trinity (Dublin); Leiden	Barbados; Demerara; Baltimore	Surgeon/doctor	EIC ship surgeon
Benjamin Rush	NJ; Edin; Lon	Philadelphia	Doctor	France
Henry Moyes	Edin and/or Glasgow?	Itinerant lecturer	Lecturer on natural philosophy	U.S., extensive travels in British Isles
Thomas Bernard	Harvard; Middle Temple	Lon	Law (retired early)	
Andrew Bell	St. Andrews	Madras; Lon; Durham	Clergyman	VA; extensive travels in England
Benjamin Thompson	Harvard	Lon; Munich; Paris	Military; aide to Elector of Bavaria	
Benjamin Waterhouse	Lon; Edin; Lei	Boston; Cambridge	Physician	Europe
John R. B. Rodgers	NJ; U. Penn.; Edin; Lon	New York City	Doctor	France?; Phila.
Thomas Eddy		New York City	Merchant, financier	NJ; VA; England
Jedidiah Morse	Yale	Charlestown, Mass.	Clergyman	Extensive travels in U.S.
Andrew Brown	Glasgow; Edin	Halifax, NS; Lochmaben; Edin	Clergyman	Boston; Phila.; Paris
Charles Murray		New York City	British consul in Madeira	

Key: Education, cont'd.:  
 Education: Lei=Univ. of Leiden  
 Edin=Univ. of Edinburgh  
 Edinburg  
 Lon=London hospitals  
 NJ=College of New Jersey  
 Adult Residence and Other:  
 UP=United Provinces  
 Lon=London  
 WI=West Indies  
 EIC=East India Company

Notably, of the twenty-three men in this admittedly unscientific sample, eighteen were medical men or clergymen.<sup>32</sup> In part, that predominance is a function of studying

---

<sup>32</sup> Biographical data on the men in this cohort comes from the following sources: On John and Samuel Bard, see J. Brett Langstaff, *Dr. Bard of Hyde Park* (New York, 1942). On Jeremy Belknap, see “Jeremy Belknap” in *Sibley’s Harvard Graduate*, vol. 15, ed. Clifford K. Shipton (Boston, 1970), pp. 175-195. On Andrew Bell, see Jane Blackie, ‘Bell, Andrew (1753–1832)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/1995>, accessed 19 Sept 2007]. On Thomas Bernard, see James Baker, *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Bernard, Baronet* (London, 1819); R. D. Sheldon, ‘Bernard, Sir Thomas, second baronet (1750–1818)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/2251>, accessed 19 Sept 2007]. On Andrew Brown, see “Andrew Brown,” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*. On Thomas Cogan, see “Memoir of Thomas Cogan, M.D.”; Carolyn D. Williams, ‘Cogan, Thomas (1736–1818)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online ed., May 2007 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/5813>, accessed 19 Sept 2007]. On John Crawford, see Wilson, “Dr. John Crawford”; Julia Wilson, “An Early Baltimore Physician and His Medical Library,” *Annals of Medical History* 4 (1942): 63-80; David L. Cowen. “Crawford, John”; <http://www.anb.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/articles/12/12-00178.html>; *American National Biography Online* Feb. 2000. Access Date: Wed Sep 19 2007 10:14:33 GMT-040; Edward T. Schultz, *History of Freemasonry in Maryland*. vol. 2. (Baltimore, 1885), pp. 297-307; Tobias Watkins, *An Eulogium on the Character of Brother John Crawford* (Baltimore, 1813). On Thomas Eddy, see Samuel L. Knapp, *The Life of Thomas Eddy* (1834; reprint edition, New York, 1976); H. Larry Ingle. “Eddy, Thomas”; <http://www.anb.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/articles/15/15-00200.html>; *American National Biography Online* Feb. 2000. Access Date: Wed Sep 19 2007 13:57:55 GMT-0400. On John Haygarth, see Christopher Booth, *John Haygarth, FRS: A Physician of the Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 2005). On William Hawes, see Carolyn D. Williams, “Hawes, William (1736–1808),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/12648> (accessed April 24, 2008). On Alexander Johnson, see Carolyn D. Williams, ‘Johnson, Alexander (bap. 1716, d. 1799)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/57457>, accessed 19 Sept 2007]. On John Coakley Lettsom, see James Johnston Abraham, *Lettsom: His Life, Times, Friends and Descendants* (London, 1933); Christopher Lawrence and Fiona A. Macdonald, *Sambrook Court: The Letters of J. C. Lettsom at the Medical Society of London* (London, 2003); Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*. On Jedidiah Morse, see Joseph W. Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse and New England Congregationalism* (New Brunswick, 1983). On Henry Moyes, see Eva V. Armstrong and Claude K. Deischer, “Dr. Henry Moyes, Scotch Chemist,” *Journal of Chemical Education* 24 (1947): 169-174, and John Anthony Harrison, “Blind Henry Moyes, ‘An Excellent Lecturer in Philosophy,’” *Annals of Science* 13 (1957): 109-125. On Charles Murray, see John Burke, *Burke’s Landed Gentry*, vol. 2 (London, 1846), p. 903; Arthur H. Plaisted, *The Manor and Parish Records of Medmenham* (London, 1925), pp. 140-141. On John Murray, see the obituary of Murray in *The Gentleman’s Magazine* 62 (1792), p. 961; Patricia Cleary, *Elizabeth Murray: A Woman’s Pursuit of Independence in Eighteenth-Century America* (Amherst, 2000), p. 16; Nina Moore Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray Loyalist* (Boston, 1901), pp. 1-2; John Burke, *Burke’s Landed Gentry* (London, 1846), p. 903. On Thomas Percival, see *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Percival M.D.*, ed. Edward Percival (London, 1807), pp. ii-xii. On Elisha Poinsett, see J. Fred Rippy, *Joel R. Poinsett: Versatile American* (Durham, 1935), pp.4-6; Joseph Ioor Waring, *A History of Medicine in South Carolina* ([Charleston?], 1964), pp. 275-276. On John R. B. Rodgers, see Richard Harrison, *Princetonians 1769-1775: A Biographical Dictionary* (Princeton, 1980), pp. 518-520. On Benjamin Rush, see *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*; Nathan Goodman, *Benjamin Rush Physician and Citizen 1746-1813* (Philadelphia, 1934); David Freeman Hawke, *Benjamin Rush: Revolutionary Gadfly* (Indianapolis, 1971). On Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford, see W. J. Sparrow, *Knight of the White Eagle: A Biography of Sir Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1964); Phillip Drennon Thomas.

medical charities: Medical charities brought various benefits to medical men and thus they were interested (pecuniarily, professionally, and intellectually) in forming them. But, in addition, both elite medical men and clergymen belonged to learned occupations that often required travel for education or to find a suitable position. Moreover, those occupations had strong translocal and transnational networks. In addition, medical men promoted professional images of themselves as benefactors of humankind. Thus these men were well placed to be instigators.

Another trait of instigators is that they lived in cities for their educations and once they were settled. In the early modern Anglophone world, associational activities flourished in urban areas. Growing and mobile populations, growing disposable incomes, and growing demand for commercial leisure activity plus “social confusion” about status, among other factors, fueled a boom in voluntary societies including philanthropic organizations. Urban residence gave instigators access to and experience with charitable programs and provided pools of other men in which to find fellow activists.<sup>33</sup>

Behind those commonalities, instigators were a varied lot, representing a sizeable cross-section of British Atlantic community’s white male members (with Germans excluded due to research constraints). They included men who were born or who settled in the British Isles, North America, the West Indies, and Europe and one who lived in the East Indies (while two others served as East India Company ship surgeons.) Religion-

---

"Thompson, Benjamin"; <http://www.anb.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/articles/13/13-01660.html>; *American National Biography Online* Feb. 2000. Access Date: Wed Sep 19 2007 11:28:43 GMT-0400; David Knight, 'Thompson, Sir Benjamin, Count Rumford in the nobility of the Holy Roman empire (1753–1814)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/27255>, accessed 19 Sept 2007]. On Benjamin Waterhouse, see Philip Cash. "Waterhouse, Benjamin"; <http://www.anb.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/articles/12/12-00951.html>; *American National Biography Online* Feb. 2000. Access Date: Wed Sep 19 2007 11:36:28 GMT-0400.

<sup>33</sup> Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800*, chap. 5, quotation p. 155.

wise, they were Anglicans, Congregationalists, Friends, and Presbyterians, with a few maintaining ties to more than one community. Three men had Huguenot ancestry.

Differences aside, the most important trait that these instigators shared was their mobility: They moved around the Atlantic with remarkable fluidity. These men's voyages generally did not rival the cosmopolitan experiences of many people of African descent whose extensive moves, ironically, were coerced or constrained by narrow options. But compared to the fifty-five delegates to the United States Constitutional Convention, of whom few had traveled much, the men in this cohort were a mobile lot. Because they are the subjects of the first two chapters and many appear in later chapters, tracing their individual geographic and social paths is necessary to follow their philanthropic activities.<sup>34</sup>

Many of these men sought to improve their lots in life by residing abroad or by moving. The future doctors John Coakley Lettsom, John Haygarth, Thomas Percival, Benjamin Waterhouse, Benjamin Rush, John R. B. Rodgers, Samuel Bard, and Elisha Poinsett all pursued their medical studies in Edinburgh, Leiden, and/or London, cities none of them came from. Most of them also rounded out their medical educations with tours of other European cities. Lettsom (1744-1815), had been born in the British West Indies and always referred to himself as an American, but grew up in Yorkshire. He married into wealth and, with the patronage of the famed Quaker doctor John Fothergill, set up a successful practice in London, his home for the rest of his life. Haygarth (1740-

---

<sup>34</sup> Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, chap. 1; Cassandra Pybus, "Billy Blue: An African American Journey through Empire in the Long Eighteenth Century," *Early American Studies* 5 (2007): 252-288; Jon Sensbach, *Rebecca's Revival: Creating Black Christianity in the Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005); on the delegates to the Constitutional Convention (compared to the Spanish American liberators), see J. H. Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America 1492-1830* (New Haven, 2006), pp. 395-396.

1827) and Percival (1740-1804), from the West Riding of Yorkshire and Warrington, England, respectively, settled in Chester and Manchester, England, respectively, on finding opportunities in those cities. For his part, John Bard (1716-1799) had moved in the 1740s from Philadelphia to New York on a tip from his friend Benjamin Franklin that there were good career prospects in the latter city. Rodgers (1757-1833) too would decamp from Philadelphia, where he had begun his career as a doctor, to New York in 1788. After their sojourns abroad, Rush (1745-1813) returned to Philadelphia, Samuel Bard (1742-1821) to New York, and Waterhouse (1754-1846) to Rhode Island (before moving to Boston in the 1780s). Poinsett (c. 1737-1803) too returned to his hometown, Charleston, after service as a surgeon on an East India merchantman following medical studies in England.<sup>35</sup>

Of all the medical men in this cohort, John Crawford (1746-1813) moved most extensively. The future mainstay of Baltimore voluntary organizations was born in Northern Ireland in 1746 to Thomas Crawford, a Presbyterian minister in Crumlin, County Antrim, who came from “an illustrious but impoverished family,” and Anne Mackay, aunt of the writer Elizabeth Hamilton.<sup>36</sup> Around age seventeen, John began medical studies at Trinity College Dublin. His whereabouts during part of the 1760s

---

<sup>35</sup> Lawrence and MacDonald, *Sambrook Court*, p. 2; Booth, *John Haygarth*, p. 29; Percival, *Memoirs of Thomas Percival*, pp. xvii-xviii; Cash, “Benjamin Waterhouse”; Goodman, *Benjamin Rush*, chap. 2; Harrison, *Princetonians*, p. 519; Langstaff, *Dr. Bard of Hyde Park*, pp. 56-61; Rippey, *Joel R. Poinsett*, p. 4. Abraham, *Lettsom*, pp. 102-105. Lobo, “John Haygarth, Smallpox and Religious Dissent in Eighteenth-Century England”; Percival, *Memoirs of Thomas Percival*, p. xviii. Langstaff, *Dr. Bard of Hyde Park*, p. 33. Harrison, *Princetonians*, p. 519. Goodman, *Benjamin Rush*, chap. 3. Cash, “Benjamin Waterhouse.” Waring, *A History of Medicine in South Carolina*, p. 275. On American medical students abroad, see Whitefield J. Bell, Jr., “Philadelphia Medical Students in Europe, 1750-1800,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 67 (1943): 1-29; John M. O’Donnell, “Cullen’s Influence on American Medicine,” in *William Cullen and the Eighteenth Century Medical World*, eds. A. Doig, J. P. S. Ferguson, I. A. Milne and R. Passmore (Edinburgh, 1993), pp. 236-237.

<sup>36</sup> Watkins, *An Eulogium on the Character of Brother John Crawford*, p. 8. On Crawford’s family, see Alexander Gordon, ‘Crawford, William (1739/40–1800)’, rev. I. R. McBride, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/6645>, accessed 19 Sept 2007].

remain a mystery but by the early 1770s, he was a surgeon on East India Company ships and made two voyages to the East Indies. During the 1780s, Crawford served as surgeon at the Naval Hospital in Barbados. Then in 1790, he moved to the Dutch colony of Demerara where he became Garrison Surgeon thanks to the patronage of General Edward Mathew. Crawford's observations in that post led to the development of his germ theory.<sup>37</sup> By 1794, suffering in poor health, he went to the United Provinces to recover; while there he received a medical degree from Leiden. Due to the French Revolutionary Wars, the adaptable doctor found himself stuck in Holland but took the chance to chart his future life in a Dutch colony. He successfully proposed to the Dutch council for colonial affairs to be made superintendent of the medical affairs of the Colony of Demerara and Essequibo. In addition, he received permission to set up a botanical garden in Demerara where he could grow plants that "country practitioners" taught him had medicinal uses to send to the botany professor at Leiden. The British takeover of the Dutch colony, however, scotched Crawford's plans. In 1796, he moved to the United States at the urging of his brother-in-law and settled in Baltimore.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> None of the other historians who have studied Crawford mention what he did during the mid-to-late 1760s, and I have not yet been able to find sources that shed light on his activities during that decade. Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," pp. 63-64. "A Letter Addressed to Lieutenant General Mathew . . . by John Crawford, M.D.," p. 2, Box 130, Manuscript Collections of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland (MS 3000), MdHS. Crawford had arranged a leave from Barbados in early 1789 for two months to go to arrange his affairs in Demerara. Letter from John Crawford to unknown recipient, January 28, 1789, Naval Hospital Barbados 1789, MS 8410, Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine (WL), London. N.B. The Wellcome Library online catalog wrongly cites this document as MS 8401. On his germ theory work, see Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," p. 68, and Crawford's "Remarks on Quarantine," serialized in *The Observer* from April to December 1807.

<sup>38</sup> *The (Baltimore) Observer*, September 19, 1807, p. 182. (Crawford edited this periodical as the *Companion and Weekly Miscellany* from 1804-1806. His daughter Eliza Anderson (later Godefroy) then took over the editorship and renamed the periodical *The Observer*. See Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," p. 68.) Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," p. 64. "Memorial of Doctor [John] Crawford (the Chief Surgeon of the Colony of Demerary) to the Lord of the Treasury," (n.d.), WL. Wilson says that Crawford went to England in 1794, but in his memorial to the Lords of the Treasury, Crawford says he received permission to leave Demerary in April 1794 and arrived in Holland in July. I think his mid-1790s trip to England came after his time in the United Provinces based on his memorial to the Lords of the Treasury. Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," p. 64.

Thomas Cogan (1736-1818), son of an apothecary in Rowell, Northamptonshire, rivaled Crawford for the number of moves during his lifetime, though his moves consisted of ricocheting between England and the United Provinces. Educated to be a Dissenting minister, but reportedly unable to find a position in England on account of unorthodox or unpopular theological opinions, he found a pulpit in a Presbyterian church in Rotterdam in 1759. Cogan eventually returned to England, in 1762 and 1763, to begin medical training in London hospitals; he also continued his preaching in Southampton. In time, he took a junior ministerial post at the English Church in The Hague and married Johanna Maria Groen, daughter of a wealthy Dutch merchant with ties to Britain. Through his wife, Cogan gained a fortune – with strings but evidently tolerable ones: His wife’s family required him to pursue a medical career. Cogan received a degree in medicine at Leiden and practiced there and in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Cogan then moved to London where Cogan established a practice. (For her part, Mrs. Cogan established a reputation as a nuisance for, true to stereotype, her fixation with cleanliness. Her daily cleaning regimen included the use of an engine “by means of which the drawing-room and bed-chamber windows were wetted daily, to the great obstruction and annoyance of” passersby.) In 1780, the Cogan returned to the United Provinces where they lived for fifteen years. They moved yet again in 1795, back to England, in the face of the French Revolutionary Wars.<sup>39</sup>

Alexander Johnson (1715-1799), who saw Cogan as his nemesis for winning the credit Johnson thought he deserved for introducing a new medical-charity movement to England, had been born and raised in the United Provinces, of English parents, and lived

---

<sup>39</sup> This sketch of Cogan’s life comes from “Memoir of Thomas Cogan, M.D.” and Williams, “Cogan, Thomas (1736–1818)”; the quotation is from “Memoirs,” pp. 78-79.



there well into adulthood. After having received a medical degree from King's College, Aberdeen in 1769, he moved to London.<sup>40</sup> His associate Henry Moyes (1749-1807) had been born in Kinghorn, Fifeshire, Scotland, and had gone blind when he suffered from smallpox as a young child. Moyes evidently studied in one or both the Universities of Edinburgh and of Glasgow. Sometime in the 1770s, he began giving lectures on chemistry and natural philosophy in Edinburgh. In 1779, he went to England where he made his name as an itinerant public lecturer. Contemporaries regarded Moyes as deeply knowledgeable about natural philosophy, but publics on both sides of the Atlantic found him especially fascinating because of his blindness.<sup>41</sup>

The Scotsmen in this cohort, typically, made the British Empire and its institutions their homes. Andrew Bell (1753-1832) lived in Virginia as a young man, working as a tutor, and only returned to Britain on account of the American Revolution. In 1787, by then ordained, Bell left Britain for India to take up multiple clerical posts in Madras. Charles Murray (d. 1808), scion of a Scottish gentry family, the Murrays of Philipaugh, served as British consul in Madeira from 1772 to 1791, while his cousin John Murray (1721-1792), from a cadet branch of the family, was a British naval surgeon who had spent "much time in the West Indies and other parts of America." Andrew Brown (1763-1834), a serious historian of North America whose perfectionism limited his

---

<sup>40</sup> Williams, "Johnson, Alexander." According to *Observator Londinensis* (surely Johnson or someone close to him), Johnson was living in London by 1770. "Friendly Hints to the Directors of the Humane Society" by *Observator Londinensis*, *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 Part II (1787): 1077-1079, p. 1077.

<sup>41</sup> *Providence Gazette*, September 11, 1784. Harrison, "Blind Henry Moyes," pp. 110-111. "Anecdotes of Dr. Moyes, the Blind Philosopher" by George Bew, *Gentleman's Magazine* 56 (1786), pp. 103-104; *New York Daily Advertiser* April 17, 1786 and August 27, 1790; quotation by Joseph Priestley in Harrison, "Blind Henry Moyes," p. 109.

output, served as a minister in Halifax, Nova Scotia, between 1787 and 1795, when he returned to Scotland.<sup>42</sup>

Many philanthropic instigators had moved in pursuit of education or employment, but the American Revolutionary crisis led others to re-establish themselves in new communities. First to have his life disrupted by the crisis was Thomas Bernard (1750-1818), son of the last royal governor of Massachusetts. Bernard had grown up partly in America and was attending Harvard when colonial politics led to his removal to England.<sup>43</sup> Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford (1753-1814), who would become a friend of Bernard's in London, was also forced to move by the American Revolution but turned those circumstances to spectacular success. The future Count was born into a middling family in Woburn, Massachusetts, in 1753. His education consisted of schooling to the age of thirteen, apprenticeships to a storekeeper in Salem and then a physician in Woburn, and attendance at some lectures at Harvard. In 1772, he moved to Rumford (now Concord), New Hampshire, to teach school, and there met and married the well-off widowed daughter, Sarah Rolfe, of a clergyman. In New Hampshire, Thompson gained the patronage of Gov. John Wentworth, who made Thompson a major in the New Hampshire militia. When war with Britain broke, Thompson remained loyal to the Crown and sailed for England in 1776. There he ingratiated himself with superiors and became private secretary to Lord George Germain and later secretary to Georgia (a profitless post), and then, in 1780, Undersecretary of State for the American Department.

---

<sup>42</sup> Blackie, "Bell, Andrew." Many thanks to David Hancock for the years of Charles Murray's consulship in Madeira. [Murray], *An Enquiry into the Origin, Progress, & Present State of Slavery: With a Plan for the Gradual, Reasonable, & Secure Emancipation of Slaves*, p. 3. The obituary for John Murray in the *Gentleman's Magazine* names him as the author of the pamphlet. *Gentleman's Magazine* 62 (1792), p. 961. "Andrew Brown," pp. 87-88. On the extensive migration of Scots, see T. M. Devine, *Scotland's Empire 1660-1815* (London, 2003); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1992), pp. 123-132.

<sup>43</sup> Sheldon, "Bernard, Thomas."

During this time, Thompson faced accusations of embezzlement – for the first, but not the last, time – and treason. To further his career, Thompson raised a regiment of the King’s American dragoons. With it, he went, in 1781, to America, where he distinguished himself by desecrating a Long Island church graveyard by using it for military purposes. In 1783, he returned to England.<sup>44</sup>

Britain’s loss of the Thirteen Colonies disrupted Thompson’s career, as it did the lives of Loyalists in general, but Thompson, who had left his wife and young daughter in New Hampshire, turned the dislocations into opportunities. After retiring from the army on half-pay, he traveled in Europe. Through military ties, he met the modernizing Elector Karl Theodor of Bavaria. With George III’s permission and a knighthood to boot, Thompson accepted a position as a colonel and aide-de-camp to Karl Theodor. Within a few years, he had reformed the Bavarian army. In 1790, he instigated other reforms in Munich that catapulted him to a new level of prominence. To address the problem of begging in Munich, Thompson arrested the city’s many beggars and placed them in the House of Industry, a workhouse, where they were put to work and fed one meal a day. In recognition of Thompson’s achievements in Bavaria, the Elector rewarded Thompson with a raft of high positions including, in 1792, the honorific Count Rumford. Rumford, by then an internationally respected, though unloved, philanthropist, spent the next decade or so shuttling between Munich, London, and Paris with sojourns in Italy and Ireland.<sup>45</sup>

More prosaically, Dr. Elisha Poinsett and Thomas Eddy, who (like Samuel Bard) had stayed loyal to the Crown but not suffered banishment, each relocated after the war.

---

<sup>44</sup> This and the following paragraph are drawn from Knight, “Thompson, Benjamin, Sir” and Sparrow, *Knight of the White Eagle*.

<sup>45</sup> Knight, “Thompson, Benjamin, Sir”; *Knight of the White Eagle*.

Following a five-year stint in England, Poinsett returned to Charleston.<sup>46</sup> The Quaker Eddy (1758-1827), a merchant and banker who had grown up in Philadelphia, spent the war years in New York and then moved to Virginia. In 1791, following a short trip to England in 1785 and more time in Virginia and Philadelphia, Eddy settled in New York.<sup>47</sup>

Among this group, only John Bard, Jedidiah Morse, and Jeremy Belknap had never crossed the Atlantic or the North Sea, although Morse and Belknap, typically for clergymen, had moved within New England to take up pulpits. Moreover, Morse (1761-1826), the arch-Congregationalist and reactionary geographer traveled regularly within the United States. For his part, the liberal cleric and founder of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Belknap (1744-1798), who had visited synagogues in Newport and Philadelphia, epitomized the cosmopolitan orientation of these instigators.<sup>48</sup>

These men were not a coherent cohort, and other people could be added to the list. But the people introduced here shared four traits that underlay their roles as instigators. First, they were male and thus, unlike women, could set agendas publicly without hazarding their reputations. Second, they came from the middling-elite ranks that sustained, and were empowered by, associated philanthropy. Third, they lived in cities, the vital environment for voluntary associations. Fourth, and most important, they perambulated the world.

#### *New Philanthropic Resources*

On their perambulations, these instigators gathered and transmitted improving ideas and institutions that ran the gamut from new ways of looking at situations to small

---

<sup>46</sup> Rippy, *Joel R. Poinsett*, p. 5; Waring, *A History of Medicine in South Carolina*, p. 276.

<sup>47</sup> Knapp, *The Life of Thomas Eddy*, pp. 47-54.

<sup>48</sup> Phillips, *Jedidiah Morse*, pp. 20-21, 59, 83-84, 119, 154, 209-210.

and large innovations that would enhance existing charitable programs to entirely new philanthropic agendas. As an adult, Thomas Bernard, for instance, remembered observing as a youth in America “the eagerness with which the young labourer laid up the greatest part of his earnings, confident, that when he married and settled in life,” the laborer’s nest egg would set him up securely. Bernard recognized that laborers in America had better opportunities than their counterparts in England and that realization led him to think about how the lot of the poor in England could differ. Needless to say, he did not imagine restructuring English society to reduce landed wealth. Instead, his observations led him to muse in his writing for the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor (SBCP) about the benefits that would accrue to the poor and to the country if young laborers “could be induced” to imitate the American example.<sup>49</sup> More concretely, Rev. Dr. Andrew Bell, who served as the director of the Madras Male Asylum from 1789 to 1796, brought back to Britain the Indian educational techniques of teaching children to write by forming letters in sand and of having older children instruct younger (the monitorial system) that Bell had observed at a Malabar school. (British and American charity schools adopted those ideas, though the English Quaker Joseph Lancaster too developed a monitorial system of education around the same time as Bell introduced the idea.) Such exchange went west to east too. Foundling hospitals (where 85 percent of the charges died) were set up in Russia thanks to ideas brought back by Ivan Ivanovich Betskoi from his many years residence in Western Europe.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> *The Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Improving the Comforts of the Poor (SBCP Reports)*, vol. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (London, 1805), p. 7.

<sup>50</sup> Andrew Bell, *An Analysis of the Experiment in Education, Made at Egmore, Near Madras*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (London, 1807), pp. 49, 26, 53, 81-86. On the adoption in Britain of the practice of making letters in sand

Correspondence gave instigators another way to collect ideas. In writing on new foodstuffs to alleviate serious hunger in England during the hard 1790s, John Coakley Lettsom relayed information about squash that came to him from a British admiral who had first tried squash in Turkey and from an American doctor, Benjamin Waterhouse, who ate squash at home. Both men sent Lettsom specimens or seeds plus directions on the cultivation and preparation of the vegetable. (The admiral best liked squash boiled, while Waterhouse thought squash, when boiled and mixed with flour, made the “most excellent pan-cakes.”)<sup>51</sup>

Besides new outlooks and resources to use in existing philanthropic projects, new agendas were imported from abroad. Perhaps the best example is the humane society movement for the rescue and resuscitation of drowning victims, begun in Amsterdam in 1767. For decades before the founding of the Amsterdam resuscitation organization, the problem of how to restore apparently dead people to life had interested physicians. But resuscitation from apparent-death was a novel program, greeted with skepticism in the late 1760s and early 1770s. Likewise, associations to promote the recovery of drowned persons were a new type of charitable undertaking. By 1800, however, dozens of

---

to teach writing, see Bell, *An Analysis of the Experiment in Education*, p. 86; *The Report of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor*, vol. 3 (London, 1802), p. 254; Patrick Colquhoun, *A New and Appropriate Education for the Labouring People* (London, 1806), pp. 14, 24. See DeWitt Clinton, *An Address to the Benefactors and Friends of the New York Free School Society, Delivered at the Opening of that Institution, in their New and Spacious Building* (New York, 1809), pp. 11-12, 15, on the adoption of educational practices from Joseph Lancaster's and Andrew Bell's methods by the New York City Free School Society and the influence of the New York charity school on charity schools in Philadelphia. For more on British charity schools and on the controversy between Lancaster and Bell and their camps, see M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement* (London, 1938), pp. 333-339. Hubertus Jahn, “Health Care and Poor Relief in Russia” in Grell, Cunningham and Jutte, *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Protestant Europe*, p. 164.

<sup>51</sup> Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science* (1797), pp. 159-160; W. Waldgreave to Lettsom, August 16, 1792, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, pp. 378-381.

humane societies had been established or attempted around the Atlantic.<sup>52</sup>

The 1767 Society for the Recovery of the Drowned had been established by a group of wealthy men to cope with the common problem of people drowning in Amsterdam canals. The Society's program was two-fold. It publicized its methods of resuscitation (which replaced older methods, now scorned by elite medical practitioners, for reviving people half-dead – though not *apparently*-dead – from drowning, hanging, or other causes.) In addition, the Society offered rewards to encourage lifesaving. Cities across the European continent soon followed suit. According to books by Thomas Cogan and Alexander Johnson, by the early 1770s, Hamburg, Milan, Padua, Paris, Venice, Vienna, and other cities had set up lifesaving programs, and the sovereigns of Hungary and Russia had encouraged the new lifesaving methods.<sup>53</sup>

The appeal of the humane society (in the Anglophone world, most rescue-and-resuscitation charities took the name “humane society”) cause stemmed from elements that intersected with the improving sensibilities. For one thing, resuscitation as a new medical project engaged the attention of learned men – especially, of course, medical men – who were eager to be part of and keep up with international currents in medicine.

---

<sup>52</sup> For a history from the classical era to the twentieth century of diagnosing death, see Martin Pernick, “Back from the Grave: Recurring Controversies over Defining and Diagnosing Death in History,” in Richard M. Zaner, ed., *Death: Beyond Whole-Brain Criteria* (Dordrecht, 1988), see esp. pp. 20-27 on physicians' interest in resuscitation and the definition of death in the eighteenth century. On the history of the Royal Humane Society and resuscitation in Britain, see Luke Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity: A Cultural History of Resuscitation and the Royal Humane Society of London, 1774-1808” (Ph.D. diss., University of York, 2001).

<sup>53</sup> Alexander Johnson, *A Short Account of a Society at Amsterdam Instituted in the Year 1767 for the Recovery of Drowned Persons; With Observations Shewing the Utility and Advantage that Would Accrue to Great Britain from a Similar Institution Extended to Cases of Suffocation by Damps in Mines, Choaking, Strangling, Stifling, and other Accidents* (London, 1773), pp. 3-7; Thomas Cogan, *Memoirs of the Society Instituted at Amsterdam in Favour of Drowned Persons, for the Years 1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, and 1771. Translated from the original by Thomas Cogan, M.D.* (London, 1773), pp. ii, iv-v. On older methods of reviving half-dead people, see Peter Linebaugh's discussion of efforts in England to revive convicts executed by hanging. Peter Linebaugh, “The Tyburn Riot Against the Surgeons,” in *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth Century England*, ed. Douglas Hay (New York, 1975), pp. 102-105 and picture 13 between pp. 64 and 65.

But, in addition, the rescue and resuscitation movement excited people because it held out so much promise of progress. The enhanced ability to save lives highlighted to contemporaries that they were gaining control over that most unpredictable event – death. The exhilaration that came from that ability cannot be overstated: “[T]o restore suspended animation, to recover and call into action the latent powers of life, is working a miracle to preserve the devoted victim of inauspicious chance—It is saying to the motionless frame—“LAZARUS, *come forth!*,” was how a newspaper report on the founding of the Jamaica Humane Society in 1789 put it. Moreover, the charitable undertaking to save lives offered both proof that benevolence was on the upswing and a way to foster more benevolence.<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, the humane society movement fit improving criteria well because, though lifesaving was the weightiest of matters, the pursuit of lifesaving happened one person at a time. It was a thrilling and momentous agenda, yet a narrowly focused, step-by-step endeavor.

Another thrilling philanthropic idea, to Count Rumford anyhow, was eating maize. The Massachusetts native had not discovered maize abroad. Rather, he tried to contribute an idea from home, where maize (known as Indian corn) was a staple food, to the international pool of ideas for relief of the poor. Rumford touted his ideas on maize in the first volume of his *Essays, Political, Economical, and Philosophical*, published in the mid-1790s. Poor harvests in Britain, worsened by the effects of war, caused great suffering among the vulnerable. Moreover, Rumford was then trying to arrange to return

---

<sup>54</sup> This paragraph is based on extensive reading of the records of humane societies and Luke Davidson’s analysis. Davidson deals throughout his dissertation with the issue of why the cause of resuscitation appealed to enlightened people in the eighteenth century, although he does not discuss the cause in terms of the incremental logic of improvement. For an overview of Anglophone humane societies and doctors’ roles in them, see Elizabeth Thomson, “The Role of Physicians in the Humane Societies of the Eighteenth Century,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 37 (1963): 43-51. On the idea that the humane-society movement promoted humanity, see Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity,” pp. 106-115. “Jamaica,” (Philadelphia) *Independent Gazette*, August 11, 1789.



to America. Perhaps his desire to end his exile heightened the delectability of maize in his food memory.<sup>55</sup> At the beginning of an entire, rhapsodic chapter devoted to Indian corn, Rumford proclaimed it to be a food that was “beyond comparison the most nourishing, cheapest, and most wholesome that can be procured for feeding the Poor.” To encourage his readers to adopt the use of Indian corn, Rumford included “*Proofs that it is more nourishing than Rice.—Different Ways of preparing or cooking it.—Computation of Expence of feeding a Person with it, founded on Experiment.—Approved Receipt for making an INDIAN PUDDING.*” Rumford also reprinted recipes for other types of corn pudding although he thought his Indian pudding recipe could not really be improved upon. (Parts of the volume, which contained explanations of the programs or institutions he championed along with minute details useful in undertaking those ventures, read more like a cookbook than a compilation of *Essays, Political, Economical, and Philosophical.*) Rumford’s attempt to allay prejudices against “American cookery” seems to have had little effect. In one of his essays, Rumford’s otherwise admirer Thomas Bernard suggested feeding Indian corn to livestock to save other grains.<sup>56</sup>

Rumford may have had little effect with his maize idea, but his writings on food are important. Rumford understood the function of border crossers in the development of beneficence. “Those whose avocations” or “fortune” caused them to travel “have many opportunities of acquiring useful information,” Rumford observed. “[B]ut the most important advantages that *might* be derived from an intimate knowledge of the manners

---

<sup>55</sup> Sparrow, *Knight of the White Eagle*, p. 103. On stress heightening taste memory, see Molly O’Neill, “Keep the Home Fires Burning,” *New York Times*, May 7, 1995, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=990CEFDE153FF934A35756C0A963958260> [viewed September 19, 2007]

<sup>56</sup> Rumford, *Essays*, vol. 1, pp. 248-277, quotations p. 248. *SBCP Reports*, vol. 3, p. 69. The word “corn” in English usage then and now referred to grains in general. See the definition of the noun “corn” in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (1989). Definition 5 notes the current differences in British and American usage.

and customs of different nations,” namely, “—the introduction of improvements tending to facilitate the means of subsistence, and to increase the comforts and conveniences of the most necessitous and most numerous classes of society”— had been neglected. Foodstuffs from around the world were imported into Britain, but knowledge of their use in other countries “has seldom been thought worth importing!” Rumford “lament[ed]” that the well-to-do in England and Germany “monopolized” “cheap and wholesome luxuries,” such as macaroni and polenta, while the poor remained ignorant of those foreign foods. Culinary cosmopolitanism, according to Rumford, was the way to redress the problem of hunger and it was up to travelers to convey the knowledge necessary for taking advantage of the world’s bounty.<sup>57</sup>

### *Conclusion*

Rumford knew what he was talking about. A certain type of person had a key job to do in the field of philanthropy. Instigators came from a range of backgrounds and varied in many ways but they were alike in crossing borders and in being curious. In addition, they embraced both practical cosmopolitanism and improvement, as did many of their contemporaries, who, therefore, were receptive to the ideas instigators collected. Those ideas included new causes, such as the humane society movement. As a result of that movement, a new class of people, victims of drowning and other causes of sudden death, now became objects of charitable concern. Or the innovations could be new techniques to use in existing endeavors. For instance, charity school advocates embraced the monitorial system and saw in it a way to teach many more pupils.

Or new ideas could be recipes. One historian has written about the abstract “recipe knowledge” – the understanding of the cause and effect of one’s actions –

---

<sup>57</sup> Rumford, *Essays*, vol. 1, pp. 246-247.

prompted by the growing commercial economy that allowed eighteenth-century men and women to imagine acting on moral responsibility in new ways.<sup>58</sup> But it was *recipes*, for Indian pudding or squash pancakes, for example, that captivated hands-on philanthropists. Appreciating that attention to the nitty-gritty is essential to understanding how humanitarian activity increased and to recognizing the importance of border crossers in the economy of philanthropy. As they moved around the world, instigators picked up useful and targeted innovations that they and their contemporaries employed to elaborate eleemosynary infrastructures in measured ways. Although charitable institutions seem, in retrospect, to have mushroomed across regions, philanthropists worked incrementally by adopting manageable, focused programs, community-by-community. Not all the ideas instigators threw out went anywhere. But people who trafficked in ideas stoked philanthropy's growth. As a result, they contributed critically to the unfolding of the urban Anglophone Atlantic world's charitable landscape as a coherent whole and, over time, to contemporaries' ambitions for a yet greater reach to their beneficence.

---

<sup>58</sup> Haskell does muse about how technological change, such as the advent of the airplane, can change conventions of moral responsibility (for instance, by making it easier to fly halfway across the world to aid suffering strangers), but does not discuss the innovations available in the eighteenth century. Haskell, "Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility," esp. pp. 356-359.

## Chapter Two

### The Little Picture: Instigators and the Spread of Institutions

In the infancy of the New York Dispensary, adversaries battled in print over the charity's boundaries and the role of the Medical Society in the institution. In the course of the dispute, one party noted that while some people had already subscribed to the nascent Dispensary, "a much greater number, however, and perhaps equally well disposed [to the idea of the unfamiliar institution], keep back until they see, (to use their own phrase) *how it will work*."<sup>1</sup> The ideas trafficked by instigators were not inexorably put into practice, as the foregoing comment suggests. Someone or some few people had to launch new projects community-by-community. The same people who collected and transmitted innovations had a knack for that first job in associated beneficence. By introducing new methods of disbursing resources, instigators served as midwives to the expansion of the Anglo-American philanthropic infrastructure.<sup>2</sup>

Historians have generally overlooked the phenomenon of who instigated charitable institutions. We have a big-picture understanding of how institutions moved around Britain and across the Atlantic. Innovations spread through medical, Evangelical, and Dissenting networks around Britain. Americans borrowed from British precedents after learning about new models from printed sources and correspondents. That depiction

---

<sup>1</sup> "Thoughts of a Public Dispensary," *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 24, 1791.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Christopher Brown explains that vague antislavery feeling could go nowhere while "those who cared knew neither how to proceed or what end to seek." Brown, *Moral Capital*, p. 100. On the division of labor between people who introduce ideas and those who implement them, see Gascoigne, *Science in the Service of Empire*, p. 65, and Thomas S. Robertson and Yoram Wind, "Organizational Cosmopolitanism and Innovativeness," *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 332-338.

is generally accurate but imprecise. “[A]ssociating was a new technology,” as Johann Neem explains. “Before associations could become useful, people had to be taught how to use them.” Obviously, people did not have to learn anew about the workings of associations in general with each unfamiliar *type* of charitable institution. But every new way of undertaking beneficence needed mastering, particularly the less time a method had been in existence. And before new methods could be mastered, they needed to be introduced, proposed as worthy of trial.<sup>3</sup>

Understanding how institutions spread and how people adopted these new technologies requires delving into the experiences of individuals as they transmitted and initiated new ventures. The records of charitable enterprises often do not allow precision in tracing the introduction of institutions. The breadth of this project, however, makes it possible to uncover a few case studies of the launching of novel projects. Admittedly, these examples are suggestive given the limitations of sources, but they offer insight into a largely unexplored phenomenon and, moreover, into the role of individuals in large historical developments.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, Bynum, “Hospital, Disease and Community,” pp. 102-104; Lobo, “John Haygarth, Smallpox and Religious Dissent in Eighteenth-Century England,” pp. 224-229; Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity,” pp. 99-101; Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 172-175, 402; Roberts, *Making English Morals*, esp. pp. 34-37, 64, 72, 75-76; Foster, *Errand of Mercy*; Raymond A. Mohl, “Humanitarianism in the Preindustrial City: The New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism,” *Journal of American History* 57 (1970): 576-599, pp. 590-592, 595; Neem, “The Transformation of Civil Society,” pp. 298, 305-313; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 3-4. Francis Lobo pays glancing attention to the issue of instigation. Lobo, “John Haygarth, Smallpox and Religious Dissent in Eighteenth-Century England,” p. 229. For the role of religious exiles in the spread of poor relief institutions in early-modern Europe, see Grell and Cunningham, “Reformation and Changes in Poor Relief in Early Modern Northern Europe,” pp. 4, 13, 15, 26-28. Quotation, Neem, “The Transformation of Civil Society,” pp. 288-289.

<sup>4</sup> On the difficulty of tracing the transmission of ideas in charity, see Slack, “Hospitals, Workhouses, and the Relief of the Poor in Early Modern England,” p. 236; Cunningham, Introduction to *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform*, p. 10. Similarly, technologies of smallpox inoculation and papermaking spread as people moved across space. Miller, *The Introduction of Smallpox Inoculation in England and France*; Rosenband, “The Competitive Cosmopolitanism of an Old Regime Craft.” Peter Clark argues for the primacy of newspapers in the spread of clubs and associations, but I think his reliance on printed sources led him to overlook the importance of individuals. Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 172-175

Instigators' personal stories shed light on the timing of the formation of eleemosynary enterprises. In associated philanthropy, self-selected individuals originated the formation of institutions. People who crossed borders, then, influenced what, when, and where charitable organizations were established. Put another way, a focus on the role of male instigators helps weave local and sometimes very personal conditions together with Atlantic-wide developments in the extension of humanitarian movements.<sup>5</sup>

The experiences of various border-crossers active in two new medical-charitable movements, the humane society and dispensary movements, illuminate generally obscured aspects of the geographic expansion of technologies of associated philanthropy. Following the paths of several people reveals that individuals' migrations and personal motives influenced the spread of new types of charities from one city to another. Conversely, probing the histories of the founding of various organizations shows that when they were adopting novel institutions, contemporaries valued the presence of people who had experience with those institutions elsewhere. But given voluntary organizational norms, instigators might be denied recognition for their roles in associated charity particularly if they did not work well in groups. By contrast, an instigator who did work well within associated philanthropy could propel the growth of a global scope to organized beneficence through focused, local activities linked to a larger cause. To avoid losing the reader in the thickets of the urban Atlantic medical-charitable landscape, the first section gives background on various charities.

---

<sup>5</sup> Games, "Beyond the Atlantic." On the way gender shaped the nature of an individual's associational activities, see Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, chap. 2; Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800*, pp. 204-208; Taylor, *Jonas Hanway*, p. 59. See also, Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class*, pp. 416-436; Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*; see also Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890-1935* (New York, 1991).

*Background on the Humane Society and Dispensary Movements around the Anglophone Atlantic*

Medical philanthropy flourished in the Georgian era. In the early to mid-century, the hospital movement spread around Britain and, ultimately, to British America with the founding of the Pennsylvania and New York Hospitals. Later in the century, dispensaries, humane societies, fever wards, or hospitals, and other specialized projects emerged. Medical men embraced these charities because, as medical historian Guenter Risse explains, “[p]hysicians and surgeons quickly realized that the opportunity to observe large numbers of patients allowed them to dramatically increase their understanding of diseases.” Moreover, they provided ways for medical men to assert or attain social status, as they did for lay supporters too.<sup>6</sup>

The movement to promote the rescue and resuscitation of victims of drowning and certain other forms of sudden death, begun in Amsterdam in 1767, stretched around Continental Europe within a few years. Not until the 1770s did Britons start founding lifesaving charities after both Thomas Cogan and Alexander Johnson published English translations of the Amsterdam resuscitation group’s reports in 1773. (According to an obituary of Thomas Cogan, Cogan’s wife had translated the memoirs of the Amsterdam

---

<sup>6</sup> Woodward, *To Do the Sick No Harm*; Porter, “The Gift Relation”; Lindsay Granshaw, “The Rise of the Modern Hospital in Britain” in *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*, ed. Andrew Wear (Cambridge, 1992); William H. Williams, “The ‘Industrious Poor’ and the Founding of the Pennsylvania Hospital,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 97 (1973): 431-443; Eric Larabee, *The Benevolent and Necessary Institution: The New York Hospital 1771-1971* (Garden City, 1971), pp. 1-83; Charles E. Rosenberg, *The Care of Strangers: The Rise of America’s Hospital System* (New York, 1987), chap. 1; I. S. L. Loudon, “The Origins and Growth of the Dispensary Movement in England,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 55 (1981): 322-342; Helen Brock, “North America: A Western Outpost of European Medicine” in *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 204-205; Charles E. Rosenberg, *Caring for the Working Man: The Rise and Fall of the Dispensary Movement* (New York, 1989); Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity”; Thomson, “The Role of Physicians”; Bynum, “Hospital, Disease and Community”; Guenter B. Risse, “Medicine in the Age of Enlightenment” in *Medicine in Society*, p. 184; Bynum, “Physicians, Hospitals and Career Structures in Eighteenth-Century London”; Jonathan Barry, “Publicity and the Public Good: Presenting Medicine in Eighteenth-century Bristol” in *Medical Fringe and Medical Orthodoxy, 1750-1850*, eds. W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (London, 1987), p. 33; Fissell, *Patients, Power and the Poor*, pp. 87-88.

resuscitation organization from low Dutch to English, though the male Cogan is credited on the book as the translator.) As Royal Humane Society lore and Luke Davidson, author of a recent dissertation on the Royal Humane Society, have it, London apothecary William Hawes (1736-1808) read the translated memoirs of the Amsterdam resuscitation society and was so inspired that he began his own effort to promote saving the lives of drowning victims in London. Eventually, he and Cogan joined forces and with a group of other men founded the Society for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned in April 1774. In 1776, it became known as the Humane Society and in 1784 it had received royal patronage and became the Royal Humane Society (RHS). (For the sake of simplicity, I will refer to it as the RHS for its whole existence.)<sup>7</sup>

The Royal Humane Society had as its mission “to restore such as have in an instant *been numbered amongst the dead*, by some dreadful disaster, or by some sudden impulse of phrensy.” In addition to people drowning from accidents or suicide attempts, the Society’s beneficiaries included people apparently dead from hanging, noxious vapors, freezing, and other causes of sudden death. To pursue its mission, the Society offered rewards to people who retrieved drowned bodies, who took the apparently dead bodies into their houses, who followed the Society’s resuscitation procedures, and who fetched the Society’s Medical Assistants to the scene of the emergency to oversee resuscitations. Publicizing those rewards, the resuscitation methods, and its achievements formed a large part of the charity’s activities. At the outset, the Society

---

<sup>7</sup> Johnson, *A Short Account of a Society at Amsterdam Instituted in the Year 1767 for the Recovery of Drowned Person*, pp. 3-7; Cogan, *Memoirs of the Society Instituted at Amsterdam in Favour of Drowned Persons, for the Years 1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, and 1771*. “Memoirs of Thomas Cogan,” p. 82. *Society for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned. Instituted MDCCLXXIV* (1) (London, 1774)], p. 5. Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity,” pp. vii-viii. At its April 22, 1776, the Society voted to be known as the Humane Society. Humane Society committee meeting, April 22, 1776, Minute Book, 1774-1784, Royal Humane Society archives, London. In 1784, George III agreed to patronize the Society and “Royal” was added to the name. Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity,” pp. 91-92.



hoped to have a national scope, but without adequate funds for activities on that scale, it only gave rewards for lifesaving efforts in defined, though changing, boundaries. Funds for its work came from members' dues and from investments; the RHS was a typical eighteenth-century public subscription charity. Members, known as directors, paid annual or life dues, and were recognized accordingly in the Society's reports.<sup>8</sup>

Although the RHS set geographic limits to its rewards, it distributed its materials far and wide to spread knowledge of resuscitation and to spur the organization of humane societies in places "too remote to be intimately connected" with the RHS. In addition, RHS founder William Hawes, who worked endlessly to disseminate information about the cause, gave lectures in London in the 1770s and at least well into the 1780s on the art of reanimation. And Alexander Johnson, not involved in the Royal Humane Society, kept busy trying to promote the cause of resuscitation. Hawes and Johnson laid the groundwork for growth of the movement by dispatching so much material on the cause and urging the establishment of new societies, but the lifesaving cause struck a chord with gentlemen more broadly, and over the next few decades, humane societies were founded across the British Isles (see Appendix One), although, typically for voluntary associations, many of the societies were short-lived.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Society for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned*, (1) p. 6; on the types of accident victims the Society aimed to help, see the *Society for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned. Instituted MDCCLXXIV* (2) (London, 1774), p. 14. On the RHS and its operations, see Davidson, "Raising Up Humanity," pp. 33-106. On the RHS's national vision, see, *Plan and Reports of the Society for the Recovery of the Apparently Drowned. Part II* ([London, 1774]) p. 35. For a literary analysis of RHS fundraising discourse, see Carolyn Williams, "The Luxury of Doing Good": Benevolence, Sensibility, and the Royal Humane Society" in *Pleasure in the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Roy Porter and Marie Mulvey Roberts (New York, 1996). Williams's article provides a good overview of the organization's anniversary festivals.

<sup>9</sup> *RHS Reports 1776* ([London, 1776]), p. 107. On Hawes's efforts to distribute materials, see the reports of the RHS from the 1770s and 1780s. Many letters to the RHS mentioned that the letter writers had received materials sent by Hawes. In addition, the RHS minutes refer to Hawes's "utmost assiduity" in handling the business of the Society, especially the correspondence. Royal Humane Society committee meeting, November 3, 1777, Minute Book, 1774-1784. On Hawes's lectures, see *RHS Reports 1809*

Meanwhile, the dispensary movement in England had begun in 1770.

Dispensaries dated to the seventeenth century, but the movement to found dispensaries took hold in London in the 1770s (perhaps because they offered a way to counter Wilkesite radicalism by demonstrating concern for the lower sorts). In the early eighteenth century, the Francke Foundations in Halle had set up a dispensary based on a Dutch model. Later in the century, dispensaries became common in cities in Central and Eastern Europe. Studies of the medical charities, however, have not closely explored links between dispensary supporters in Britain and in Continental Europe.<sup>10</sup>

Several dispensaries had been established and had closed in England between the end of the seventeenth century and 1770. Led by John Coakley Lettsom, the dispensary movement, historians agree, began with the founding of the General Dispensary in Aldersgate Street in 1770.<sup>11</sup> Historians credit the General Dispensary with being “the model on which all subsequent [London] dispensaries were based.” The charity provided free outpatient medical care to the laboring poor and treated different types of maladies than hospitals did. Members’ subscriptions funded the Dispensary. Members had the

---

(London, [1809]), pp. 5-6; *RHS Report 1787-89* ([London, 1790]), p. 43, *RHS Reports for 1806* (London, [1806]) p. 99. Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 109, p. 60.

<sup>10</sup> Crosson, “The Public and Private Faces of Eighteenth-Century London Dispensary Charity.” Renate Wilson writes that the medical institutions of the Francke Foundations were based on Dutch models and that Francke had sent an associate to Leiden to study medical institutions there. About the medical institutions of the Francke Foundations in general, see Wilson, “Pietist Universal Reform and the Care of the Sick and the Poor”; see pp. 143-144 on the Dutch influence. Mary Lindemann, “Urban Growth and Medical Charity: Hamburg 1788-1815,” pp. 117-118.

<sup>11</sup> For a brief sketch of dispensaries established in England before the dispensary movement, see Frank H. Ellis, “The Background of the London Dispensary,” *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 20 (1965): 197-212 and Loudon, “The Origins and Growth of the Dispensary Movement in England,” pp. 322-323. On the late eighteenth-century dispensary movement, see Loudon, “The Origins and Growth of the Dispensary Movement”; Crosson, “The Public and Private Faces of Eighteenth-Century London Dispensary Charity”; Kilpatrick, “Living in the Light.” On the dispensary movement as part of an eighteenth-century public health movement and as a forerunner of the fever hospital movement, see Porter, “Cleaning up the Great Wen,” p. 73. On the relationship between medical professionalization and medical institutions including dispensaries in eighteenth-century London, see Bynum, “Physicians, Hospitals and Career Structures in Eighteenth-Century London.”

right to recommend a certain number of patients based on subscription level; patients needed recommendations to receive treatment. “An Apothecary constantly reside[d] at the Dispensary, to receive Letters of Recommendation, and to compound and deliver out all such Medicines as shall be prescribed by the Physician”; a physician attended for an hour on three days of the week. While laymen dominated hospitals, medical men set up and ran London dispensaries. (In that trait, they differed from American dispensaries.)<sup>12</sup> By 1805, at least twenty-one dispensaries had been founded in London. Just as dispensaries proliferated in London, so too did they spread across England as well as to Cork, Dublin, and Edinburgh in the last two decades of the eighteenth century.<sup>13</sup>

The geographical expansion of the humane society and dispensary movements did not stop at the Atlantic. In fact, news about the new resuscitation methods quickly made its way to America. The (Boston) *Royal American Magazine* printed a Swiss doctor’s instructions for recovering drowned persons in its March 1774 edition. That same year, a New York man, William Milbourne, wrote to William Hawes, the RHS founder, to tell him that a surgeon friend of his had saved the life of a man drowning in a New York river thanks to the directions in the pamphlet that Hawes had sent Milbourne. Information on resuscitation continued to circulate in America during the Revolutionary conflict. An almanac published in Newbury, Massachusetts, in 1780, explained that officials in

---

<sup>12</sup> Kilpatrick, “Living in the Light,” quotation on p. 255. The traits of the General Dispensary he cites (summarized in this paragraph) generally hold true for dispensaries throughout the Anglophone world. Dispensaries treated fever cases but not surgical cases; hospitals generally did the opposite. Kilpatrick, “Living in the Light,” p. 257; *An Account of the General Dispensary for the Relief of the Poor* (London, 1772), p. 8; Kilpatrick, “Living in the Light,” p. 257. On lay dominance of hospitals in the antebellum United States, see Rosenberg, *The Care of Strangers*, pp. 9, 25. The same held true for dispensaries.

<sup>13</sup> See the list in Kilpatrick, “Living in the Light,” p. 254. On provincial English dispensaries, see Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 122, 172. *RHS Reports 1785-1786* ([London, 1787]), p. 136. *Account of the Dublin General Dispensary and Humane Society* (Dublin, 1793). R. A. Cage, *The Scottish Poor Law 1745-1845* (Edinburgh, 1981), pp. 72-73. For a study of the Irish dispensary movement including eighteenth-century precedents, see Ronald Cassell, *Medical Charities, Medical Politics: The Irish Dispensary System and the Poor Law, 1836-1872* (Rochester, NY, 1997).

Amsterdam, Venice, Paris, and Edinburgh had set up public institutions for the recovery of the drowned, and the almanac included the Scottish establishment's directions on lifesaving. But in spite of the availability of information on resuscitation, there was no successfully functioning humane society in the United States until the visit to the new nation by the Scottish "blind philosopher" Dr. Henry Moyes in the mid-1780s.<sup>14</sup>

Before Moyes's visit, however, a group of twenty-one men – nine of them medical men – formed the Humane Society of Philadelphia (PHS), the first American rescue and resuscitation charity, in 1780. The Society got off to an inauspicious start. The Philadelphia men obviously knew enough about foreign humane societies to set up an organization with the same name and based on the same agenda, but they lacked the information needed to actually pursue the lifesaving mission. But thanks to the top physician to the French army, then in America, the PHS got the critical details and began to engage in its program. The group limped along for a few years, but in 1784, the PHS petered out in the midst of pursuing a charter of incorporation.<sup>15</sup>

The Philadelphia Humane Society was the first of the new medical charities in the United States, but it fell into decline before making any mark on the world. The humane society movement still needed to be launched in the United States, the London doctor Alexander Johnson therefore believed. And in the mid-1780s, he saw an opportunity to

---

<sup>14</sup> *Royal American Magazine*, March 1774, p. 100. *Plan and Reports of the Society Instituted at London. . . For the Recovery of the Drowned* ([London, 1775]) p. 38. Daniel George, *An Almanack for the Year 1780* (Newbury, 1780).

<sup>15</sup> According to a 1799 PHS pamphlet, Robert Parrish proposed founding a humane society, although so far the historical record has not given up how or why Parrish, in particular, came to the idea in the first place or at the time that he did. Philadelphia Humane Society (PHS) meeting, September 5, 1780, Philadelphia Humane Society Minutes Vol. 1, Pennsylvania Hospital Archives (PHA), Philadelphia. PHS meeting, September 7, 1780; September 11, 1780; January 1, 1781; February 5, 1781; September 14, 1784; March 2, 1787, PHS Minutes Vol. 1, PHA. Parrish's role is mentioned in Benjamin Say, *An Annual Oration Pronounced Before the Humane Society of Philadelphia, on the Objects & Benefits of Said Institution; the 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 1799* (Philadelphia, 1799), p. 10.

do just that and maybe too get some recognition for his labors in the cause. Johnson had published on resuscitation and, according to Johnson's or a friend's credible claims, he had been sending information about resuscitation far and wide from the early 1770s. Then in 1784, he seized another way of encouraging his cherished cause by enlisting Henry Moyes, who Johnson had met in London, to promote it during his lecture tour in the United States.<sup>16</sup>

The results of Moyes's advocacy were the publication of information about resuscitation in various American newspapers, the formation of a humane society in Massachusetts and, maybe, the revival of the Philadelphia Humane Society. Moyes initiated the founding of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts when he spent an evening in late winter 1785 with Dr. Aaron Dexter, Rev. James Freeman, and Royall Tyler. Conversation among the men, according to the charity's 1817 history, turned to "the different institutions established solely for publick benefit" and Moyes suggested forming a society similar to the Royal Humane Society. One of the men knew that another gentleman in town had received a Royal Humane Society

---

<sup>16</sup> "Friendly Hints to the Directors of the Humane Society," by Observator Londinensis, *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 Part II (1787), pp. 1077-1079. Henry Moyes to Alexander Johnson, November 12, 1785 in *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 Supplement (1787), p. 1154. Letter by Dr. Alexander Johnson, March 15, 1786, *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 Supplement (1787), p. 1154. On Johnson's endeavors to promote the resuscitation movement, see also the letter by Verus, September 12, 1791, *Gentleman's Magazine* 61 (1791), pp. 821-824. The letters by Observator Londinensis and Verus must be by Johnson or someone close to him. Davidson does not discuss the three letters cited here, which make claims for the impact of Johnson on the humane society movement in Britain and America. Those letters do not upset Davidson's conclusion about Johnson's early impact but reveal – corroborated by Johnson's letters to Sir Robert Murray Keith and to Benjamin Rush in 1790 and by essays by Johnson published in various American newspapers – that Johnson continued to work in to promote the cause of resuscitation. Furthermore, Johnson's ongoing efforts and contribution to the establishment of the Humane Society of Massachusetts must qualify Davidson's contention that Johnson failed "to make either any impression in his own day or to appeal to subsequent historians." Williams acknowledges Johnson's early efforts to form a London resuscitation society and notes he corresponded with the Amsterdam group. She also concludes that the RHS intentionally ignored Johnson. She does not discuss his impact on the resuscitation movement in the United States. Williams, "Johnson, Alexander." Alexander Johnson to Sir Robert Murray Keith, May 28, 1773, Hardwicke Papers, Add. 35505, f. 280, British Library, London. Alexander Johnson to Rush, April 3, 1790, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 25, LCP. On Johnson's essays in American newspapers, see below, p. 113 n. 57. Davidson, "Raising Up Humanity," p. 331.

pamphlet from William Hawes. Thus, according to the MHS history, the men regrouped the next evening to consult the RHS pamphlet and drew up a plan of a humane society based on the RHS “with some local alterations.” The 1817 history goes on to say, maybe inaccurately, that Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse “call[ed] on Dr. Moyes, while the other gentlemen were with him [and] offered to” ask Governor James Bowdoin to subscribe to the proposed charity “to which all [the men present] consented.” In 1786, the Massachusetts Humane Society was established with Bowdoin as its first president.<sup>17</sup>

The following year, the Philadelphia Humane Society was revived. The immediate impetus for its revival came from a proposal made at the February 19, 1787, Philadelphia Dispensary meeting to “to engraft the Humane Society on the Dispensary.” The previous year, an ecumenical group of clerics, merchants, physicians, and surgeons had founded the Philadelphia Dispensary modeled on the General Dispensary in London.<sup>18</sup> The Dispensary managers tabled the proposal to attach the humane society to the dispensary and within two weeks, Philadelphia Humane Society members had revived

---

<sup>17</sup> “Relief from Accidental Death; or Summary Instructions for the General Institution Proposed in the Year 1773, by Alexander Johnson, M.D.,” *Providence Gazette*, October 2, 1784; “Relief from Accidental Death; or Summary Instructions for the General Institution Proposed in the Year 1773, by Alexander Johnson, M.D.,” *Boston Magazine*, November 1785, pp. 405-408, 449-454; “To the Printers of the Columbian Herald,” (Charleston) *Columbian Herald*, May 29, 1786; “Relief from Accidental Death; or Summary Instructions for the General Institution Proposed in the Year 1773, by Alexander Johnson, M.D.,” (Charleston) *Columbian Herald*, June 1, 1786. William Tudor, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society, at their Anniversary, May, 1817* (Boston, 1817), pp. 29, 30, 31. Mark A. DeWolfe Howe follows this version in his history. Mark A. DeWolfe Howe, *The Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: An Historical Review, 1785-1916* (Boston, 1918). See also Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 49-50.

<sup>18</sup> Philadelphia Dispensary Managers’ Meeting, February 19, 1787, Philadelphia Dispensary Minute Book 1786-1806, (PHA). On the formation of the Philadelphia Dispensary, see Alexander, *Render Them Submissive*, pp. 132-133, Goodman, *Benjamin Rush*, pp. 157-158, and Hawke, *Benjamin Rush*, pp. 320-322. Hawke writes that the Philadelphia Dispensary was based on the model of the General Dispensary and that, “A copy of Lettsom’s *Medical Memoirs of the General Dispensary in London*, published in 1774, undoubtedly found its way to Rush” around, he suggests, the time of publication. As Hawke points out the plans of the Philadelphia and General Dispensaries varied very little; clearly the General Dispensary was a model for the Philadelphia Dispensary. But the great similarities between the plans do not reveal the timing or the process of the transmission of the model. Hawke, *Benjamin Rush*, pp. 320, 321. To compare the plans, see *Plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor* (Philadelphia, 1787) and *An Account of the General Dispensary for the Relief of the Poor* (London, 1772).

the dormant charity. Moyes had left the United States by that point; he sailed for Britain from Charleston in May 1786. But he still may have provoked the revival of the PHS. Moyes had spent months in Philadelphia in early 1785 and the winter of 1785-1786, and his friends there included Dispensary physician and Humane Society member Benjamin Rush and Dispensary manager Thomas Clifford, a merchant. Moyes had a goal of instigating humane societies, and he rubbed shoulders with men involved with Philadelphia medical charities. Moreover, Alexander Johnson thought Moyes had planted a humane society in Philadelphia. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume he bandied about the topic of humane societies on his visits to Philadelphia in early 1785 and early 1786 and that his campaign on behalf of the resuscitation cause had moved a Dispensary manager to broach adding the humane society program to the Dispensary. Any knowledge the Philadelphia men might have had that a humane society had been recently set up in Massachusetts – and Moyes could have provided that knowledge – would probably have heightened the Philadelphians’ interest in reviving the PHS.<sup>19</sup>

The Philadelphia Dispensary was the first dispensary set up in Anglophone America. The second was founded not in Boston, where a host of charitable institutions were formed in the post-revolutionary years, nor in New York, whose doctors hated to lag behind their Philadelphia brethren, but in Barbados, within only a few months of the founding of the Philadelphia Dispensary. The Barbados Dispensary had been established in 1786. The Governor, David Parry, served as president, and Mrs. Parry was patroness. In October of 1786 the charity bought a house in the Old Church Yard, Bridgetown, for

---

<sup>19</sup> Philadelphia Dispensary Managers’ Meeting, February 19, 1787, Philadelphia Dispensary Minute Book 1786-1806; PHS Managers’ Meeting, March 2, 1787, PHS Minute Book 1780-1805, PHA. Armstrong and Deischer, “Dr. Henry Moyes,” p. 172; Henry Moyes to Thomas Clifford, Providence, October 3, 1785, Clifford Correspondence, vol. 7, HSP. Alexander Johnson to Rush, April 3, 1790, Rush Manuscripts vol. 25, LCP.

its operations, and by its second anniversary, in October 1788, the Dispensary could boast of some success. In its first two years, the Dispensary had admitted 227 patients, of whom 159 were released as cured. Jews as well as Christians supported the Dispensary, and the second anniversary report particularly noted the liberality of the Jewish community (not to mention the “decent and becoming” behavior of the Jews who had attended the anniversary church service in contrast to “the levity and ill-manners of some [Jewish] folks” that had been observed at synagogue services by (Christian) visitors, who, like Jeremy Belknap, were unsettled by the conduct of congregants at Jewish worship services.)<sup>20</sup>

In spite of the reported success, sometime after the second anniversary the Dispensary ceased to exist. According to an article in a Barbados newspaper in 1998, financial difficulties had doomed the Dispensary. But there may have been political reason behind the financial woes, as the sorry tale of the charity’s offer to care for the poor of St. Michael’s Parish, Bridgetown, suggests. In its first year, the charity had offered to give medical care (evidently in return for a subscription) to the poor of St. Michael’s Parish, who, as was typical in England, received medical care from physicians hired by the parish for that purpose. The Vestry of St. Michael’s had rejected the offer, it said, based on information it had solicited from one of the doctors, James Hendy, involved in the Dispensary. According to the Vestry’s letter refusing the offer, many of the parish poor lived out of town and the Dispensary doctors would thus be inconvenienced when treating them. In addition, the Vestry had no complaints with the doctors it employed. According to the Vestry’s account, Dr. Hendy bore responsibility

---

<sup>20</sup> *RHS Reports 1785-1786*, p. 170. *Barbados Mercury*, July 21, 1787. *Barbados Mercury*, October 21, 1788. See Chapter One about Belknap.



for the rejection of the Dispensary's offer. Hendy disputed that interpretation and argued that the Vestry had intended to reject the offer after hearing from Hendy on the proposal. Therefore, Hendy recounted, he wrote a follow-up letter to the Vestry to suggest that the Dispensary and the doctors hired by the Vestry could share responsibilities for the poor of St. Michael's. It was the follow-up letter that seemed, Hendy worried, to provide damning evidence that he, Hendy, had undermined the Dispensary's offer. After hearing the details of this whole incident at the July 1787 meeting, the President of the Dispensary, Governor Parry, regretted that the Dispensary had approached the Vestry in the first place.<sup>21</sup>

The Vestry admitted that it could save money if it accepted the offer so, no surprise, there was a political angle to this story not revealed in the letters between the parties. The politics of the conflict begins to emerge in a nasty letter in the *Barbados Gazette* in August 1787 addressed to "The Great Dispensary Orator and modern Aesculpius." The letter attacked someone for allying, evidently, with the Vestry crowd, and only in passing referred to the Dispensary dispute as yet another means of bludgeoning the letter-writer's opponent. The larger conflict had to do with Assembly politics. If the Dispensary's offer to the Vestry foundered on this conflict, perhaps the charity too fell victim to factional clashes in Barbados.<sup>22</sup>

### *Instigators and Motivations*

*John Crawford – Barbados and Baltimore.* So what explains the founding of a dispensary in Barbados in the mid-1780s? John Crawford's return to Barbados and his need to start anew there may be part of the answer. Both his story and the details of the

---

<sup>21</sup> Thomas, "The Old Poor Law and Medicine"; Warren Alleyne, "It So Happened," (Barbados) *Sunday Sun of the Nation*, May 31, 1998. *Barbados Mercury*, July 21, 1787. *Barbados Gazette*, July 18 to 21, 1787.

<sup>22</sup> *Barbados Gazette*, August 8 to 11, 1787.

founding of the New York Dispensary provide opportunities to examine instigators' roles in particular charities. The two case studies suggest the importance of the circulation of migrants, and their personal agendas, to the timing of the spread of institutions. In addition, these case studies underscore the intimacy of the Atlantic community in which philanthropists operated.

If the interconnected development of Atlantic world charities had to be told through the history of one person that person would be John Crawford. The Northern-Irish born Crawford had served as surgeon on two East India Company voyages before moving to Barbados, then Demerara and finally Baltimore. Crawford had been named surgeon and agent at the Barbados Naval Hospital in 1779, a year after he had married a Miss O'Donnell of Limerick. Crawford had a trying first few years in Barbados. He had to contend, as he told it, with a crowded and unhealthy hospital, lack of adequate supplies, and patients who drank much too much rum (which they bought by selling hospital supplies) and who "wander[ed] about the Town in the middle of the Day." Superiors accused Crawford of favoritism towards a hospital contractor and blamed him for the high rates of desertion and death in the hospital. "The labour, vexation, and disappointment [he] experienced materially injured [his] health," and in 1781, Crawford, his wife, and two young children headed for England so that he could recuperate. On the voyage, Mrs. Crawford died. How or where Crawford spent his time in England is a mystery, but he eventually returned to Barbados. Sometime after his return, he and his colleagues founded the dispensary and humane society.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," p. 63. "A Letter Addressed to Lieutenant General Mathew," p. 2, 104-125, quotations pp. 111, 112. Wilson gives 1782 as the year Crawford headed to England to recuperate, but the *Hibernian Magazine* for December 1781 reports the death of "the lady of Dr. John

John Crawford was not the only Crawford brother involved with the dispensary and humane society movements. His younger brother Adair Crawford (1748-1795), who achieved fame for his writings on animal heat and respiration, too was active in medical charities. In 1770, Adair had received a Masters of Arts from the University of Glasgow, where he had enrolled in 1764, and in 1780 he received a medical degree from Glasgow. As a student, Adair had become interested in chemistry, and in 1779 he published the first edition of his acclaimed work on animal heat. In 1780, he moved to London. He first practiced medicine privately and then won election as the physician to St. Thomas's Hospital circa 1783. He later became professor of chemistry at the Royal Military Academy in Woolwich. In the years before his election to St. Thomas's Hospital, Adair had served as one of the physicians to the General Dispensary in Aldersgate Street. (His colleague there, John Coakley Lettsom, had told Benjamin Rush in a letter about the election for a physician to St. Thomas's and added that Adair Crawford was thought to be one of the two candidates "to stand the most probable chance.") Besides his dispensary work, Adair subscribed to the Royal Humane Society and served as one of the Society's Medical Assistants (professionals who were to be called to the scene of an emergency to oversee resuscitation procedures) for London and Westminster in the early 1780s. His name disappears from the Royal Humane Society records after 1783. In 1794, Adair Crawford retired to the estate of the Marquess of Landsdowne, where he died the following year.<sup>24</sup>

---

Crawford of Barbadoes" on the passage from the Leeward Islands. *Hibernian Magazine*, December 1781, p. 672. Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physicians," p. 64.

<sup>24</sup> Claire L. Nutt, "Crawford, Adair," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 14, pp. 68-69. *Medical Register* for 1780 (London, 1780), p. 54; *Medical Register* for 1783, p. 35. The *Medical Register* for 1783 listed Adair Crawford in the List of Physicians Resident in London and gave his address as Lamb-Conduits Street. *Medical Register* for 1783 (London, 1783), p. 11. That address is the address given for the Dr. Crawford named in the *RHS Reports*. Lettsom to Rush, September 8, 1783, Rush Manuscripts, vol.

There is little information on the founding of the Barbados Dispensary, but the evidence suggests that John Crawford had a key part in instigating the charity's formation. For one thing, the Dispensary was founded after Crawford returned to Barbados from a visit to England, where his brother participated in both the dispensary and humane society movements. In addition, the report of the July 1787 meeting of the Barbados Dispensary managers (still at the organizing stage) reveals Crawford setting the agenda. At that meeting, the managers agreed to his suggestion to fit up the Dispensary's house for dispensing medicines and to form regulations for the admission of patients. The managers also agreed to his suggestion that the Dispensary should hire a midwife to care for poor women during deliveries. And the meeting approved the idea of adding a humane society program to the Dispensary after receiving a letter and gift of an RHS apparatus sent to Crawford by the RHS in response to a letter he had written.<sup>25</sup> Crawford made several suggestions of how the Dispensary should proceed and what services, including a lifesaving program, it should offer. He was the driving force at the July 1787 meeting, and therefore it seems reasonable to think he had played a leading role in proposing the institution. Final evidence in support of Crawford as Barbados Dispensary instigator is that he had personal and professional reasons to try to re-establish himself in Barbados. His first few years in Barbados had been filled with conflict and disappointment at the Naval Hospital. Initiating the formation of a new medical charity could have been a way to find a more gratifying outlet for his energies, that is, to start

---

28, LCP. *RHS Reports 1779-1780* ([London, 1781]), p. 141; *RHS Reports 1781-1782*, pp. 124-134; John Hadley Swain, *A Sermon Preached at St. Martin's in the Fields, London, on Sunday, March 30, and at Hampstead Church, Middlesex, on Sunday, May 25, 1783, for the Benefit of the Humane Society* (London, 1783), p. 45. He also was involved in the Society for Promoting Medical Knowledge. *Medical Register* for 1783, p. 39. The *Medical Register* for 1783 lists John Crawford of Barbados as a member of the Incorporation of Surgeons. *Medical Register* for 1783, p. 18.

<sup>25</sup> *Barbados Mercury*, July 21, 1787. *RHS Reports 1785-1786*, p. 170. *RHS Reports 1787-1789*, pp. 93-96.

over in a sense. Crawford's situation – his time in England, return to Barbados, and his ordeals at the hospital – may explain how it was that Barbados came to be the second place in Anglophone America to boast a dispensary.

Migrants, according to Peter Clark, played a vital role in peopling voluntary associations, but, in addition, newcomers to communities initiated the formation of charitable organizations. For instance, John Hurford, a long-time “zealous supporter” of the Royal Humane Society moved to Chasely, in the Severn Valley, in 1786 and led the creation of the Severn Humane Society. From his arrival in Chasely, Hurford wrote to the RHS, he had wanted to found a society “for the restoration of life.” At first prospects seemed dim, but he soon met “seven persons of great respectability who approve[d] of the idea” and agreed to work with Hurford. By the end of 1786, thanks to equipment and publications sent by the RHS, the Severn Humane Society was in operation. (The Severn Humane Society served the counties of Gloucester, Worcester and Shropshire. Edward Jenner, later famed for discovering cowpox inoculation, was its medical assistant for Berkeley, Gloucestershire.) Not only had Hurford extended the lifesaving movement, a cause important to him, but also he had eased his integration into a new community by launching a voluntary association and thus forging ties with several people of the type he wanted to know.<sup>26</sup>

Likewise, John Crawford in Baltimore. And his role as an instigator of the dispensary there bolsters the idea that the histories of particular people can help explain when and where new charitable institutions were founded. In 1796, after his plans to form a botanical garden in Demerara had fallen through when the Dutch lost the colony

---

<sup>26</sup> Peter Clark discusses the “vital assimilating mechanism for newcomers to town” served by voluntary societies, although he is referring to newcomers participating in already existing organizations. Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 158-161. *RHS Reports 1785-86*, pp. vi, 158, 161, vi, 160.

to Britain, Crawford moved to the United States and settled in Baltimore. Within a few years of arriving there, he was engaged with a group of men in founding a dispensary in his new home. Public efforts to establish the Baltimore Dispensary began with a meeting on January 9, 1801, chaired by the Roman Catholic bishop Rt. Rev. Dr. John Carroll. The immediate impetus for founding the dispensary came from an incident during the outbreak of yellow fever in 1800. The city's health commissioner (and mayoral candidate) Joseph Townsend, according to Dr. James Smith, had failed to respond adequately or humanely to the plight of a sick 10- or 12-year old girl who then died. That failure formed part of a pattern of "wretched management" and callous disregard toward the sick poor by Townsend that dated back to the 1797 yellow fever epidemic, Smith charged. To remedy the appalling state of affairs, he proposed setting up a dispensary. Smith assured the public that "the most respectable citizens" have approved such an institution and that plans for a dispensary were "in forwardness."<sup>27</sup> Indeed, the dispensary was soon established, and Crawford – who then was both chairman of the Medical Faculty of Baltimore and Grand Master of the Freemasons of Maryland – and Smith were active in its organization and operation. The dispensary opened in 1801 and by August 1803 had admitted over a thousand patients. Crawford remained involved in the dispensary until his death in 1813.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> For this history of the Baltimore Dispensary, see James Smith, *The Additional Letters of Humanitas* ([Baltimore], 1801). On the Dispensary, see also *One Hundred Years of History of the Baltimore General Dispensary* (Baltimore, 1901).

<sup>28</sup> *The Additional Letters*, p. 17; *Rules and By-Laws of the Baltimore General Dispensary* (Baltimore, 1803), pp. 15-16. On Crawford's Masonic role, see Schultz, *History of Freemasonry in Maryland. Vol. 2.*, pp. 297-307. On Smith, see Whitfield J. Bell, "Dr. James Smith and the Public Encouragement for Vaccination for Smallpox," *Annals of Medical History*, 3<sup>rd</sup> series 2 (1940): 500-517. *Rules and By-Laws of the Baltimore General Dispensary*, p. 16. Whitfield J. Bell. "Smith, James"; <http://www.anb.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/articles/12/12-01977.html>; *American National Biography Online* Feb. 2000. Access Date: Thu Apr 24 2008 17:28:29 GMT-0400 (EDT).

The yellow fever outbreak of 1800 was the proximate cause leading to the founding of the Baltimore General Dispensary, but the idea had been percolating for a few years. On his way to settle in Baltimore, Crawford had spent time in Philadelphia where he and his daughter, Eliza, had been looked after by Benjamin Rush and his family. (Thirteen years earlier, Rush had initiated a correspondence with Adair Crawford; it does not seem to have lasted since the Rush Manuscripts contain only one letter from Adair Crawford to Rush. Presumably Adair's connection to Rush or connections through medical networks led to John Crawford's acquaintance with Rush.) His friendship with Rush brought Crawford letters of introduction to physicians and other men in Baltimore, although fellow countrymen also eased his move to Baltimore and his Masonic membership no doubt helped too. (This auspicious start, however, did not foreshadow happy times ahead. Crawford was mired in debt to the end of his life, and in the opening of the nineteenth century, his son Thomas, then a medical student in London, died.) Crawford and Rush, whose lives spanned almost exactly the same years, had much in common and would maintain a relationship until at least 1811. Besides their prominent roles in medical circles in their cities, their innovations in medical theories, their beliefs in revelations, and their disapproval of the teaching of Latin and Greek, both men shared a commitment to "promoting the public good."<sup>29</sup>

That shared commitment – a shared zeal for leading public activities – contributed to the eventual formation of the Baltimore Dispensary. When Crawford had been in

---

<sup>29</sup> On Eliza Crawford, see Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," p. 68. Adair Crawford to Rush, July 4, 1783, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 25, LCP. Wilson says Rush and Crawford "had long been acquainted through mutual exchange of letters and ideas," but does not give her evidence for this statement. Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician," p. 64. John Crawford to Rush, January 4, 1797, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, LCP. Wilson, "Dr. John Crawford," p. 117. Crawford to Rush, January 27, 1806, March 21, 1806, June 13, 1798, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, LCP.

Philadelphia, he and Rush had discussed the idea of founding a dispensary in Baltimore. Perhaps part of Crawford's interest lay in creating opportunities to establish a medical practice in a new place: medical men understood well the advantages to themselves of medical charities. For Rush's part, he had retired from active public life in Philadelphia after the 1793 yellow fever epidemic, but had earlier tried to seed a dispensary in Boston. Through his friend, Rush could again encourage medical charity, help set philanthropic agendas. A couple years after their conversation, in 1798, Crawford wrote to tell Rush that many leading citizens of Baltimore supported the idea of a dispensary. Moreover, he solicited Rush's help in devising the plan and asked his friend to send a copy of the constitution of the Philadelphia Dispensary. Crawford felt some urgency about the project because recent weather conditions made possible the outbreak of disease, which would threaten the poor who lived in cramped and dirty areas.<sup>30</sup>

Rush, true to form, fulfilled the request. After Rush sent him the materials from the Philadelphia Dispensary, Crawford forwarded those papers and a plan based on that information to the Mayor of Baltimore, but nothing was done then. It took the 1800 yellow fever epidemic and the city's perceived failures in that crisis to catalyze action. The two doctors' plans alone had not been enough, and had Crawford never moved to Baltimore, a dispensary would in all probability have been founded in Baltimore at some point. (Dispensaries were established in Boston and in Charleston in 1796 and 1801,

---

<sup>30</sup> Crawford to Rush, June 13, 1798, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, LCP. Wilson cites the correspondence between Rush and Crawford and implies their plans led directly – if slowly – to the establishment of the Baltimore Dispensary. Wilson, “An Early Baltimore Physician,” p. 66. Rush to Jeremy Belknap, May 5, 1790, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush* Vol. 1, pp. 565-566. On the advantages of medical men of medical charities, see Risse, “Medicine in the Age of Enlightenment,” p. 184; Bynum, “Physicians, Hospitals and Career Structures in Eighteenth-Century London”; Barry, “Publicity and the Public Good,” p. 33.



respectively.) Crawford, however, did move to Baltimore and his arrival there played a role in the timing of the founding of the Baltimore Dispensary.<sup>31</sup>

*Rodgers v. Bard – New York.* A few years before the establishment of the Baltimore Dispensary, the dispensary movement had arrived in New York under a set of circumstances – the relocation to the city of someone with dispensary experience and the need to establish himself – similar to its arrival in Baltimore. The newcomer to New York was Dr. John R. B. Rodgers. Rodgers had served as one of the Philadelphia Dispensary’s six attending physicians since November 1786 when Benjamin Rush, one of the dispensary’s consulting physicians, proposed electing Rodgers. That Rush nominated Rodgers was to be expected. Rodgers, a graduate of the College of New Jersey, had been a medical pupil of Rush from 1775 to 1778 or 1779, and, like his teacher, served in the Continental Army’s medical establishment. After the war ended, he received a Bachelors of Medicine from the University of the State of Pennsylvania in 1784. He next went to London and Edinburgh to round out his medical studies. In London, Rodgers mingled with Rush’s friends there, and he received a medical degree from the University of Edinburgh in 1785. After his stint in Britain, he returned to Philadelphia and began to practice medicine. By securing a position for Rodgers as a dispensary physician, Rush could help his student embark on his career. Besides serving at the dispensary, Rodgers was a manager of the Philadelphia Humane Society and was elected a junior fellow of the newly established College of Physicians of Philadelphia. In late 1788, John R. B.

---

<sup>31</sup> Crawford to Rush, January 27, 1799, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, LCP. On the Boston and Charleston dispensaries, see Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, p. 103, and Waring, *A History of Medicine in South Carolina*, p. 136, respectively.

Rodgers left Philadelphia and moved to New York City, where his father was the leading Presbyterian minister.<sup>32</sup>

Advocacy for the establishment of a dispensary in New York began in New York newspapers in August 1790. The year before, an editorial comment in the *Gazette of the United States* in August 1789 had proclaimed that “[a] public Dispensary is a great blessing to a populous city” and rued that Philadelphia bested New York in this regard. “We are however happy to hear, that it is in contemplation to establish a Dispensary in this city.” A newspaper campaign to build support for a dispensary in New York began in earnest, though, with a piece published first on August 30, 1790, in the *New York Daily Advertiser*. The writer expressed surprise “that such an institution has never been pushed forward among us. The population of the city is so great, and is so encreasing, that a Dispensary could very easily be established and supported.” “[T]here need no arguments to prove its public utility,” the writer continued, “it would relieve the honest and industrious poor in their own families; it would save the lives and relieve the distresses of thousands; it would keep the poor from being preyed on by merciless and unfeeling quacks.” The writer ended with a proposal to open a subscription for a dispensary.<sup>33</sup>

Over the next several months New York newspapers ran items in favor of the proposed “pious and heavenly institution.” The clergy were implored to sway their

---

<sup>32</sup> *Plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary*, p. 4. Consulting physicians and surgeons were older gentlemen of the faculty, while the attending physicians and surgeons tended to be starting out in their careers. Consulting physicians and surgeons might be called on to confer about hard cases, but their main function seems to have been to lend their reputations to the institution. Special managers’ meeting, November 4, 1786, Philadelphia Dispensary Minutes 1786-1805, PHA. John Coakley Lettsom to Rush, October 9, 1784, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, LCP; Richard Price to Rush, October 14, 1784, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 43, LCP; Charles Dilly to Rush, August 8, 1785, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 31, LCP; Harrison, *Princetonians*, p. 519. PHS managers’ meeting, March 14, 1787, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. *Transactions of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia* 3<sup>rd</sup> series, vol. 9 (1887), p. lv. Rodgers was elected a fellow on April 3, 1787; Special managers’ meeting, December 23, 1788, Philadelphia Dispensary Minutes 1786-1805, PHA.

<sup>33</sup> *Gazette of the United States*, August 15, 1789. *New York Daily Advertiser*, August 30, 1790. The piece was republished on September 1, 1790. *New York Daily Advertiser*, August 30, 1790.

congregants to “contribute their mite toward the relief of the suffering fellow creatures.” The mechanics of New York were urged to donate to the cause and to choose wisely when electing managers of the charity. Most importantly given the conflict about the founding of the New York Dispensary that would flare up in the near future, the Medical Society of New York, it was reported, had resolved at a meeting on October 14, 1790, “to offer [the citizens of the New York] their professional services” at the dispensary. In addition, the Medical Society put forward a plan of a constitution for a dispensary and commented that experience in “most of the large cities of Europe, and in our neighbouring city of Philadelphia” showed the worth of the clinics in relieving the “laborious and industrious poor.”<sup>34</sup>

Proponents of the proposed institution invoked the example of the Philadelphia Dispensary repeatedly over the next few months. Advocates of the charity did not merely prod New Yorkers by noting that the city lagged behind other cities, although supporters of benevolent causes on both sides of the Atlantic turned to that tactic time and again. The printer of the *New York Daily Advertiser* also printed the plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary a few times “at the particular request of several Medical Gentlemen” and printed its record of patients treated that year.<sup>35</sup> The goal presumably was to familiarize the public with the concept and the benefits of a type of medical charity untried, but in one city, in the United States.

---

<sup>34</sup> *New York Daily Advertiser*, August 30, 1790. See also *New York Journal*, September 7, 1790, October 26, 1790; *New York Daily Gazette*, November 4, 1790, November 11, 1790, November 18, 1790. *New York Daily Advertiser*, November 9 and 18, 1790 (quotation about “mite” in Nov. 18 edition). *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 4, 1791. *New York Daily Advertiser*, October 20, 1790.

<sup>35</sup> The dispensary plan ran in the *New York Daily Advertiser* on December 10 and 15, 1790, and evidently had run earlier. Following the common practice of inserting the annual reports and like materials of local and non-local charitable in newspapers, New York printers had printed the annual reports of the Philadelphia Dispensary in New York newspapers from its founding. See, for example, *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 11, 1788. *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 1, 1791.

Meanwhile, over the fall and early winter fundraising was underway. The Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors, at a meeting in October 1790, had resolved to raise subscriptions for the proposed dispensary; Dr. Samuel Bard had been appointed to the fundraising committee. By January 1, 1791, enough funds had been raised to move on to electing managers and setting up the charity. The managers included Isaac Roosevelt, who became the first president and also served as president of the New York Hospital from 1790 to 1794; Rev. Dr. John D. Rodgers (1727-1811), father of Dr. John R. B. Rodgers and president of the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors, (also known as the Humane Society); and several other members of the distressed-debtors group.<sup>36</sup> By mid-January, the Medical Society had met and appointed twelve physicians from its ranks to the dispensary positions. The twelve included mainstays of the New York medical establishment such as Drs. Richard Bailey and Samuel Bard and relative newcomer John R. B. Rodgers. On February 1, 1791, the dispensary accepted its first patients. By late November, it had treated 310 patients.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> *New York Daily Advertiser*, December 28, 1790. *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 1, 1791. For the 1791 memberships of the New York Hospital and the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors, see *Duncan's New York City Directory for 1791* [New York, 1791] and the *New York Daily Advertiser*, November 29, 1790. For the list of initial Dispensary managers, see *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 5, 1791. Confusingly, the informal name of the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors was the Humane Society. In 1803, the organization formally changed its name to the Humane Society, although at that point the organization had nothing to do with the resuscitation movement. The New York Dispensary had imported lifesaving apparatus in late 1791 and advertised where it could be gotten in the case of emergencies. In the 1790s, an abortive attempt was made to found a resuscitation group in New York, and that organization was called the Humane of the State of New York. In 1807, the Humane Society (formerly known as the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors) added a program for the rescue and resuscitation of drowning victims to its mission. For a history of the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors, see Raymond Mohl, "The Humane Society and Urban Reform in Early New York, 1787-1831," *New-York Historical Society Quarterly* 54 (1970): 30-52. On the Dispensary's importation of lifesaving apparatus, see the *New York Daily Advertiser*, December 30, 1791. On the short-lived Humane Society of the State of New York, see *The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York* (New York, 1795), and Thomson, "The Role of Physicians," pp. 48-49. For a brief time in the mid-1790s, New York had two dispensaries. The second dispensary was the New York Public Dispensary, and was run by medical students. See *Duncan's New York City Directory for 1791*.

<sup>37</sup> *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 15, 1791. *Rules of the City Dispensary, for the Medical Relief of the Poor* [n.d., c. 1792].

Even before the new medical charity admitted its first patients, conflict erupted. The opening salvo, “Thoughts of a Public Dispensary by a Subscriber,” called for changes to the rules in the dispensary’s constitution – the constitution had been drafted by the Medical Society – that made access to the charity’s treatment dependent on living within certain geographic boundaries and that prohibited domestic servants from receiving care. (Both rules were common dispensary rules. Geographic boundaries delimited a charity’s ambit. Doctors would not want to provide free care to domestic servants because their employers would ordinarily be expected to pay for their medical treatment.) Dr. John Bard, father of Samuel Bard and president of the Medical Society from 1789 to 1791, responded with a pamphlet that charged that “A Subscriber” aimed “to lessen and depreciate in [the Dispensary’s lay managers’] estimation, the character of the Medical Society.” The controversy drew in Dr. Richard Bailey (father, incidentally, of Elizabeth Seton of the Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children) and eventually touched on the extent of the Medical Society’s influence in the charity, the benefits to physicians from the existence of the dispensary, dissension within the Medical Society, Samuel Bard’s alleged “inordinate pride,” and the dispensary physicians’ demand for a horse. Ultimately, the physicians forewent the horse and walked on their rounds, and the lay managers, probably wisely, curtailed the Medical Society’s role in appointing physicians.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> “Thoughts of a Public Dispensary,” *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 24, 1791. *A Letter from John Bard, . . . to the Author of Thoughts on the Dispensary* (New York, 1791), preface. The New York City directories for 1789-91 list John Bard as president of the Medical Society. *The New York City Directory for 1789* (New York, 1789), p. 121; *The New York City Directory for 1790* (New York, 1790), p. 136; *Duncan’s New York City Directory for 1791* (New York, 1791), p. 44. One of “A Subscriber”’s claims was that physicians supported the establishment of a dispensary because it would relieve them of having to care for poor patients gratis as was customary. That claim was credible. Benjamin Rush noted that the founding of the Philadelphia Dispensary had cost him one-quarter of his patients. He, however, following the British doctors William Cullen and John Fothergill, advised young doctors to pursue poor people as

A battle between “A Subscriber” and John Bard over who – minister or physician – first proposed the dispensary echoed the larger struggle over lay versus professional control of the charity. The battle between “A Subscriber” and Bard merits attention here for the two people identified as initiating the idea. The dispute began with “A Subscriber’s” assertion that “the Rev. Dr. Rodgers . . . was the first person who suggested the practicability of establishing a public Dispensary in this city.” “The hint [Rodgers] first threw out at a meeting of the Humane Society [i.e., the distressed-debtors’ charity] where it was well received,” “A Subscriber” explained, and “it was from thence laid before the Medical Society, who soon after submitted a plan to their fellow-Citizens.” John Bard contested that point vigorously and explained that the very formation of the Medical Society had had to do with plans to establish a dispensary in New York. “[T]he idea of establishing a Dispensary,” Bard claimed, “was among the chief views which induced the first movers and promoters of that institution, to invite the gentlemen of the profession in this City, into a fraternity. At this time,” Bard added, “I obtained a copy of the institution of the Dispensary of Philadelphia; the design was never lost sight of, it was the frequent topic of our conversation, and ever intended to be carried into execution as soon as it could conveniently be done.” In his vituperative response, “A Subscriber” “waive[d] all controversy” about who first suggested setting up a dispensary in New York. He added that “whether it was conceived by you, and brought forth by your son, or

---

patients. *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, pp. 79-80, 89; see also Barry, “Publicity and the Public Good,” pp. 33-34. *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 24, 1791; *A Letter from John Bard*; *New York Daily Advertiser*, May 31, 1791; *A Letter from Doctor Richard Bayley, to Doctor John Bard. . . [A]n Answer to a Part of his Letter Addressed to the Author of Thoughts on the Dispensary* (New York, 1791). *A Letter from Doctor Bailey*, p. 10; *Rules of the City Dispensary, for the Medical Relief of the Poor* [n.d., c. 1792].

whether it was imported from Philadelphia, or the genius of liberty gave it birth, at the manumitting society, with me matters not a rush.”<sup>39</sup>

Whether Rev. Dr. Rodgers or John Bard “first threw out” the idea of establishing a dispensary in New York remains unresolved. Rev. Dr. Rodgers certainly seems a plausible candidate. Not only was he president of the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtor, member in 1790 of the Manumission Society’s Committee of Correspondence, and Vice-Chancellor of the University of New York, but also he led New York’s Presbyterians through the founding of the Brick Church and a Presbyterian charity school, and served in important positions at the Synod level.<sup>40</sup> Rodgers, then, had much experience as a leader of benevolent and public institutions. Through his son, Rodgers would have had access to first-hand knowledge of the Philadelphia Dispensary and the perceived benefits of the clinics (to the laboring poor and to physicians). Moreover, Rev. Dr. Rodgers would have had additional impetus to propose a dispensary because of the opportunities it would offer his son to build his career in a new city. Evidence in support of that motivation is supported by the fact that an effort to found a dispensary in New York did not begin until after the physician Rodgers had arrived in New York. John and Samuel Bard, however, also had access to knowledge and information from the Philadelphia medical community, and might have wanted to keep up with their peers there; that motivation had been a factor in the founding of New York Hospital in which both Bards had been involved. John Bard grew up and received his medical education in Philadelphia and retained ties to family and friends there. Thus, both Rodgers and the

---

<sup>39</sup> *New York Daily Advertiser*, January 24, 1791. *A Letter from John Bard*, p. 6. *New York Daily Advertiser*, May 31, 1791.

<sup>40</sup> On John D. Rodgers, see Samuel Miller, *Memoirs of the Rev. John Rodgers, D.D. Late Pastor of the Wall-Street and Brick Churches, in the City of New-York* (New York, 1813).

Bards had good ties to the Philadelphia medical and philanthropic communities and either family could have initiated the founding of the New York Dispensary.<sup>41</sup>

But one of John Bard's comments hurts his case. Bard claimed the Medical Society had from its beginning been interested in setting up a dispensary, but his comment that the Medical Society's dispensary plan was "ever intended to be carried into execution as soon as it could conveniently be done" does not negate the claim that Rev. Dr. Rodgers first took public steps towards setting up the charity. The Medical Society had the idea under discussion, but perhaps the Rev. Rodgers had been moved to action first by the arrival of his son in New York.

Again, it is impossible to resolve the dispute about who deserves credit for instigating the founding of the New York Dispensary, but the issue of who instigated the formation of charitable institutions matters in general. The seemingly impersonal process of institutional expansion rested on very personal motives and interests of the people who initiated the founding of new charities. The scale and scope of philanthropy grew as instigators' cosmopolitan practices, such as traveling and moving, and their individual needs brought transnational movements to new places.<sup>42</sup>

### *Transplanting Philanthropic Models*

So newcomers might propose the founding of charitable institutions to try to establish themselves in a new place. Why does it matter? That phenomenon reveals

---

<sup>41</sup> For evidence about keeping up with Philadelphia as a motivation for founding New York Hospital, see Samuel Bard to John Bard, December 29, 1762; John Bard to Samuel Bard, April 9, 1763, Bard Collection, NYAM.

<sup>42</sup> Mary Lindemann notes that many of the medical students of influential German medical-charity founder, Ernst Gottfried Baldinger, "later established similar 'klinische Instituten' at other major universities throughout central and eastern Europe." Lindemann, "Urban Growth and Medical Charity," p. 118. For the role of religious exiles in the spread of poor relief institutions in early-modern Europe, see Grell and Cunningham, "Reformation and Changes in Poor Relief in Early Modern Northern Europe," pp. 4, 13, 15, 26-28.



more than simply one set of motivations in philanthropic activity or ways that migrants integrated themselves into communities. It also explains something about the nature of adopting innovations. Contemporaries preferred to start unfamiliar projects with the involvement of people who had previous experience with the type of undertaking in question. But not everybody was suited to associated philanthropy, and instigators' participation might not last long. Nor, in spite of what people assumed, could beneficent enterprises succeed everywhere. The setting had to be right too.

The acceptance of ideas from the transnational array of charitable programs often required first-hand sources of information about ventures untried locally. Assuring would-be subscribers that a novel institution worked was part of campaigns to garner support for new charities, as the New York Dispensary proponents knew. Thus they repeatedly ran information in the newspaper about the Philadelphia Dispensary. But not only the potential subscribers needed to be persuaded that if they parted with their money, it would be to worthwhile ends. The initial group of people who came together to plan and launch a new charity also needed to be convinced that they would be devoting their time to a viable endeavor. A human link to the same type of project elsewhere could provide that assurance and, therefore, there were frequently such links in the form of a migrant like John R. B. Rodgers or a traveler like Henry Moyes. Moreover, although many historians assume that rising need led to the adoption of new solutions to social ills, emulation, rather than need, often played a major role in the formation of charities: Migrants could stoke concerns about keeping up with peers elsewhere and prompt action. The nature of associated philanthropy, however, can make it hard to trace these teachers. The publications of associated charities generally stressed the *association* of individuals

in support of a cause and did not single out individuals for recognition. (In charities' later publications, when they looked back to their beginnings, the role of particular individuals in forming the organization or providing crucial early support might be acknowledged.)<sup>43</sup>

With that caveat about charities' publications in mind, sources about the humane society and dispensary movements in America reveal frequent human links in their spread. Henry Moyes and John R. B. Rodgers are two examples. Another is John Crawford in Barbados and then Baltimore, where, besides his role in the founding of the Baltimore Dispensary, he was involved in the forming of a humane-society program by the Dispensary in 1804. Likewise, the Church of Scotland minister Rev. Andrew Brown provided a link between the Massachusetts Humane Society (MHS) and the Halifax Marine Humane Society, organized in 1794. Brown, a Scot who lived in Halifax from 1787 to 1795 had visited Boston in 1791 and spent time with MHS members Revs. Jeremy Belknap, John Eliot, and John Clarke, also an MHS officer. In 1793, the MHS made Brown of Halifax an honorary member. In his letter of thanks, Brown promised he would try to set up a humane society in Halifax, and the newspaper announcement of the formation of the Halifax Marine Humane Society suggests that Brown kept his word and played a leading role in organizing the new charity: His name was listed first (it was not

---

<sup>43</sup> For a discussion of the importance of personal sources of information in the adoption of innovations in another context, see Bryce Ryan and Neal C. Gross, "The Diffusion of Hybrid Seed Corn in Two Iowa Communities," *Rural Sociology* 8 (1943): 15-24. Adrian Wilson stresses the importance of personal sources in the transfer of knowledge of smallpox inoculation in the early eighteenth century. Wilson, "The Politics of Medical Improvement in Early Hanoverian England," p. 27. Likewise, Conrad Edick Wright highlights, as an example of how extensive organized charity had become in New England, a traveling Bible society organizer in 1820. Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 3-5. Numerous scholars have called attention to the importance of emulation in the founding of charitable institutions. Morris, "Voluntary Societies and British Urban Elites," pp. 342-343; Neil J. O'Connell, "George Whitefield and Bethesda Orphan-House," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 54 (1970): 41-62; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 99-105.

because his name began with “B” – there were three people whose names came before his in alphabetical order) on the list of men raising funds for the new society.<sup>44</sup> (See Chapter Four for more on the MHS naming Brown as an honorary member.)

In the case of the evidently unsuccessful efforts of the Medical Society of South Carolina to set up a lifesaving program in Charleston in 1793, the instigator was identified. Dr. Elisha Poinsett, the Medical Society recorded in its minutes, had imported an RHS lifesaving apparatus and “offered [the apparatus] to [the Medical] Society at cost and charges.” The Medical Society accepted the offer, although conforming to associational norms, it declared publicly that *the Society* had imported the apparatus. (Plus the Society informed newspaper readers that the apparatus would be kept at Dr. Poinsett’s house, “where it [could] be had on application.” In addition, members of the Society would “attend, if required, in order to give the necessary medical assistance.”) Poinsett had spent five years in the mid-1780s living in London, presumably as a result of his Loyalism during the American Revolution. While in London, the doctor would almost certainly have been familiar with the high-profile Royal Humane Society. There is no evidence he was involved with the RHS, but he had had the experience of border-crossing that shaped instigators. Thus that Poinsett imported an RHS apparatus and

---

<sup>44</sup> Similarly, the founder of the St. Andrew’s Society in New York circa 1756 was the same man who had founded the St. Andrew’s Society in Philadelphia. Bridenbaugh, *Cities in Revolt*, p. 127. On Crawford’s involvement in forming the Baltimore humane society, see Crawford to Rush, February 15, 1804, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, LCP. On the Baltimore Dispensary’s addition of humane society program, see *An Address to the Citizens of Baltimore and its Vicinity, Containing a Concise Account of the Baltimore General Dispensary, Its By-laws, and Other Matters Worthy of Notice* (Baltimore, 1812), p. 8. Andrew Brown traveled to Boston with a letter of introduction to Jeremy Belknap. S. S. Blowers to Belknap, September 24, 1791; Andrew Brown to Belknap, June 14, 1793; Brown to Belknap, December 31, 1793; Belknap Papers, 161.B (Reel 5), MHS. Thomas Barnard, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At the Semiannual Meeting, June 10, 1794* (Boston, 1794), p. 21. *A Statement of Premiums Awarded by the Trustees of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, from July 1817 to April 1829* (Boston, 1829), p. 49. (Halifax) *Royal Gazette and Nova Scotia Advertiser*, December 16, 1794.

initiated the Medical Society's efforts to form a lifesaving program is of a piece with the other human links in the spread of the humane society and dispensary movements.<sup>45</sup>

Human links mattered in England too. In the case of the Bath Humane Society, Thomas Cogan – the doctor who published one of the two translations of the Amsterdam resuscitation group's reports and who repeatedly moved between England and the United Provinces – presumably initiated the founding of the charity. The Cogan family had settled in South Wraxhall, near Bath, in the early 1800s. There Cogan reinvented himself as an improving farmer and became an active, as well as prize-winning, member of an agricultural society. Cogan's new pursuits, however, did not distract him from his longtime interest in the humane society mission. (Over the years he had served a conduit between the London and Amsterdam resuscitation groups, and he innovated with lifesaving equipment.) Although a dedicated laborer in the cause of resuscitation, Dr. Anthony Fothergill, lived in Bath and had served as a correspondent, fundraiser, and Medical Assistant for the RHS there in the 1780s, 1790s and early 1800s, no humane society had been established in Bath. Perhaps Fothergill was not a "clubbable man." Boston doctor Benjamin Waterhouse's assessment of Fothergill would suggest that conclusion – although Waterhouse, who warred constantly with others, is hardly the most reliable judge of personalities. After spending a day with Anthony Fothergill in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1808, Waterhouse told Benjamin Rush that Fothergill was an "odd man" and capricious. "The motto of the celebrated Janus is applicable to this person," Waterhouse added. Cogan, however, could work well with others. After Cogan arrived

---

<sup>45</sup> Information on Poinsett's importation of the RHS apparatus and the Medical Society's acceptance of the offer comes from the copy of the Medical Society's minute in Waring, *A History of Medicine in South Carolina*, p. 121. *State Gazette of South-Carolina*, May, 15, 1793.

in Bath – and perhaps not coincidentally after Fothergill moved to the United States – Cogan and some friends formed the Bath Humane Society in 1805.<sup>46</sup>

An appealing idea, such as the humane society model that people in so many communities tried to adopt, was not enough for an institution to succeed. Associated philanthropy was the defining form of beneficence in the eighteenth century but did not suit everyone: The prison reformer John Howard, for instance, did not last long as a commissioner of a proposed new prison when compromise was required. (See Chapter Three.) To organize associated charitable ventures, instigators needed to want and be able to work with other people, as Cogan could. Maybe Anthony Fothergill, who won an RHS prize for a book on lifesaving, worked better on his own. (Fothergill lived in Philadelphia from 1803 to 1812 and attended one Philadelphia Humane Society meeting, but although he had been made an honorary member of the PHS in 1799, he did not become active in the group.)<sup>47</sup>

Besides individuals' preference or ability to engage in associated philanthropy, the setting had to be right to support such activity. Barbados, where Dispensary operations had been undermined by political disputes, had been an unlikely setting for the

---

<sup>46</sup> "Memoirs of Thomas Cogan," pp. 87-88. RHS committee meeting, May 7, 1783, Minute Book 1774-1784, RHS archives; *RHS Reports 1785-86*, p. v.; *RHS Reports 1783-84*, pp. vi, vii. *RHS Reports 1783-1784*, pp. 121-123; *RHS Reports 1785-86*, pp. 181-186, 253; *RHS Reports 1793*, p. 2; *RHS Reports 1803*, p. 46. For a short sketch of Fothergill's life, see 'Take Time by the Forelock': *The Letters of Anthony Fothergill to James Woodforde 1789-1813*, eds. Christopher Lawrence, Paul Lucier and Christopher C. Booth (London, 1997), pp. xi-xv. Benjamin Waterhouse to Benjamin Rush, September 22, 1808, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 30, f. 113, LCP; "Memoirs of Thomas Cogan", p. 94; *RHS Report 1806*, pp. 38-45. *Bath Humane Society, Instituted in the Year 1805; Supported by Voluntary Contributions* (Bath [England], 1806). Carolyn Williams says simply that Cogan founded the Bath Humane Society. Williams, "Cogan, Thomas."

<sup>47</sup> *RHS Reports 1799* (London, 1799), p. 8. Anthony Fothergill, *An Essay on the Preservation of Shipwrecked Mariners, in Answer to the Prize Questions Proposed by the Royal Humane Society* (London, 1799). PHS managers' meeting, June 12, 1799, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. PHS managers' meeting, October 14, 1807, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA. Likewise, Sir John Fielding was a "philanthropic buccaneer, who was unwilling to subordinate his efforts to an organizations, preferring to collect his own funds and dispense them in his own way." Taylor, *Jonas Hanway*, p. 98.

Dispensary and Humane Society to succeed. As the Royal Humane Society had opined in 1776, factionalism in smaller communities undermined voluntary associations.<sup>48</sup> Both the New York and Barbados Dispensaries had become embroiled in conflicts early in their existences, but New York's denser associational infrastructure, at a slightly greater remove from governmental politics than Barbados (where the governor served as Dispensary president), could absorb and resolve the conflict. Beyond the dangers of factionalism, the Barbados Humane Society faced probably insurmountable obstacles in a brutal slave society where sympathy and faith in proffered rewards might both be in short supply.<sup>49</sup>

Likewise, the efforts of the British Factory in St. Petersburg to set up a humane society there in 1797 were probably doomed to failure. The success of lifesaving programs based on the British model depended on broad participation, perhaps broader participation than for any other type of philanthropic program. Charitable institutions in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russia, however, were state-dominated. Without Russian government support and adaptation of the program, the humane society that the Royal Humane Society so confidently boasted had been established by the British Factory, with RHS help, probably could not survive. (Evidence that the program founded under the British Factory's purview lapsed comes from the Philadelphia Humane Society minutes: In December 1817, the PHS received a letter from the Literary Committee of St. Petersburg asking for information on how to set up a humane society.)<sup>50</sup>

Activists, like many of their Enlightenment peers, were optimists. Failures that

---

<sup>48</sup> *RHS Reports 1776*, p. 93.

<sup>49</sup> My thanks to Roderick McDonald for discussing this issue with me.

<sup>50</sup> Jahn, "Health Care and Poor Relief in Russia," p. 164. *RHS Reports 1798*, p. 32.

PHS meetings, December 10, 1817; March 12, 1818; June 10, 1818; September 13, 1820, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA.

seem obvious in retrospect seemed feasible to their proponents. Associated-philanthropic ventures took root best in urban areas of societies with growing middle classes eager to for opportunities to assert their gentility and to play roles in governance. To survive, charitable organizations needed to draw on a base that could provide a few hundred supporters and continuity of leadership. Moreover, although desire for sociability and social status were among the factors that impelled middling and elite folks to subscribe to charities, they also had to think that aiding distressed neighbors served to enhance the orderliness of the whole community. Societies, like Barbados, where part of the population was sojourning, not settling, and much of the population was property, whose welfare (to use an inapt term) was the responsibility of owners, did not provide fertile ground for associated philanthropy. Border crossers could take ideas for charitable enterprises wherever they went, but the nature of the host society influenced whether those enterprises succeeded.<sup>51</sup>

Finally, for charitable organizations to take off, good management had to emerge. Countless charitable projects were instituted but then faltered in short order. For instance, the humane society established in New York City in 1794 faded within a year or two. Not enough people were going to meetings, according to the irritated entries in the diary of Elihu H. Smith, one of the group's medical officers. Obviously, since they fell apart, short-lived groups left thin records. But complaints like Smith's and the minutes of longer-lived charitable organizations underscore what will be obvious to anyone who has

---

<sup>51</sup> On the social structure of British Caribbean islands, see Andrew O'Shaughnessy, *An Empire Divided: The American Revolution and the British Caribbean* (Philadelphia, 2000), chaps. 1 and 2. Barbara Bellows's study of poor relief in Charleston, another slave society, stresses the paternalist ethos of well-off Charlestonians towards the poor; her study focuses on the antebellum era. On the distinction between slave societies and societies with slaves, see Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, pp. 7-13. On spread of voluntary associations to the British Caribbean, see Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 420-421.

ever been involved with associated activity – whether charitable, political, or professional: A core group of people had to stay energetically involved, and, crucially, organizations had to attract a few effective managers for work to get done. Sometimes instigators also made good managers, but not always.<sup>52</sup>

### *How Not to Be Recognized as an Instigator*

A number of factors, then, had to come together to successfully instigate charitable organizations and for those groups to survive. As a result, people who thought they deserved credit for starting charities sometimes faced frustration. The disappointments of overlooked instigators shed light on how the norms of associated philanthropy could not only reinforce existing hierarchies and exclusions, but also minimize the contributions of people who pursued their goals outside of that structure.<sup>53</sup>

One overlooked instigator, to his mind anyhow, was Benjamin Waterhouse. Waterhouse believed that he, not Dr. Moyes, had initiated the founding of the Massachusetts Humane Society. According to his draft memoirs, before Waterhouse moved to Boston (to teach at the new medical school at Cambridge) from his native Rhode Island in 1782, a pleasure boat in Newport harbor had overturned and a number of young people had drowned. Some of the boaters had been pulled out of the water quickly but no one there knew resuscitation techniques. Waterhouse, who had received his medical training in Leiden and London under the supervision of his relative, the famed

---

<sup>52</sup> *The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York*, p. 8; Elihu H. Smith, “Manuscript diary in Yale Medical Library: ‘The Journal of E. H. Smith, New Series, Vol. 1,’” New York, March-July 1796, pp. 186 and 190, quoted in Thomson, “The Role of Physicians,” p. 49. Smith’s diary has since been edited and published. *The Diary of Elihu Hubbard Smith (1771-1798)*, ed. James E. Cronin (Philadelphia, 1973). On the division of labor in organizations between people who instigate and people who execute innovations, see Robertson and Wind, “Organizational Cosmopolitanism and Innovativeness”; Gascoigne, *Science in the Service of Empire*, p. 65.

<sup>53</sup> On women’s organization re-creating hierarchies and exclusions, see Boylan, *The Origins of Women’s Activism*, pp. 38-47.



Dr. John Fothergill, later wrote that the tragedy compelled him to publish in the *Newport Mercury* the methods used in England for the recovery of the drowned. Plus, he wrote, he had urged the formation of a humane society similar to the one in London, but to no avail. (His piece was printed in the *Mercury* on July 20, 1782, and cited the examples of the Dutch, French and English societies, but did not explicitly call for the establishment of a humane society.) According to his memoirs, three years later when he and Moyes were visiting Rhode Island together, they had “sketched out the rules and general principles of a humane society, and agreed to” put the plan before some leading Bostonians. Waterhouse claimed that he communicated the idea to Gov. Bowdoin and that Moyes had talked about it with a few men at the Rev. James Freeman’s house. As a result, in Waterhouse’s telling, a humane society was set up in Boston. Waterhouse, who had ongoing trouble gaining or retaining memberships in voluntary organizations, was elected one of the initial six trustees of the society, but within a few months declined to serve.<sup>54</sup>

Although Waterhouse thought he deserved primary credit, the Massachusetts Humane Society, in its 1817 history of the Society’s formation, highlighted Moyes’s role as instigator and relegated Waterhouse to a bit player. Waterhouse’s vainglory plus conflicts over smallpox vaccination he had been involved early in the nineteenth century might have led the MHS trustees to downplay Waterhouse’s role in the society’s founding. Bigotry was probably a factor too: Congregationalist-Federalist Boston’s “tribal exclusiveness” made life hard for a Quaker Republican.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Waterhouse’s draft memoirs, n.d., Box 16.4, Benjamin Waterhouse Papers (H MS c. 16), Countway Library. *Newport Mercury*, July 20, 1782. Tudor, *A Discourse*, p. 31.

<sup>55</sup> On Waterhouse and the introduction of smallpox vaccination, plus his clashes with his medical brethren in New England, see John B. Blake, *Benjamin Waterhouse and the Introduction of Vaccination: A*

Like Waterhouse, Alexander Johnson resented not having received recognition for his part in the spread of the humane society movement. Over the years after the founding of the Royal Humane Society, Johnson or someone close to him published pieces in periodicals that touted Johnson's early and ongoing efforts to establish and spread the cause of resuscitation. Part of Johnson's acrimony towards the RHS, akin to the conflict over who first proposed founding the New York Dispensary, came from his view about how humane societies should be run. (In the New York Dispensary case, there had a battle over lay versus medical control, won by the laymen.) Johnson disapproved of what he saw as professional monopolization of knowledge of resuscitation by RHS medical men. People's egos were at stake too, especially if, like Waterhouse and Johnson, they wound up estranged from organizations. These men wanted credit because they appreciated the importance of agenda-setters in philanthropy. And, indeed, Johnson, especially, may have deserved more historical recognition than he has received. His claims to have disseminated masses of information about lifesaving gain credence thanks to the ability, made possible by the database of America's Historical Newspapers, to search years worth of dozens of newspapers; that search turned up various essays on resuscitation written by Johnson and published at different times. Johnson had played a role in spreading knowledge of resuscitation methods and therefore he helped lay the groundwork for the formation of humane societies in the Anglophone world.<sup>56</sup>

---

*Reappraisal* (Philadelphia, 1957). On bigotry towards Waterhouse, see Philip Cash, "Setting the Stage: Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse's Reception in Boston, 1782-1788," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Science* 1992 (47): 5-28; quotation p. 28.

<sup>56</sup> On Johnson's disapproval of the RHS, see the letter by Verus, September 12, 1791, *Gentleman's Magazine* 61 (1791), pp. 821-824. (Verus is presumably Johnson.) Besides the letters and essays cited in footnotes 17 and 18, essays by Johnson were published in several American newspapers in 1790. ("Directions for an Extension of the Practice of Recovering Persons Apparently Dead: Taken from the Instructions at Large Published by Alexander Johnson, M.D. (Introducer of the Practice in England) And Confirmed by Reporters Received from Abroad," published in the *Burlington (N.J.) Advertiser*, June 22

Johnson appreciated the task of agenda-setting in philanthropy and knew how to discharge that task. But he, like Waterhouse, did not get the recognition he craved for his part in the expansion of the humane society movement because he did not work well within the dominant framework of beneficence. Without the help of the apparatus of associated philanthropy, instigators might be ignored.

*Instigators and the “Rise” of Humanitarianism*

Charles Murray, the British consul in Madeira from 1772 to 1791, by contrast, grasped the nature of associated philanthropic activity and used it to help create the Royal Humane Society’s sense of pursuing a global mission. As his efforts show, self-selected instigators brought charitable innovations to new places. By doing so, they extended the range of philanthropic movements so that, over time, contemporaries found that they were practicing philanthropy on a global scale. The local activities and personal interests of instigators propelled a worldwide scope in organized beneficence.

Around 1787, Murray wrote to the Royal Humane Society to ask for the most up-to-date instructions on resuscitation and all the necessary lifesaving apparatus. In his letter, Murray explained that he thought that “there can hardly be devised an institution more truly benevolent or more deserving of encouragement or extension.” He therefore planned to have the RHS instructions translated into Portuguese and distributed throughout Madeira and Lisbon. As it always did, the Royal Humane Society fulfilled

---

and 29, 1790; the *Norwich (Conn.) Packet & Country Journal*, August 13 and 20, 1790; and the *Savannah Georgia Gazette*, September 23, 1790.) Based on Moyes’s role in placing Johnson’s directions in American newspapers in the mid-1780s, Johnson presumably had a role in the insertion of his essay in newspapers in 1790. He seems to have been especially active that year in trying to disseminate information on humane societies and to garner credit for his role. Besides those newspaper publications, Johnson wrote to Benjamin Rush that year to advocate the formation of humane societies, preferably as public institutions, in “every City & Town of Note” in Pennsylvania. Alexander Johnson to Rush, April 3, 1790, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 25, LCP. Perhaps Johnson’s endeavors in 1790 were responsible for the attempted formation of a humane society by physicians in Baltimore that year. See the announcement about the organization of the society in the (Philadelphia) *Federal Gazette*, July 17, 1790.

the request for materials and two years later the Society was rewarded with news from Murray about the progress of the “blessed art” of resuscitation in Portugal. A Portuguese friend of Murray, he related, had translated the Society’s directions. Murray had had the directions bound with a few RHS annual sermons to assure the Portuguese clergy and people that the English clergy approved of “the humane and pious labours” of the RHS. Then he had two thousand copies of the volume printed and distributed throughout the Portuguese kingdom. As a result, Murray could report, several lives had been saved, and a Portuguese nobleman planned to form a society on the plan of the London charity.<sup>57</sup>

Murray’s two letters to the Royal Humane Society covered more than those practicalities. In them, Murray explained the reasons he aimed to extend the humane society movement to Portugal. For one, during his years in Madeira, he had “witnessed the loss of many of our fellow-creatures by casualties.” Beyond that reason, Murray wanted, he wrote, “to prove myself not an altogether an unworthy member of the Humane Society of London.” Although he had “spent the greatest part of [his] life” in Portuguese dominions, Murray had a sense of belonging to the London-based intellectual and benevolent community of the Royal Humane Society.<sup>58</sup> By promoting the cause of resuscitation in Portugal, he could participate as an active RHS member. Hence, by spatially expanding the resuscitation movement, Murray served his needs as geographically-mobile person eager to take part in the thriving British associational world.

The last reason Murray gave for wanting to spread the humane society movement to Portugal was so that his “second native country” could share in “the blessings which

---

<sup>57</sup> *RHS Reports 1787-89*, pp. 87-88; *RHS Reports 1787-89*, pp. 398-399.

<sup>58</sup> *RHS Reports 1787-89*, pp. 87-88; *RHS Reports 1787-89*, pp. 398-399.

[his] real native country enjoys, by means of the Humane Society.” Bringing the humane society movement to Portugal was a way for Murray “to shew [his] gratitude to a people amongst whom [he had] spent the greatest part of [his] life—from whom [he had] received innumerable marks of friendship.”<sup>59</sup> By avowing to have two native countries and explaining his efforts to extend the humane society movement from his first home to his adopted home in terms of living in both Portuguese and British communities, Murray embraced a cosmopolitan sense of self. His cosmopolitan philanthropy, however, did not arise from his being a citizen of the world at large. Rather, it came about because Murray was rooted in two communities. New understandings of moral responsibility could rest on the mundane realities of multiple sets of local or particularistic ties that border crossers such as Murray developed, with the eighteenth-century commonplace that commerce fostered social bonds disposing people to think of those ties in affective terms. (Of course, philanthropic endeavors by Britons, and later Americans, in foreign places implicated more than just new ideas of moral responsibility. Overseas philanthropy could serve the ends, sometimes explicitly stated, of commercial expansion and empire-building by strengthening the sinews of British and American presence and influence abroad.)<sup>60</sup>

Murray fulfilled his aim of bringing knowledge of resuscitation to Portugal in part because the humane-society cause was so portable: He inaugurated a resuscitation program with information and equipment from the RHS, the help of a Portuguese friend, and his ability to fund the printing of material. As a result of the Consul’s efforts, the

---

<sup>59</sup> *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 398.

<sup>60</sup> On individuals’ epistolary ties shaping the geography of their humanitarian imaginations, see David Lambert and Alan Lester, “Geographies of Colonial Philanthropy,” *Progress in Human Geography* 28 (2004): 320-341. See also Haskell, “Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility.”

RHS would boast in its reports, year after year, that its charitable labors had been extended to Portugal. The framework of associated-philanthropy, Murray's mobility and his connections, and his financial wherewithal gave Murray and the RHS the capacity to act in Portugal. His success led him to hope, he told the RHS, that his efforts in Portugal might encourage others to try "to extend the Art of Resuscitation, and the study of suspended Animation, to foreign countries, where they are not yet known, so as to allow our fellow-creatures to participate with us, in the blessed effects of the benevolent and most praise-worthy labours of our [Royal Humane] Society." Murray could hope for the extension of the humane society movement to foreign places because practicing cosmopolitanism in philanthropy, as he and the RHS had found, was well within reach. And not only did the readers of the RHS annual reports discover that the humane society movement was expanding to new places, that is, that charitable capacities were increasing. Readers of newspapers in Philadelphia, New York, and Stockbridge, Massachusetts, in late summer 1790, also learnt that the life of a Lisbon silversmith had been saved after the British consul in Madeira had translated the RHS resuscitation directions into Portuguese.<sup>61</sup>

### *Conclusion*

By working within the framework of associated philanthropy – asking the RHS for help, reporting back on his activities –, Murray's accomplishments in Portugal had been those of others too. The RHS had had no plans for Portugal, but the Society embraced Murray's success as its own. Self-selected individuals played key, though by no means exclusive, roles in the extension of charitable movements to new places

---

<sup>61</sup> *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 400. (Philadelphia) *Pennsylvania Packet*, August 20, 1790; *New York Daily Gazette*, August 31, 1790; (Stockbridge, Mass.) *Western Star*, September 7, 1790.

through their migrations and travels. Instigators – people who crossed borders – did not necessarily have cosmopolitan intentions for philanthropy. But they, like many of their contemporaries, were pragmatically citizens of the world. They collected ideas and carried them to new place or they took ideas from home with them on their travels. They initiated charitable institutions to fulfill ambitions, to establish themselves professionally, and to meet people, not to mention to pursue their ideals of improvement and to put religious beliefs into practice.

Motivated by a variety of factors, instigators brought transnational trends to local communities. Thanks to their experience with unfamiliar institutions, they provided know-how that assured other activists that projects were worth trying. But even though a few energetic people often did much of the work in any charitable organization, the survival of associated philanthropic enterprises depended on people who worked well in groups. Instigators might soon find themselves sidelined. Whether they were overlooked or recognized, instigators matter in the history of humanitarianism. The expansion of charitable activity depended on the intersection of international intellectual and economic trends, local conditions, geographically-mobile lives, and personal motives that led people to pursue focused programs – for instance, translating lifesaving directions into Portuguese – in new places. Far-flung lives and local, targeted changes buttressed the growth of beneficence. Moreover, as philanthropists acted at once as members of multiple communities, they found themselves realizing the goal of universal benevolence. Increasingly, contemporaries would come to expect a global scale in philanthropy.

## Chapter Three

### The Patriot of the World

One admirer lauded John Howard, the English prison and hospital reformer, as “*a Friend to Every Clime, a Patriot of the World.*” Another praised Howard for building cottages for tenants on his Bedfordshire with only the condition that the tenants “attend divine service every Sunday at CHURCH, at MASS, MEETING, or SYNAGOGUE. Thus you see,” the writer added, “his expanded and benevolent disposition is confined to no sect, nor any particular notion.” (Never mind that Catholics and Jews were probably few and far between in Bedfordshire.) Edmund Burke, though, put it best when he hailed Howard in a 1780 speech for

visit[ing] all Europe,--not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces, or the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art; not to collect medals, or collate manuscripts:--but to dive into the depths of dungeons; to plunge into the infection of hospitals; to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain; to take the gage and dimensions of misery, depression, and contempt; to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and to compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries. His plan is original; and it is as full of genius as it is of humanity. It was a voyage of discovery; a circumnavigation of charity.<sup>1</sup>

Howard the humane cosmopolite? This is not Michael Ignatieff’s John Howard, the ascetic, severe man with a martyr complex who helped invent the penitentiary, a cruel new institution of social control. Have scholars misread something about Howard?

---

<sup>1</sup> “Observations on the Statue for John Howard, and Howardian Fund for Prison-Charities and Reforms. Written by Dr. Warner” in “Hints Respecting the Monument Erected to John Howard,” in John Coakley Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science*, vol. 2 (1801), p. 172; *Gentleman’s Magazine*, vol. 56 (June 1786), p. 485. Edmund Burke, “Speech at Bristol Previous to the Election 6 September 1780,” *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke. Vol. 1*, eds. W. M. Eofson with John A. Woods (Oxford, 1996), pp. 637-638.



Yes. Howard was less the creation of an extreme faith than a creature of celebrity who used fame to propel a consumerist demand for his kind of humanitarianism. What does Howard's celebrity reveal about the connection between consumer culture and the expansion in humanitarian activity? Celebrity and consumer culture are intimately linked, in a three-fold way. First, demand for new goods, activities, and attractions are defining traits of consumer societies; celebrity caters to one aspect of that demand by providing sensations. Second, in a competitive market for media, an aspect of consumer societies, sellers of media seek material that will lure in readers; stars offer such material. Celebrity and media, therefore, have a symbiotic relationship. Third, the sellers of other goods and opportunities need too to attract attention; luminaries offer a means to do so.<sup>2</sup>

At first glance, the self-abnegating Howard seems to be an unlikely subject for a study of the connections between the contemporaneous development of consumer societies and the quickening rate of change in humanitarian activity. Howard won fame for his arduous and extensive tours throughout Europe to investigate prisons and hospitals, although his endeavors were not new in kind. Yet by the 1780s, admirers on both sides of the Atlantic were celebrating him in overblown terms. Howard had sown that public adulation. While he rejected certain aspects of consumer culture (not least the pleasures of urban sociability including associational methods for beneficence), he skillfully fashioned his public image. And while he resisted being turned into a celebrity, he responded to his fans' perception of him by adapting his goals to meet their cosmopolitan expectations of him. That dynamic reveals more than the relationship

---

<sup>2</sup> On the relation between celebrity and media, see Donna T. Andrew and Randall McGowen, *The Perreaus & Mrs. Rudd: Forgery and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century London* (Berkeley, 2001), chap. 3; Richard Schickel, *Intimate Strangers: The Culture of Celebrity in America, with a New Afterword by the Author* (Chicago, 2000); see also Cheryl Wanko, *Roles of Authority: Thespian Biography and Celebrity in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Lubbock, TX, 2003).

between a luminary and the public. By exalting Howard or other noteworthy philanthropists, contemporaries kept a personal element in beneficence as it shifted over the centuries away from paternalistic charity towards more bureaucratic forms. Rationalization gathered pace in the eighteenth century and coincided with the rise of sentiment to a cultural commodity purveyed through print.<sup>3</sup> The public's imagined relationship with a lionized philanthropist retained an emotional aspect in beneficence, but deflected it away from needy folks. Celebrity, especially that of John Howard, however, was only one manifestation of the importance of consumer desires to changes in beneficence. As activists knew, the public (themselves included) wanted novelty and choice. Those expectations under-girded the expansion of charitable infrastructures. The reaction to Howard, then, highlights the pervasive impact of the norms of consumer culture in philanthropy.

#### *Howard and His Travels*

Probably, Michael Ignatieff's portrayal of Howard (1726?-1790) would more or less suit Howard. His faith was his uppermost concern. He thought of himself as having "peculiarities in diet" – he ate no meat, for instance – and also, perhaps sensitive like George Washington for insufficiencies he perceived in his schooling, he thought of himself as having peculiarities in his education. According to friends, he took the biblical patriarchs as models for parenting. And praise of him was exaggerated. He avowedly did not set out on his prison tours out of concern for suffering strangers. And, though he received so much acclaim for his prison tours, investigating prisons and ministering to

---

<sup>3</sup> Knott, "Sensibility and the American War for Independence," p. 27.

prisoners were not new activities in the late eighteenth century. What made Howard's activities different was their scale and range.<sup>4</sup>

Not only were prison visits not new, but also journeys undertaken with the intention of promoting beneficent goals had a long history. Missionary travel went back centuries, and throughout the eighteenth century religious activists had traveled to promote their causes. Early in the century, the leading international Pietist operation, the Francke Foundations of Halle, Germany, and the Foundations' English associate, the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge, sponsored missionaries and sent personnel on trips to set up institutions, make contacts, and investigate conditions, all towards religious-philanthropic ends.<sup>5</sup> Over the eighteenth century, the practice of traveling to gather resources and information and to advance charitable causes grew and by the beginning of the nineteenth century travel had become a common tool of philanthropy.

Throughout the latter eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth, well-to-do travelers took in eleemosynary institutions. In the 1760s, Philadelphians John Morgan and Benjamin Rush, like British colleagues, each visited hospitals on trips to Europe while they were medical students in Britain. Both students garnered knowledge about the layout and furnishings, management, staffing, and patient populations of hospitals abroad. Decades later, Rush made explicit the value of touring hospitals and other charitable institutions in an 1810 letter to his son James, then a medical student on his own European trip. "Visit all public and humane institutions, particularly maniacal ones.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Michael Ignatieff's depiction of Howard's asceticism, anxious spirituality, and severity as a parent. Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, pp. 47-52. John Howard to William Seward, October 24, 1786, Add. MS 5418, British Library, London. On Washington, see Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, p. 199. On the lack of originality of Howard's ideas, see Rod Morgan, "Divine Philanthropy: John Howard Reconsidered," *History* 62 (1977): 388-410. On mid-eighteenth-century concern about the state of prisons, see J. M. Beattie, *Crime and the Courts in England 1660-1800* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 304-305, 555-560.

<sup>5</sup> Duffy, "The Society of Promoting Christian Knowledge"; Hitchcock, "Paupers and Preachers."

Pry into their interior, as far as diet, dress, regimen, and expense are concerned. Record everything useful, especially where *numbers* are concerned, in your journal,” Rush advised his son. “They will be choice raw materials to work upon in promoting the happiness of your fellow citizens when you return.”<sup>6</sup>

Not only medical men visited beneficent institutions. When the Congregational minister Jeremy Belknap (1744-1798), then based in Dover, New Hampshire, went to Philadelphia in the fall of 1785, he conformed to the norm that travelers would inspect public and charitable institutions. Both the hospital and the almshouse in Philadelphia came in for praise in his journal, as did the city’s water pumps. Belknap, like other travelers, collected information on other city’s institutions for more than just himself. His correspondent Manassah Cutler, the Congregational minister and botanist of Ipswich, Massachusetts, sent Belknap a letter in Philadelphia with requests for details of the American Philosophical Society. After Belknap’s return to New Hampshire, Cutler peppered him with questions about the agricultural and philosophical societies in Philadelphia: “I wish to ask many questions \_\_ particularly about the Agricultural Society, as the [American Academy of Arts and Sciences] has taken up that subject,” he explained. “Was you at a meeting of the Phil. Society? What No. of members commonly attend? Are they about printing another Vol? What do they say about us? &c &c &c.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Jeremy Black comments that British travelers to the United Provinces visited poor-houses and houses of correction, among other public institutions. Jeremy Black, *The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1992), p. 59. *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, pp. 53, 69. *The Journal of Dr. John Morgan of Philadelphia from the City of Rome to the City of London 1764 Together with a Fragment of a Journal Written at Rome, 1764 and a Biographical Sketch* (Philadelphia, 1907), pp. 112, 140-141, 147, 151-155. Rush to James Rush, February 7, 1810, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 2, p. 1037.

<sup>7</sup> Jeremy Belknap, Journal of a Trip to Philadelphia in 1785, Miscellanea vol. 2, Belknap Papers, MHS; Manassah Cutler to Belknap, October 21, 1785, and November 15, 1785, Belknap Papers Reel 161.A (Reel 4), MHS.

Cutler expected, correctly, that he could get information from a traveling friend about another city's associational infrastructure to further efforts to set up similar bodies in his region. His expectations reflected travel customs by the well-off in the eighteenth century that continued into the nineteenth century. In addition to those norms, a specialization of the habit of visiting humane institutions developed in the late eighteenth century when trips prompted specifically by philanthropic ends joined the era's other types of voyages of discovery. Jeroen Dekker deems "philanthropic tourism" a "new activity" of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Dekker is right to point to the importance of the international "philanthropic journey" in creating contacts, spreading ideas, and standardizing institutions, although most of the trips he cites took place after the third decade of the nineteenth century. Philanthropic tourism, however, was not a new activity in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but a refinement of earlier and ongoing practice.<sup>8</sup> Specialization of philanthropic travel became a highly visible part of beneficence in the 1770s and, especially, the 1780s with Howard's journeys. Dekker refers to Howard as an "early example" of a philanthropic tourist. But that characterization understates the place of Howard in the contemporary public imagination. Far more than an early example, Howard is the paramount example, and he received unparalleled contemporary recognition for his endeavors.

Long before he began his tours to explore prisons, Howard had been an ardent traveler. His several trips to Europe before his prison-investigation travels stand out only for their number. Unlike most British tourists, who only made one European journey,

---

<sup>8</sup> See Black on British travelers' comments about European workhouses and prisons. Black, *The British Abroad*, pp. 232-233. Jeroen J. H. Dekker, "Transforming the Nation and the Child: Philanthropy in the Netherlands, Belgium, France and England, c. 1780-c. 1850" in *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform From the 1690s to 1850*, eds. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes (New York, 1998), pp. 137-139.

Howard traveled on the Continent numerous times as an ordinary tourist. As a young man, he traveled in France and Italy funded by interest on money he inherited from his father, a wealthy upholsterer and carpet warehouseman in Smithfield, London. Howard's father also left him a house in Clapton and an estate in Cardington, Bedfordshire.

According to his biographer, Howard probably spent one to two years in Europe on his first trip, during which he cultivated a taste for fine art. His next European trip, relevant to his later prison reform work, came after the death of his first wife. In 1752, Howard had married his former landlady, a woman more than twice his age, after she nursed him through an illness. Within a few years, she died, and to ease his melancholy, Howard set out in 1756 to visit Portugal, where he particularly wanted to see the effects of the recent earthquake in Lisbon. The packet, the *Hanover*, on which Howard sailed was captured by French privateers, and the ill-treatment he faced as a prisoner of war, Howard later said, “[p]erhaps . . . increased [his] sympathy” for the plight of prisoners. In 1756, Howard was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society due to his meteorological studies, and in 1758, he married again. His second wife, Henrietta Leeds, shared Howard's piety – although she belonged to the Church of England and he was an Independent. She also shared her husband's commitment to benevolent projects for their tenants and the local poor, and Howard suffered a great blow with her death after giving birth to a son in 1765. In the 1760s and 1770s, to cope with his sorrow over Henrietta's death, Howard spent more time exploring Europe as well as traveling around the British Isles. In spite of his zeal for travel, Howard, unlike some of his contemporaries, did not rethink his prejudices as a result of interacting with foreigners. Rather, travel confirmed his negative views of

Roman Catholicism and made him esteem England more highly than he had, according to a biographer.<sup>9</sup>

In 1773, Howard became sheriff of Bedfordshire, and in November of that year he embarked on the first of over ten trips to inspect prisons and hospitals. As with his leisure travel, unhappiness or disappointment impelled Howard to journey abroad. Not every trip came about because of distress, but Howard met all his distress with travel. Howard had visited jails around England in late 1773 and 1774 and had been examined by the House of Commons on his findings. In 1774, Howard stood as an independent for election to Parliament for the borough of Bedford with his friend and kinsman, Samuel Whitbread against two other candidates. Howard and Whitbread lost and leveled charges of improprieties against the election officers that led to an investigation of the election by a committee of the House of Commons. As a result, Whitbread and one of the other candidates were returned to Parliament; Howard was awarded the fewest number of votes by the committee. His first prison investigation trip to Europe, in 1775, came several months after Howard's challenge of the election results failed. When he returned to England later in 1775, he continued inspecting English prisons. Lingering sadness over the death of his second wife prompted Howard to want to spend time away from his estate in Cardington, and over the next decade and a half, Howard crisscrossed the British Isles repeatedly and took six more trips to Europe on his philanthropic journeys. His travels and prison-reform writings had an impact. Parliament passed a bill in 1779 to

---

<sup>9</sup> Black, *The British Abroad*, p. 4. This sketch of Howard's life comes from James Baldwin Brown, *Memoirs of the Public and Private Life of John Howard, the Philanthropist, Compiled from his own Diary. . . His Confidential Letters; the Communications of his Surviving Relatives and Friends; and other Authentic Sources of Information*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London, 1823), pp. 2-21. Howard, *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales*, p. 23. Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*, pp. 22-7, 99-100, 83. Although certain of my subjects provide exceptions, Jeremy Black comments that many British travelers to Europe in the eighteenth century "returned to Britain as better-informed xenophobes." Black, *The British Abroad*, p. 235.

build a new penitentiary, and named Howard, his friend John Fothergill, and Thomas Whatley, treasurer of the Foundling Hospital, as supervisors. The three men could not agree on a site – an important issue due to concerns about salutary conditions for prisoners – for the new penitentiary and after Fothergill’s death in 1780, Howard resigned as supervisor. (For a variety of causes, that penitentiary was not built.) True to form, he reacted to this latest disappointment with another trip to Europe to examine prisons. Howard’s son’s madness and, according to a scandalized twentieth-century biographer, drug use and homosexual activity, created a final source of unhappiness for Howard. His distress over his son’s condition spurred Howard to leave England for his last trip, in 1789-1790.<sup>10</sup> Howard died in Russia on that trip.

Before his death, Howard published several books on prison reform based on his travels; his final book was published posthumously. Following customs in philanthropy, Howard distributed many of the books gratis. He gifted books to people positioned to act on his recommendations. He also had his books sold below cost. In not trying to make a profit with his books, Howard, like his peers, situated beneficence outside the commercial market. By giving their publications to fellow activists, however, philanthropists advertised their liberality and marketed their ideas to people who they thought could act on them.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> For an analysis of Howard, reforms he proposed based on his travels, Nonconformist support for him, and the connection between prison reform and the creation of a disciplined factory labor force, see Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, esp. pp. 52-54, 57-67. For details of Howard’s trips, see Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*. On his Parliamentary bid, see Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*, pp. 147-150. Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*, pp. 241, 307-308. See Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, pp. 59-61, on Nonconformist doctors’ belief in the importance of healthful conditions for the moral reform of prisoners. On the failure of the penitentiary project, see Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, pp. 93-96. D. L. Howard, *John Howard: Prison Reformer* (New York, 1958), pp. 114-115. Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*, p. 551.

<sup>11</sup> On Howard’s publications, including translated editions, see Leona Baumgartner, “John Howard (1726-1790) Hospital and Prison Reformer,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 7 (1939): 486-625. On Howard’s distribution of his works, see Rod Morgan, “Howard, John (1726?–1790)” in *Oxford Dictionary of*



Howard did not aim to impress with his turn of phrase; he was not a man of letters. Instead, his works presented detailed empirical information on jails along with ideas for reforms. The bulk of the books are descriptions of prisons around the British Isles and Europe, jail by jail, datum by picayune datum. A reader could learn, for instance, that at the county bridewell in Southwell in Nottinghamshire, there was “a room, on the ground-floor, in which were two men: one of them sentenced for three years, the other for seven, in a damp dungeon, down 10 steps, 14 feet square, 7 ½ feet high . . . Apothecary, Mr. *Hutchinson*. . .” Or that, “The *Prison* at NICE has three stories, with four or five good rooms on each floor . . . Their beds have mattresses and blankets. Their allowance is two pounds of bread per day . . .” Howard’s attention to minutiae is telling. He did draw general principles from his findings, but Howard and his contemporaries approached beneficence by breaking problems down into manageable components. (That preference perhaps was another factor in the failure of the penitentiary, a big venture, proposed by Parliament.) A host of small reforms could add up to large change, but they were undertaken incrementally. The way Howard’s books were excerpted as smaller volumes, for instance on the jails in the Norfolk or Oxford circuits, underscores that point. Activists could consult the sections specifically relevant to the prisons in their area. And they did. The acting magistrate for Wiltshire told Howard that he “naturally turned to your Observations on” a jail in his area and was “very much chagrined” that Howard criticized problems at the jail when the man and his

---

*National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/article/13922> (accessed April 1, 2008). Inscriptions in sermons for charities and other charitable pamphlets reveal the gifting of those materials. Paul Langford highlights Howard and other philanthropists as opinion-makers. Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 483-485. For an analysis that stresses the fraught relationship between commercial society and benevolence, see Sarah Lloyd, “Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners: Conviviality, Benevolence, and Charity Anniversaries in Eighteenth-Century London,” *Journal of British Studies* 41 (2002): 23-57.

colleagues had been at “considerable Pains to rectify such things.” Not all readers were so unhappy. Jeremy Bentham extolled Howard’s books as “a model for method.”<sup>12</sup>

General (genteel) reaction to Howard came from more than his early social-science approach. The scale and single-minded focus of Howard’s journeys marked a new development in the practice of non-religious beneficence. Bentham, who wrote on the topic of prison reform from the late 1770s, revealed contemporaries’ sense of the novelty of Howard undertaking trips solely with philanthropic goals in mind. “You certainly must have heard of [Howard],” Bentham wrote in the spring of 1778 to an Englishman in St. Petersburg, “on the occasion of the extraordinary tours he took all over England, and a considerable part of the continent, merely for the purpose of inspecting the state of the prisons, in order to suggest improvements in that branch of the police.” By the time he died twelve years later, Howard had visited prisons in Austria, Britain, Denmark, Flanders, France, Germany, Greece, Holland, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey. He had also visited hospitals in many of those places, and had studied European and Turkish lazarettos (hospitals for the treatment and quarantine of plague patients) on his 1785-1787 trip. The tens of thousands of miles he covered – over 42,000 by his reckoning after his first decade of travel – cost him, according to Brown, over £30,000.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> On Howard’s poor writing, see Morgan, “Divine Philanthropy,” p. 388. Howard, *State of the Prisons* (1780), p. 282. John Howard, *An Account of the Principal Lazarettos of Europe: With Some Papers Relative to Plague* (Warrington, 1789), p. 56. John Howard, *An Account of the Present State of Prisons . . . in the Norfolk Circuit* (London, [1789]); John Howard, *An Account of the Present State of Prisons . . . in the Oxford Circuit* (London, [1789]); Radnor to John Howard, April 20, 1789, Letters to John Howard, MS English Misc. c. 332, Bodleian Library, Oxford, f. 18; Jeremy Bentham to Rev. John Forster, April/May 1778, *The Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham*, vol. 3, ed. Timothy Sprigge (London, 1968), p. 106.

<sup>13</sup> Jeremy Bentham to Rev. John Forster, April/May 1778, *The Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham*, vol. 3, ed. Timothy Sprigge (London, 1968), pp. 105-6. John Field, *Correspondence of John Howard, Not Before Published* (London, 1855), p. 87. Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*, p. 604.

In spite of the remarkable amount of time, money and distance of his journeys, not to mention the dangers he exposed himself to, Howard's activities were familiar. He went overseas, as he explained in his first publication on prison reform, *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales*, published in 1777, because he "conjectur[ed] that something useful to [his] purpose, might be collected abroad." Like his peers, Howard canvassed foreign institutions for all sorts of details with the idea that that information could be put to use at home.<sup>14</sup>

### *Crafting His Image*

Like his peers too, Howard tended to his image, though he would have been aghast at the idea that he did. Personas could be bought, through clothes, furnishings, and leisure activities, and sold, through print and other forums. Cultural entrepreneurs – such as preacher George Whitefield, philanthropist Jonas Hanway, or thespian David Garrick – and/or their biographers – Garrick's, for instance, or Jonathan Edwards as missionary Daniel Brainerd's – were involved in a similar endeavor of peddling ideas, feelings, and renown. So too was John Howard, and though he seemed to reject consumer culture norms of self-fashioning, he actually managed his image skillfully.<sup>15</sup>

Like other well-known philanthropists, Howard presented himself as modest. "The opinion of the world was a thing to which he never paid any attention," Howard's early nineteenth century biographer wrote inaccurately. Howard paid attention enough to public opinion to make sure he would be remembered for ignoring it. Most famously, he

---

<sup>14</sup> Howard, *State of the Prisons*, p. 78. Black notes that tourism in general was held to be useful for acquiring a variety of information about foreign customs, institutions and practices. Black, *The British Abroad*, pp. 292-293.

<sup>15</sup> Harry S. Stout, *The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1991), esp. chaps. 3 through 6; Taylor, *Jonas Hanway*; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 483-485; Wanko, *Roles of Authority*, esp. chap. 8; Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, pp. 139-148. Edwards edited Brainerd's diary; according to Stevens, the heavy editorial intercession made it an act of creation (see Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, p. 145.)

nixed the plans, underway in London 1786 and 1787 as a public-subscription venture, to erect a statue in his honor. Howard had already written to friends from his travels abroad in a fruitless effort to have them put the kibosh on the statue plans. His character, he told several friends sincerely, recoiled from public praise. But besides close friends, Howard voiced his views more widely. “My private education natural Temper &c all conspire in prompting me to avoid parade & Shew,” Howard wrote to Sir Robert Murray Keith, Britain’s envoy in Vienna and not a confidant of Howard’s, and thus, he explained, he was trying to squelch the statue plan. Finally Howard wrote to the statue committee in December 1786 and again February 1787 and asked for the plans “to be laid aside for ever.” “[T]he execution of your design,” he explained, “would be a cruel punishment to me.” Of course, his letter, revealing that the Patriot of the World was humble too, soon made it into print. In February 1787, Howard’s letters were broadcast in the *Gentleman’s Magazine*. Newspapers in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston picked the second, longer letter up and put it before their readers in April and May. Howard had not explicitly written the letter for public consumption, but he would have had to have been naïve in the extreme not to know that the statue committee – peopled, as Howard knew, with media-savvy men like John Coakley Lettsom and John Nichols, printer of the *Gentleman’s Magazine* – would make the letter public. And, indeed, Howard was not against using the press to make his views known. He had earlier urged friends to advertise, if need be, Howard’s opposition to public honors. That stance brought Howard accolades. “[I]n refusing a statue,” the Anglican cleric Thomas Coombe commented, Howard “shewed that he doubly deserved one.”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p. 482. Brown, *Memoirs of . Howard*, p. 18. The statue campaign documents can be found collected in “Hints Respecting the Monument Erected to John Howard,”

That Howard's image was the product of his efforts at self-fashioning is highlighted by friends' off-message comments. He thought of himself as odd, and he liked to stress that image to others, but after his death Howard's friends were at pains to qualify that image. The daughter of a close friend of Howard, one biographer reported, explained that Howard forewent "every comfort in the prosecution of his extensive schemes of benevolence" but that those sacrifices did not reflect "any austerity which he practised at home." Likewise, Howard's good friend and biographer, John Aikin, commented that "His peculiar habits of life, and the exclusive attention he bestowed in later years on a few objects, caused him to appear more averse to society than I think he really was." Indeed, Howard's letters to friends reveal a sociable man: He routinely asked after mutual acquaintances and related his visits with people on his trips. Furthermore, even on his grueling investigatory trips, Howard found time for other interests. According to Aikin, Howard "he never traveled without some instruments for" meteorological observations. Howard had a lighter side too. He joked to friends that had a statue been put up in his honor, it would have been destroyed on news that he supported a bill to check the drinking of liquor in prisons. And, according to a story told by the writer Samuel Pratt, who reported hearing it from the man himself, Howard playfully evaded one of his many would-be portraitists in a London print shop. In that case,

---

in Lettsom, *Hints on Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science*, vol. 2, pp. 142-228, and in "Papers Relative to a Monument to John Howard," Add. 26055, British Library (BL), London. Howard to Rev. Smith, December 17, 1786, Howard Edwards Collection, HSP; Howard to Samuel Whitbread, January 18, 1787, in Field, *Correspondence of John Howard*, p. 135; Copy of a letter from Howard to Mr. Dilly, October 23, [1786], "Papers Relative to a Monument to John Howard," Add. 26055, BL; Copy of Part of a Letter from Howard to Richard Price, October 13, 1786, in Price to Lettsom, November 3, 1786, Howard Edwards Collection, HSP. Howard to Sir Robert Murray Keith, October 25, 1786, Hardwicke Papers, Add. 35537, f. 187, BL. *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 (1787), p. 101. (New York) *Independent Journal*, April 21, 1787; *Pennsylvania Packet*, April 27, 1787; (Boston) *American Herald*, May 7, 1787. Copy of Part of a Letter from Howard to Richard Price, October 13, 1786, in Price to Lettsom, November 3, 1786, Howard Edwards Collection, HSP. Thomas Coombe, *The Influence of Christianity on the Condition of the World: A Sermon, Preached in Trinity Chapel, Conduit Street, on Sunday, December 13, 1789* (London, 1790), p. 14.

Howard was looking at political prints in a store in St. Paul's Church-yard when he noticed an artist drawing him. Pretending not to have seen the artist and to be laughing at a print, Howard twisted his face this way and that until the artist gave up. According to Pratt, Howard averred that he had “enjoyed the joke” and “practised it more than once, with no less success.”<sup>17</sup>

Besides making sure he would be remembered for not wanting to be remembered, Howard managed his image in other ways too. His letters from his trips are rife with comments about the arduous and heroic nature of his labors, his various forms of self-abnegation (of pleasures, of honors), and his always “calm, steady spirits.” He made a point too of insisting to friends how little he cared about meeting important people before giving detailed news, for instance, of his meeting in Vienna with an appreciative Emperor Joseph, who heard Howard's frank appraisal of Austrian prisons and reportedly made immediate reforms. Since norms of the day called for letters to be read aloud or passed around, Howard's news – his punishing labors, his impact – would not be confined to a few intimates. Sure enough, in February 1787, the *Gentleman's Magazine* related the story of Howard's meeting the emperor. (John Nichols, the publisher, knew good copy when he saw it.) In spite of Howard's claims not to care about public opinion, he knew he was on show. According to a biographer, Howard had his gardener tend his grounds even when he was away in recognition that his celebrity brought many visitors to

---

<sup>17</sup> Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*, p. 397. John Aikin, *A View of the Life, Travels, and Philanthropic Labors of the Late John Howard* (Philadelphia, 1794), p. 148. For evidence of Howard's more sociable side, see Howard's letters to his friends the Rev. Thomas Smith, Samuel Whitbread, and others in Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard* and Field, *Correspondence of John Howard*. Aikin, *A View of the Life . . . of Howard*, pp. 17-18. Thomas Percival to John Haygarth, Manchester, 1787 [sic], in Percival, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Percival*, p. cxx; Lettsom to William Cuming, September 20, 1787, Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom* vol. 1, p. 132. Samuel Jackson Pratt, *Gleanings through Wales, Holland, and Westphalia; With the Views of War and Peace at Home and Abroad*, vol. 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London, 1796), pp. 233-234.

Howard's estate (where visitors could see the cottages Howard built for his tenants.) Moreover, Howard paid heed to public interest in his work; he knew he needed it to carry out his goals. He could not leave London for about a week, Howard told his steward in an undated letter, because he was busy investigating London hospitals. “[T]he public know it,” he added, “and look for my free thoughts on those Institutions” and, therefore, Howard could not be distracted by going to Bedfordshire.<sup>18</sup>

None of this is to charge Howard with hypocrisy. Rather, it is point out that Howard was a man of his time and he, like other men and women of the day, understood the art of image-making. Benjamin Rush captured contemporaries' shrewdness about publicity when he proposed in 1785 that the church bell in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, be rung when the newly-chosen president of Carlisle College arrived in town. “The news of these things will make a clever paragraph in our Philadelphia papers and help allure scholars to our College,” Rush explained. That sort of canniness came about from living in a world in which a consumer economy was booming. Manufacturers pioneered new products and new ways of selling them. Merchants advertised their wares with growing care as the century wore on. Culture – from the arts to religion – became a commodity, as did science and beneficence. The upshot of a thriving consumer culture was a world in which people could fashion themselves for public consumption. Through their clothes, homes, and leisure activities, individuals crafted their images, and through print those more ambitious for notice told stories about themselves. From enormous transatlantic successes such as Benjamin Franklin, Count Rumford, and George Whitefield to minor

---

<sup>18</sup> For examples of his letters about his trips, see Howard to Samuel Whitbread, February 13, 1786; July 22, 1786; May 12, 1788, in Field, *Correspondence of John Howard*, pp. 101-103, 113-115, quotation, pp. 147-148. Eve Tavor Bannet, *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1688-1820* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 47. *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 (1787), pp. 178, 1150-1151. Brown, *Memoirs of. . . Howard*, pp. 395-396. Howard to John Prole [n.d.] in Brown, *Memoirs of. . . Howard*, pp. 513-514.

and fragile successes like accused London forger Margaret Rudd, the eighteenth century was an era of self-invention and self-promotion. Howard, for all his quirks, was a product of that culture, as well he might be since his London home was right near the Foundling Hospital with its art gallery, one of the best examples of the innovative marketing of beneficence. Howard distributed his books on prison reform gratis to movers and shakers, to promote prison reform, of course, but by favoring opinion-makers with his works, he promoted himself too. Akin to Washington with his celebrated retirement from public life after the Revolutionary War, Howard shaped his public image with his refusal of public honors.<sup>19</sup>

Like the mid-eighteenth-century missionaries to North American Indians David Brainerd and John Sergeant, who, in their biographers' telling, worked themselves to death, Howard enacted the Christian ideal of self-sacrifice in the performance of God's labors. In his martyrdom, however noble, Howard did not provide an ideal model for other activists. But future philanthropists could take from him the lessons of devoting oneself full-time to philanthropy and traveling. Whether consciously or not, Thomas Bernard, Rumford, and, later, Dorothea Dix followed in that mold. In the years after his death, Howard became a standard against which to measure other philanthropists.

Bernard was likened to Howard, as was another full-time philanthropist, the New Yorker

---

<sup>19</sup> Benjamin Rush to John Montgomery, June 8, 1785, in Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 356. Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, *Birth of a Consumer Society* (Bloomington, 1982). Maxine Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford, 2005). Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution*, esp. pp. 53-59. Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination*. Jan Golinski, *Science as Public Culture: Chemistry and Enlightenment in Britain, 1760-1820* (Cambridge, 1992). Armstrong and Deischer, "Dr. Henry Moyes, Scotch Chemist" and John Anthony Harrison, "Blind Henry Moyes." Lloyd, "Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners." Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, p. 4. Williams, "The Luxury of Doing Good." Gordon S. Wood, *The Americanization of Benjamin Franklin* (New York, 2004), esp. chap. 1. Sparrow, *Knight of the White Eagle*. Stout, *The Divine Dramatist*. Andrew and McGowen, *The Perreaus & Mrs. Rudd*, esp. pp. 98-109. David H. Solkin, *Painting for Money: The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England* (Yale, 1992), pp. 159-174. Paul Longmore, *The Invention of George Washington* (Charlottesville, 1999). David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (Chapel Hill, 1997), pp. 118-121.



Thomas Eddy. Through both his incredible endeavors and his management of his image, Howard had, not invented, but propelled the towering philanthropist as a cultural form.<sup>20</sup>

*The Alchemy of Celebrity*

Howard crafted his image, but had no plans to become either a star or a cosmopolite: The public turned him into both. Consumers on both sides of the Atlantic played a powerful role in the economy. By demanding novelty in goods and leisure activities, they drove sellers to offer new products or new presentations. Similarly, in the realm of media, consumers relished, responded to, and propelled phenomena launched by self-publicists, such as George Whitefield, or by the press, as in the 1775 case of Margaret Rudd and her fellow accused forgers, the Perreaus.<sup>21</sup> Likewise, publicists and the public capitalized on Howard as another media sensation. Although he had qualms about being lionized, his fans' expectations of him changed his portrayal of his goals as solely national to universal. That even Howard, who resisted the commodification of beneficence by working alone rather than through associated methods, responded to public pressure highlights the extent to which the logic of consumer societies was reshaping philanthropy.

Vital, of course, in the dynamic creation of a celebrity was public perception of the person in question. Edmund Burke had early on flagged what it was about Howard that captured public imagination. Contemporaries endlessly quoted Burke's acclaim of Howard for "visit[ing] all Europe . . . It was a voyage of discovery; a circumnavigation of

---

<sup>20</sup> Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, pp. 139-142. Baker, *The Life of Sir Thomas Bernard*, p. 126. Knapp, *Life of Thomas Eddy*, pp. 10, 16. Thomas J. Brown, *Dorothea Dix: New England Reform* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

<sup>21</sup> David J. Hancock, "Commerce and Conversation in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic: The Invention of Madeira Wine," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 29 (1998): 197-219, esp. pp. 204-207. Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure*, pp. 22-28. Plumb, "The Acceptance of Modernity." Stout, *The Divine Dramatist*, pp. 48-47. Andrew and McGowen, *The Perreaus & Mrs. Rudd*, chap. 3.

charity.” No one matched Burke’s eloquence, but other commentators lauded Howard for his trying and extensive journeys and underlined that by “traversing the globe,” in Erasmus Darwin’s phrase in his verses extolling Howard, the “Consummate Philanthropist” had set a new, cosmopolitan standard for benevolent activism.<sup>22</sup> *Pace* Burke and Darwin, Howard did not circumnavigate or traverse the globe; he traveled in one quarter of it. Admirers in the 1780s, however, cast Howard’s labors, aims, and impact on a global scale.

One reason that Howard was celebrated as the “Patriot of the World” had to do with the tumult in the transatlantic Anglophone community. Eliga Gould has persuasively argued that cosmopolitanism waxed in conservative English circles in the 1780s in response to the threat posed by the breakaway of the American colonies to an image of Britain as an enlightened polity and responsible member of the European community. Neither the dislocations wrought by the American Revolution nor cosmopolitanism as a response was confined to conservative Englishmen. British sympathizers with the American cause, though interested in the well-being of the young republic, still smarted from Britain’s loss of the “unnatural” war: Richard Price and John Coakley Lettsom, for instance, expressed to American friends concern about the United States’s treatment of Loyalists. For their part, Americans had to define their places in the world as citizens of an independent but weak nation. For both parties to the imperial divorce, then, cosmopolitanism filled a need. Donna Andrew has argued that London

---

<sup>22</sup> Bentham to Forster, April/May 1778, *The Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham*, vol. 3, p. 106. Ignatieff comments that Howard’s first book “impressed the public as much by the awesome extent of its research as by its moral fervor” and adds that the Royal Statistics Society in the 1870s “laud[ed] him as a father of social science.” Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, p. 52. Burke, “Speech at Bristol Previous to the Election 6 September 1780,” pp. 637-638. Erasmus Darwin, *The Botanic Garden. Vol. 2* (1791; rpt. Merton, Yorkshire), p. 81. Letter from Anglus to Mr. Urban, *Gentleman’s Magazine* 56 (1786), p. 359.

philanthropy in the 1770s and 1780s lacked the direction that the pursuit of national policy goals provided the city's charitable institutions in earlier and later decades.<sup>23</sup>

Rather than lacking a sense of direction in the 1770s and 1780s, however, an unbounded moral vision gave British philanthropists of all stripes a purpose as Britain came to terms with the loss of the Thirteen Colonies. Similarly, Americans could both engage in a transnational community and assert themselves on the world stage by pursuing philanthropy as citizens of the world. Commending John Howard in that vein then, gave people on both sides of the Atlantic a way to affirm their liberality.

Grappling with the withdrawal of the Thirteen Colonies from the British Empire dovetailed with worldwide quests for knowledge and commercial integration to foster the sense of moral responsibility for strangers. Burke hinted at that second reason when he termed Howard's travels "a voyage of discovery. . ." Howard's tours took place in an era when James Cook and Louis-Antoine de Bougainville circumnavigated the globe and when many Britons and Americans participated in quests after useful knowledge, especially of natural history, from around the world. Knowledge meant power – to treat diseases better, to grow new crops, to settle and exploit new lands – and the apparent march of knowledge fostered confidence about capabilities to act at home and abroad. Moreover, the new voyages of discovery and more mundane travels and migrations brought faraway places closer. Acting on the ideal of universal benevolence, then, seemed to be within reach, yet most charitable organizations remained local in

---

<sup>23</sup> Gould, "American Independence and Britain's Counter-Revolution." Richard Price to Benjamin Rush, January 1, 1783, Rush Manuscripts, Dickinson College Part I, f. 11, LCP. John Coakley Lettsom to Thomas Parke, July 21, 1785, Etting Collection, Scientists, f. 56, HSP. Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 162.

operations. By embracing John Howard, Britons and Americans laid claim to the accomplishments of a figure who transcended local boundaries.

In addition, ideas about commerce bolstered cosmopolitanism. Not only was commerce shrinking the world, the eighteenth-century idea, explained most famously by Montesquieu, that commerce created bonds of sociability among peoples led some to imagine new relations among nations based on free trade rather than competition and conflict. Such ideas appealed especially to Americans, now facing new strictures on trade. But though they were in part self-serving, ideas about free trade plus the experience of building a federal union out of disunited states prompted Americans to favor new types of ties among nations. DeWitt Clinton, in his 1794 speech to the Society of Black Friars in New York, cited the (very exaggerated) impact of Howard as an example of the power of benevolence. Clinton then went on in a Kantian vein with a vision of how “the benevolent principle” could lead to a world of nations “happy in each other.” “[A] Congress of Ambassadors from all the nations of the world” would “consult upon the ways and means of augmenting the mass of human happiness.” That idea, Clinton hastened to add, was no mere fantasy, “for it is only an extension of the confederacies of bordering states, an amplification of the design of Henry the Great of France to unite the views of the European Nations.” Howard’s British admirers routinely struck patriotic notes when lauding Howard – patriotically praising Howard as an exemplar of British cosmopolitanism – but they too used Howard to criticize the existing order in which shedding blood brought men glory.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, pp. 56-63; Thomas Paine, *Common Sense and Related Writings*, edited with an Introduction by Thomas P. Slaughter (Boston, 2001), pp. 89-90. David C. Hendrickson, *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding* (Lawrence, Kan., 2003). Clinton, *An Oration on Benevolence, Delivered Before the Society of Black Friars*, pp. 15, 16-18. “Hints Respecting the

Several factors, then, encouraged liberal outlooks and led Britons and Americans to turn Howard, through the news they circulated about him, into a cosmopolite who practiced philanthropy on a global scale. Anglus (identified by Lettsom as the Rev. Dr. John Warner), writing to the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1786, reported on Howard's plans for his lazaretto tour and explained that Howard aimed to test ways to stop the spread of the plague. Anglus did not need to tell his readers that the plague ignored national borders and disrupted international trade. Howard's effort to combat the plague, by its nature, was impartial. Readers of the *Pennsylvania Packet* learnt that Howard's presence in Vienna had led to improvements in Austrian prisons. He could have an effect far from home, that news said. Likewise, the *New York Daily Advertiser* printed, to name a few, Burke's paeon to Howard, a letter from John Coakley Lettsom to Benjamin Rush about Howard's impact in Vienna, and the news, from another letter from Lettsom to Rush, that in mid-1789 "Mr. Howard departed from London on a philanthropic expedition to our imprisoned fellow creatures in some parts of Holland, Germany, Constantinople, Cairo, Aleppo, and Barbary." Foreign Europeans and even Muslims – well beyond the groups of co-religionists helped by transnational religious-philanthropic networks – were worthy of charitable attention, the Anglophone public was told. "[I]n an age when a HOWARD has set the glorious example of doing good to all ranks of all communities and climes," the Royal Humane Society put the contemporary thinking most clearly, "an institution which boasts the appellation of *Humane* would blush to confine its influences . . . to the city where it is established, or in the country where it is patronised."<sup>25</sup> Through their

---

Monument Erected to John Howard" in Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 2, pp. 151-171.

<sup>25</sup> Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 2, p. 155. Letter from Anglus to Mr. Urban, *Gentleman's Magazine* 56 (1786), pp. 359-361. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 57 (1787), pp. 1150-1151. *New*

plaudits of the prison reformer, his contemporaries made Howard a symbol of cosmopolitan philanthropy.

Moreover, Howard's fellow philanthropists tried to use his celebrity as a tool towards their own ends. John Haygarth, the Chester, England, doctor, had hoped that Howard would mention in one of his books the school for poor girls in Chester that was a pet project of Haygarth's. Since Howard had approved of the girls' school when he and Haygarth had talked about it, Howard's "silence on this head rather disappointed [Haygarth]." Howard's "recommendation" of the boys' schools, Haygarth told Howard, "will probably have an extensive influence in exciting other towns to adopt like regulations," and Haygarth wanted to put Howard's clout to work in spreading the model of the girls' school too. Haygarth wanted only public backing of a project from Howard, but other people wanted more from the celebrity philanthropist. Jeremy Bentham, who hoped his own penal reform ideas would be adopted in Russia and who saw Howard as an ally in the cause of penal reform, "wish[ed]" Empress Catherine "would invite [Howard] to Petersburg."<sup>26</sup> Members of the Irish Parliament evidently asked Howard to visit; he told his friend Samuel Whitbread in 1786 that he planned to go to Ireland to "perform his promise to some Irish members."<sup>27</sup> Although, again, Howard was by no means the first or only person to champion prison reform in the eighteenth century, his word carried unique weight. In 1787, the *Barbados Mercury* reprinted a report, inaccurate as far as the evidence reveals, from a London newspaper, that said that "[t]he

---

*York Daily Advertiser* April 21, 1787; October 20, 1787; January 14, 1790. *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 246. The last plague epidemic in England was in the 1660s. England's government had taken measures to tackle the plague from the early sixteenth century. Slack, *Poverty & Policy in Tudor and Stuart England*, pp. 51, 116-117, 138-141, 143-144, 147-148.

<sup>26</sup> John Haygarth to John Howard, May 30, 1789, ff. 24-34, Letters to John Howard, MS English Misc. c. 332, Bodleian Library, Oxford. Bentham to Forster, April/May 1778, *The Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham*, vol. 3, p. 106

<sup>27</sup> John Howard to Samuel Whitbread, October 26, 1786, *Correspondence of John Howard*, p. 124.

humane Mr. Howard is meditating a voyage to the West-Indies, in order to make the gaols in that part of the world objects of legislative concern and attention.” Howard alone, the report implied, could spur action. Prison reform was already underway in the United States in the 1780s, but Benjamin Rush nevertheless wanted Howard to tour the country. “Shall not the United States be favoured with a visit from you,” Rush asked Howard in 1789. The United States, Rush explained, had its share of problems in prisons – “tho’ perhaps in a less degree, from their size & number, than in Europe” – and, Rush thought, Howard might be able to have a greater impact in the still-forming country than in Europe. He promised Howard the “[s]ervices of thousands” of Americans, especially Quakers, and concluded by urging Howard to “Come then Dear Sir, and direct [the troubled waters] into their proper channel.”<sup>28</sup>

Howard died before receiving Rush’s letter. Whatever the answer would have been, Rush’s request hints at the importance of consumer power in philanthropy. Rush’s appeal to Howard, like Haygarth’s and the comment in the *Barbados Mercury* too, was based on the assumption that the public responded to luminaries. Prominent people had long been asked to lend their luster to charitable enterprises. In Howard’s case, however, beneficence had been a means to celebrity because his far-flung activities took place at a time when a cultural drive to find sensations coincided with a cosmopolitan thrust on both sides of the Atlantic in the 1780s. Although Howard disclaimed adulation, his admirers took control of his image. Meanwhile, his fellow agenda-setters wanted to control his actions to advance their own concerns based on the assumption that endorsements of reform projects by a star opinion-maker – Howard’s claim to fame,

---

<sup>28</sup> *Barbados Mercury*, August 21, 1787. Rush to John Howard, October 14, 1789, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 528.

came from researching and writing, not doing – would sway people from Russia to the West Indies to Pennsylvania.<sup>29</sup>

That assumption arose from the larger phenomenon reshaping beneficence: Over the long eighteenth century, consumers' demand for novelty and choice in commercial leisure activities including associated philanthropy helped drive the elaboration of charitable infrastructures. "The public expect, every time they are addressed, to be presented with something that shall at least have the appearance of novelty," one London charity's annual report began in 1781-82. "In matters of entertainment, this expectation is justifiable; in those of business, interest lessens its forces; and, in cases of humanity," the writer instructed his audience, "benevolent minds may entirely dispense with it." However much the writer wanted to tamp down demands for novelty, he revealed that leaders recognized that they had to respond to hankerings for fresh material and the changing winds of philanthropic fashion. Activists, then, sought new ways to market philanthropy, and they, like subscribers, gravitated to new (or, often, merely reworked) methods of dispensing aid.<sup>30</sup>

To attract would-be supporters' attention to new causes and to maintain interest in existing endeavors, leaders used various strategies. Agenda-setters publicized causes by inserting letters into newspapers, pamphlets, and books; the letters invited readers into conversations among fellow philanthropists. Charities advertised with reports inserted in

---

<sup>29</sup> The term opinion-maker is borrowed from Paul Langford. Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p. 483.

<sup>30</sup> *RHS Reports 1781-1782*, p. iii. James Stephen Taylor notes that novelty attracted support to charities in mid-eighteenth-century London. Taylor, *Jonas Hanway*, pp. 71, 123. On the appeal of novelty to American and British publics in general, see Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution*, p. 170; J. H. Plumb, "The Acceptance of Modernity"; Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure*, p. 21. Similarly, Christopher Brown argues that early Quaker abolitionists' "circulars failed to capture the public imagination, because their preference for conscientious witness and humble moral appeals could foster a moral consensus but not sustained fervor or collective action." In other words, their circulars were boring. Brown, *Moral Capital*, p. 442.



periodicals or printed as pamphlets. These reports were pitched in two ways, informational and emotional, to appeal to head and heart. The informational component covered finances, number of people aided (i.e., processed – then and now, the most easily quantifiable metric), names of officers, and the like. Leaders, of course, provided that information to assure subscribers that their money was well-spent. But charities had to compete in urban cultural marketplaces that included many options for sociable and sentimental experiences – other charities, other societies and clubs, lectures, and also books. To cater, therefore, to supporters’ emotions and imaginations, charities’ reports often opened with language that ran the gamut from overblown to very overblown or included poignant descriptions of the beneficiaries and benefactors. Likewise, charities courted the public with anniversary festivals, sermons, and musical performances. Such events offered opportunities to be entertained, to be intellectually engaged, to be moved by accounts of the evil to be combated or of the good done, and to mingle with other subscribers.<sup>31</sup>

Increasingly, agenda-setters used celebrity to advance their projects. In some cases, they recruited traveling luminaries to draw attention to their causes. Haygarth and Rush had hoped for Howard to lend his both his expertise and prestige to their ventures. Alexander Johnson enlisted Henry Moyes, “one of the literary phaenomena of the present age,” to garner interest in the cause of resuscitation. The Norwich, England, poor-relief organization, the Scots Society or Society of Universal Good-will, named Mary Hayley,

---

<sup>31</sup> On English philanthropic publicity efforts, see Stevens, *The Poor Indians*; Lloyd, “Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners”; Williams, “The Luxury of Doing Good”; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 484-485. On appealing to head and heart, see Porter, “The Gift Relation,” p. 150. On American publicity efforts, see Chapter Six. On the issue of counting people processed, rather than assessing outcomes, see William Easterly, “How, and How Not, To Stop Aids in Africa,” *New York Review of Books* 54 (August 16, 2007).

famed mainly for being the sister of London radical John Wilkes, as Directress for its projected North American branch. (See Chapter Four.) More often, activists invoked stars, especially John Howard, Rumford, and later Edward Jenner, in print or in speeches. Opinion-makers put celebrities to various uses. John Howard was invoked to extol impartiality in beneficence, to condemn certain institutions, and to encourage others to do good works. Activists also lionized lesser-known people. In his charitable how-to manual, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance and Medical Science*, John Coakley Lettsom included silhouettes of “distinguished characters” in philanthropy including Howard, Rumford, Jenner, and William Hawes, well-known as the Royal Humane Society founder, but also Robert Raikes, famous as a founder of the Sunday School movement but no John Howard, and Nathaniel Hulme, Lettsom’s colleague at the General Dispensary. “[V]iew[ing] this assemblage of philanthropy,” Lettsom explained, would lead people to “the most pleasing reflections” and would humanize the heart “with the tender energies of wishing to go and do so likewise.” These men (and one woman) deserved acclaim in Lettsom’s view, but, in addition, even minor notables could help capture would-be supporters’ imaginations or sentiments in favor of specific endeavors or the general cause of philanthropy.<sup>32</sup>

Howard’s admirers sincerely esteemed him, but they also appreciated the power of celebrity in raising the profile of charitable enterprises. By stopping the plan for a statue in his honor, Howard resisted the full implications of the commercialization of beneficence in spite of his care in crafting his image. But he was not impervious to the public reaction to him. Over time, it had an impact on Howard; his shift to fit the public response to him confirms that he had an eye for publicity. When Howard began his

---

<sup>32</sup> Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 1, p. iv.

travels abroad to pursue prison reform, he went to Europe to collect useful information prompted by “love to my country.” “The redress and investigation of foreign abuses,” Howard told readers of his first book, “was not my object.” Over the next decade, his views changed as he realized his influence and fame went far beyond the British Isles. In a 1781 letter from Moscow, Howard informed a good friend that he would not leave Moscow until he had “made repeated visits to the Prisons and Hospitals, as the first Man in the Kingdom assured him that [his] publication would be translated into Russian.” A few years later, the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons closed a letter to Howard with the hope that he would “enjoy the pleasure of Seeing the Success of your Labours in the cause of humanity in every part of the Globe.” That kind of feedback, from many a source, had an effect on Howard. By the end of his life, love of mankind, not just love of country, animated his travels. In the introduction to his last book, published posthumously, Howard explained to readers that he had set off on his final tour “to gain further knowledge” – and here he slightly paraphrased a comment he had made in a letter to a friend – “with the hope that the torch of philanthropy might be conveyed into remote countries.”<sup>33</sup>

Cosmopolitanism appealed broadly to gentlemen in the 1780s, and Howard knew that marketing ideas could be advanced by catering to their interest. Although Howard

---

<sup>33</sup> Howard, *State of the Prisons*, pp 4, 78. Howard to Rev. Smith, September 7, 1781, in Brown, *Memoirs of . . . Howard*, p. 331. John Swanwick and William White, secretary and president, respectively, of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, to Howard, January 14, 1788, Letters to John Howard, MS English Misc. c. 332, f. 15, Bodleian Library, Oxford. *Appendix; Containing Observations Concerning Foreign Prisons and Hospitals: Collected by Mr. Howard, in his Concluding Tour*, ed. John Aikin, [London, 1791], p. 3. In a letter to his friend Whitbread from Moscow in 1789, Howard wrote “I labour to convey the Torch of Philanthropy in these distant regions.” Howard to Samuel Whitbread, September 22, 1789, Letters to John Howard, MS English Misc. c. 332, f. 15 Bodleian Library, Oxford.

resisted celebrity, even he gave in to the logic of responding to the public's wishes. In that way, the self-denying, avowedly peculiar Philanthropist was a man of his time.

### *Distance and Sympathy*

On both sides of the Atlantic, people endorsed the ideal of moral responsibility directed towards strangers through acclaim for Howard. One effect, however, of doing so was to deflect attention from the recipients of beneficence. Changes since the sixteenth century had been undermining the personal nature of charitable activity.

Bureaucratization of aid increased over the eighteenth century, but though they favored rationalized solutions, donors also expected philanthropy to have an emotional aspect. Imagining relationships with a celebrity gave contemporaries a way to experience sympathy in commercialized charity. That focus on philanthropists, however, furthered the long-term trend that was rendering intended beneficiaries into anonymous actors in large-scale eleemosynary enterprises.

Philanthropy is less personal than charity, and cosmopolitan philanthropy is even less so. Today's cosmopolitan charitable organizations, such as Save the Children USA, overcome the problem that distance and difference might impede sympathy, and thus the flow of donations, for example by offering donors the chance to sponsor individual children.<sup>34</sup> In the eighteenth century, there were no equivalents outside of religious philanthropy to organizations, like Save the Children USA, that operate in their own right on an international scale. Only through the workings of a far-flung web did individuals and organizations engage in transnational philanthropy. But other factors were making distance, rather than personal ties, an ever-greater trait in charitable practice.

---

<sup>34</sup> Actually, there are similarities in the practice of philanthropy in the eighteenth century and today. Save the Children USA operates transnationally in its own capacity. In addition, it is part of an international alliance of nationally-organized Save the Children organizations. See [www.savethechildren.org](http://www.savethechildren.org).

The place of personal ties in beneficence had been under stress for centuries. In Catholic thought, reciprocity – relationships between the parties – was central to charity, with reciprocity between God and donor paramount. Aiding the poor was a gift to God too, and donors hoped that their charity would, in turn, aid their salvation. Mutuality also characterized the relationship between donor and recipient. In exchange for alms, recipients, the hope was, would pray for the souls of donors. The Protestant Reformation eroded those ideas, which were already being questioned by humanist thinkers. “In a profound sense, the religious reformations of the sixteenth century were a quarrel about gifts,” Natalie Zemon Davis writes, “that is, about whether humans can reciprocate to God, about whether humans can put God under obligation, and about what this means for what people should give to each other.” John Calvin rejected the idea that exchange should play any role in charity. People could not have a reciprocal relationship with God. While Jesus and his redeeming death were gifts from God, humans could only obey and love God, not bargain through charitable acts for salvation. Calvin allowed a “general and diffuse” reciprocity in gift-giving among people – a “mutual obligation” among Christians – but in his conception, charity should be gratuitous and general. There should neither be “a pattered structure, a rhythm of giving and receiving” nor partiality in charity.<sup>35</sup>

In Reformed Geneva, those types of ideas about charity were put into practice (before Calvin’s arrival in the city) with the founding of the Geneva General Hospital in 1535. The Genevan reforms were only more radical versions of welfare reforms in other, Catholic as well as Protestant, cities. Two features of the hospital capture sixteenth-

---

<sup>35</sup> Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*, pp. 100, 114-120, quotations pp. 118, 119, 120. See also Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge*, chap. 3, esp. pp. 58-74.

century trends in European welfare policy. First, laymen ran the hospital, whereas before the Reformation the Church monopolized organized charity. Second, the charity dispensed by the hospital was rationalized. Existing welfare institutions were abolished and their functions were combined into the comprehensive General Hospital. (The Hospital served native Genevans, but did not aid outsiders beyond providing a single-night's lodging. Poor French refugees arriving in the city as a result of Reformation turmoil received aid from an institution funded by their wealthier compatriots.) What is important here about the rationalization of welfare is that it was part of a long-term move away from personal charity and towards more impersonal philanthropy. Protestant thinkers conceptualized anew the role of relationships in charity, but the waning importance of relationships in beneficence did not only owe to the Reformation. Elite hospitality, which included routinely providing for poorer neighbors, declined in early modern England and with it a casual and familiar type of charity. That change came about, according to one historian, from the gentry's gradual migration to London and its development of a national, in place of local, orientation.<sup>36</sup>

Besides the distinction between more and less personal forms of aid, charity and philanthropy can be distinguished in a slightly different way. Tudor and Stuart England, W. K. Jordan argues, saw a revolution in beneficence. Tudor and Stuart Englishmen replaced medieval alms-giving, which was "at once casual and ineffective in its incidence, never seeking to do more than relieve conspicuous and abject suffering," with charitable "endowments designed to eradicate [poverty's] causes by a great variety of

---

<sup>36</sup> Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*, p. 12. Robert Kingdon, "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva." Felicity Heal, "The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 102 (1984): 66-93, and Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*. See also Grell and Cunningham, "Reformation and Changes Welfare Provision in Early Modern Northern Europe" and Grell, "The Protestant Imperative of Christian Care and Neighbourly Love" in *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe*.

undertakings.”<sup>37</sup> Although Jordan does not say it himself, that distinction in aims of benefactions – ameliorative versus transformative – is another way of distinguishing charity from philanthropy, and one that complements the distinction between familiar and rationalized forms of giving. Ending poverty, as opposed to relieving poor folks, is inherently impersonal. The thrust in European and American welfare has been towards philanthropy for several centuries, but some forms of giving, such as aiding sufferers in disasters, blur the line between charity and philanthropy, and casual, personal charity has never disappeared. People have continued to take up collections for distressed acquaintances and, in spite of voices for hundreds of years condemning it, to give alms to beggars.

Nor, in the eighteenth-century Anglo-American world, did reciprocity disappear from the charitable equation. Many Protestant clerics throughout the century held out the hope of recompense in the afterlife for charitable deeds in this life. Benefits could be realized in the here-and-now too: Social harmony could be bought with aid to the poor. That idea plus the need to ensure only the worthy poor received aid led to the system of recommendations from subscribers for needy folks’ admission to charitable institutions such as hospitals and dispensaries. As Roy Porter puts it, this system was “traditional paternalism institutionalized.” The recipients of this type of charity were expected not to pray for their benefactors but to defer to them.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Jordan, *Philanthropy in England*, p. 17. For criticism of Jordan’s economic analysis, see William G. Bittle and R. Todd Lane, “Inflation and Philanthropy in England: A Re-Assessment of W.K. Jordan’s Data,” *The Economic History Review* 29 (1976): 203-210. For a good study of the changes in welfare practice in one community in seventeenth-century England, see Underdown, *Fire From Heaven*.

<sup>38</sup> Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 25. Christine Leigh Heyrman, “The Fashion Among More Superior People: Charity and Social Change in Provincial New England, 1700-1740,” *American Quarterly* 34 (1982): 107-124, esp. pp. 112-112. For later eighteenth-century sermons in which clerics promised returns in the afterlife for charitable giving, see for example. John Clarke, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, Eleventh of June*

The recommendation system bridged differences between charity and philanthropy. Although the use of recommendations maintained a familiar element, it signaled the long-term direction in which beneficence was moving from the Reformation onwards by refracting the charitable relationship through enterprises that aimed at systemic relief. Thus, over the eighteenth century beneficiaries were increasingly becoming interchangeable parts in rationalized charitable enterprises even when those ventures were not domiciliary. (From the perspective of poor folks, that statement could be inverted to say that charitable enterprises were interchangeable parts in poor people's survival strategies.) Historians have found the shift towards growing distance between donors and recipients occurring at different times in different places as hierarchal social differentiation hardened into class and, in America, poverty became endemic.<sup>39</sup> When the waning of ties between donors and recipients combined with the trend towards the rationalization of welfare institutions begun with the Reformation and the expansive scale of philanthropists' vision, poor people turned into mere parts in factories of charity.

The diagram of a soup-house in John Coakley Lettsom's manual, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance and Medical Science*, captures that development. Lettsom's *Hints* were replete with all sorts of information useful for would-be founders of various charitable projects, and his section on soup-houses included sample by-laws, sample forms, recipes, and a ground plan of the soup house in Orchard Street, Westminster, (London), founded in the late 1790s. The ground plan shows where the

---

1793 (Boston, 1793), pp. 27-28; Chandler Robbins, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1796* (Boston, 1796), p. 23. Porter, "The Gift Relation," quotation p. 172. See also Alexander, *Render Them Submissive*.

<sup>39</sup> For a good study of how poor people in eighteenth-century London used various resources available to them as parts of an overall survival strategy, see Hitchcock, *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London*. Heyrman, "The Fashion Among More Superior People," p. 114. Fissell, *Patients, Power, and the Poor*, pp. 113-125. Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, pp. 56-63.



soup-making equipment is, where the managers' room is, and, most strikingly, how applicants moved through the soup-house assembly line. The applicants of soup needed recommendations (and had to pay a halfpenny for the soup) so a personal element remained. But as activists like Lettsom urged the spread of institutions far and wide, they furthered trends that were turning the poor from neighbors into cogs in transnational systems of welfare. The experience of John Howard himself epitomizes the move towards the depersonalization of beneficence. He began his charitable ventures with traditional paternalist efforts directed towards his tenants, but, though he continued to practice charity towards his tenants, his focus shifted to large-scale transformative endeavors.<sup>40</sup>

That trend was intertwined with the flourishing of sympathy as a cultural touchstone, in the words of one historian. Eighteenth-century conceptions of sympathy, developed most famously by Adam Smith, held that the ability to envision oneself in another's place underlay the ability to identify with that person's feelings. The growth in beneficence, which included finding new groups of sufferers to aid, then, should logically intersect with greater emotional engagement with needy folks. In theory, properly sensible people would really feel for the poor or insane or enslaved by imagining themselves as poor or insane or enslaved. They would draw closer. In that case, the trajectory should have been the opposite of depersonalization. But instead, the flourishing culture of sensibility coincided with growing distance between rich and poor and the concomitant rationalization of philanthropy. Keith Thomas has argued that attention to animals' feelings came about from growing distance between animals and

---

<sup>40</sup> Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 1, pp. 102-182, see especially pp. 102-135. The diagram is between pages 124 and 125.

humans: people could sentimentalize animals when their livelihoods did not depend directly on them. Likewise, growing distance between the poor and the well-off fostered imaginative engagement with unknown sufferers, for instance, imprisoned people around Europe or drowning victims anywhere. That commiseration, however, was general, not familiar.<sup>41</sup>

Contemporaries perceived the increasingly impersonal tenor in philanthropy and in social relations between classes. Critics of cosmopolitanism berated the unfeeling nature of “universal philanthropy.” “[W]here is our benevolence,” asked John Sylvester John Gardiner in an 1803 sermon to the Massachusetts Humane Society, “[i]f an object of compassion implores our assistance, and we stop to consider, if there may not be another in the world, more wretched and with stronger claims on our charity.” Unlike Gardiner, Lettsom embraced expansive beneficence, but he worried about well-off people’s ignorance of the lives of the poor. In a essay first published in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* in 1780, Lettsom – a passionate man, who felt and enjoyed feeling sympathy for the poor – pulled at the heartstrings with a story about a visit he had made to a poor family’s home in the winter. His aim, he explained, was to try “excite . . . compassion for our fellow creatures.”<sup>42</sup> Lettsom had realized that a widening social gulf between rich and poor hurt needy people’s access to charitable aid and had hoped to provoke greater tenderness among the well-off. In the anxious decades last decades of the eighteenth century, however, London charities became less helpful materially towards the poor with

---

<sup>41</sup> Knott, “Sensibility and the American War for Independence,” p. 27. Fiering, “Irresistible Compassion,” pp. 210-212. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, see esp. pp. 181-182.

<sup>42</sup> John Sylvester John Gardiner, *A Sermon Delivered Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1803* (Boston, 1803), p. 11. Lettsom, “Hints Respecting the Immediate Effects of Poverty” in John Coakley Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 1 (of 1 vol.) (London, 1797), pp. 89-101, quotation p. 92.

a shift in focus from the corporeal welfare of the poor to their spiritual and moral condition. Renewing the frayed ties among the classes became a key goal of the self-help charities (such as SBCP programs to teach poor people to make economical soups) founded in the late eighteenth century in response to elite fear of the dependency by the poor.<sup>43</sup>

The quasi-paternalist (to borrow historian Donna Andrew's term) self-help charities aimed in part to overcome the impersonal nature of large charitable institutions. Other movements in the late eighteenth century faced a different set of issues. The antislavery and humane society causes both worked to help strangers. Both movements furthered the global and unfamiliar direction in philanthropy. But to win and keep support, especially in an era of sensibility, they needed to give their publics emotional content and a semblance of personal connections. Therefore, drawing on Smithian ideas about sympathetic responses following from envisioning oneself in another's situation, activists offered up tales of misery and woe. Olaudah Equiano's tale of his life, published on both sides of the Atlantic in the late 1780s and early 1790s aimed to prick consciences and foster emotional engagement with enslaved people through the use of vivid scenes of the horrors of the slave trade and slavery. Humane societies used two tactics. First, they invoked supporters' self-interest to raise funds by pointing out that "the distresses we attempt to alleviate may possibly be [*subscribers*'] own." The societies were not wrong on that score, but, in general, supporters were being asked to aid unknown people. Thus, humane societies mitigated that anonymity by highlighting in annual reports or in newspapers the cases of some of the rescued folks. (Proving that

---

<sup>43</sup> Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, chap. 6, esp. pp. 174-177. For a similar development in Philadelphia in the 1810s, see Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, pp. 63-89.

their resuscitation methods worked had initially been an important reason for printing the cases.) In addition, the Royal Humane Society gave supporters an emotional feast by parading some of the people – mainly pliant children – restored to life at anniversary festivals. (The procession was the high point of the festival, provoking many a tear from subscribers. Rescued people, however, were less keen on that custom. The RHS paid its messenger one guinea each year “for his very extraordinary trouble in collecting a number of the objects for the anniversary” and threw meals into the bargain for the rescued people.) But, though charitable organizations pimped individual beneficiaries for subscribers’ pleasure, they also underscored and furthered the impersonal nature of rationalized philanthropy with annual tallies that reduced the people aided to numbers.<sup>44</sup>

Celebrations of Howard had a similar effect. By turning Howard into a cosmopolite, admirers had expressed concern for the welfare of all of humankind. That concern, however, was vague and general – as J. S. J. Gardiner, in his sermon to the Massachusetts Humane Society, charged that “universal philanthropy” was. Discussions of Howard’s travels centered on Howard, with scant attention to the prisoners in the jails he toured. Anglus, in his letter proposing a statute to the Philanthropist, had waxed rhapsodic about the depth of Howard’s sympathy and about his heroic undertaking, but spared but a few words for the people who would supposedly be helped by the labors

---

<sup>44</sup> Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 195, 194; see also Cunningham, Introduction to *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform*, p. 6. *The Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa the African Written by Himself*, edited with an introduction by Paul Edwards (Harlow, 1992). For a new work that argues that key aspects of Equiano’s autobiography are invented, see Vincent Carretta, *Equiano The African: Biography of a Self-Made Man* (Athens, Ga., 2005). *RHS Reports 1776*, p. i. *RHS Reports 1774-1815*. Massachusetts Humane Society discourses 1787-1813. On RHS anniversary festivals and the procession of restored people, see Williams, ““The Luxury of Doing Good,”” see esp. 99-100. First Minute Book of the [Royal Humane] Society, April 24, 1777; March 29, 1775, Royal Humane Society archives, Royal Humane Society, London. For examples of tallies, see, for instance, the *RHS Reports 1800* (London, [1800]), p. 8, or the Philadelphia Dispensary annual return of patients in the *American Museum* vol. 4, pp. 161-162. The idea that organizations pimped beneficiaries borrows from Halttunen, “Humanitarianism and the Pornography of Pain in Anglo-American Culture.”

Anglus extolled. Likewise, when John Redman Coxe exhorted his brethren in the Philadelphia Medical Society in 1800 to practice charity, he focused not on the suffering of poor Philadelphians whose needs the doctors might meet. Instead, Coxe proclaimed that “[t]rue Charity does not limit her bounty to one class or description of men; She regards the whole human race as relatives; and the world as her abode” and then launched into a panegyric to Howard. Much as advocates of missionary activity to American Indians used pity for Indians to build bonds within the transatlantic British community with Indians receding into the background, so too did speech and writing about Howard concentrate on activists, not on objects of aid.<sup>45</sup>

Celebrating Howard made the Philanthropist, not needy folks, the focus of imagined relations and, in doing so, gave his admirers a taste of magnificence. Consumer societies that arose after the civilizing process offered comfort, not greatness. Eighteenth-century philanthropic projects, with their transformative and increasingly global goals, held out a modicum of glory, as the incessant comments lauding Howard, Jenner, and other philanthropists over “men who have waded through human blood” implies. For ordinary activists, greatness could be best accessed through identification with a towering figure. Rev. Henry Colman captured that dimension to Howard’s endeavors in comments to the Massachusetts Humane Society in 1812. “When we read the history of Howard; when with him we traverse the near and distant abodes of misery and disease,” – Colman made his listeners not mere readers of Howard’s travels but his traveling companions – “when we follow him to the hospital, the penitentiary, and prison;

---

<sup>45</sup> Letter from Anglus to Mr. Urban, *Gentleman’s Magazine* 56 (1786), p. 359. John Redman Coxe, *A Short View of the Importance and Respectability of Medicine. Read Before the Philadelphia Medical Society, on the 7<sup>th</sup> of February, 1800* (Philadelphia, 1800), pp. 20-22, quotation p. 20. Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, chap. 2.

when we descend with him into the dark and solitary dungeon . . . ; when we explore with him the extensive regions, which pestilence has desolated; . . . who does not perceive,” Colman asked, “that such men are indeed the honour and justly the boast of human nature?” You live vicariously through Howard, Colman told his listeners. Donors were supposed to feel sympathy for the poor, but they were expected to balance their compassion with sound decision-making. Thus, they had to hold their feelings for needy folks in check. The well-off, however, could invest stronger emotions in known characters such as John Howard. The emotional content and the focus of philanthropy lay in the relationship with the exalted philanthropist.<sup>46</sup>

The 1786-87 campaign for a statue to Howard had likewise been as much about subscribers to the campaign as about Howard. Besides trying “to excite emulation to go and do likewise,” the proponents of the statue plan thought, as Lettsom put it, that “[p]ublic approbation of private and public virtues, . . . reflects the highest honour on the community; for to reward virtue is the pleasing proof of its prevalence.” The Rev. Dr. John Warner, aka Anglus, went even further in usurping Howard’s activities as those of Howard’s admirers when he asked “[t]hose persons . . . who, feeling like Men, Christians, and Britons, the exalted merit which does so much honour to their nature, their religious, and their country” to support the statue plan. By the time Howard scotched the statue plan, 601 people had subscribed over £1,400. Some subscribers asked for their money

---

<sup>46</sup> Letter to Mr. Urban, *Gentleman’s Magazine* 56 (1786), p. 485; on Jenner see also, for example, *Public Characters, or Cotemporary [sic] Biography* (Baltimore, 1803), p. 411. Henry Colman, *A Discourse Delivered in the Chapel Church, Boston, Before the Humane Society of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1812), p. 19. Porter, “The Gift Relation,” p. 150. On the shift from societies that prized martial glory to societies that prized comfort, see Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization* (1939; Oxford, 1994), esp. pp. 156-178, 448-456; Crowley, *The Invention of Comfort*. For a related point about ideals of valor impelling young American and British men “looking to win public regard through spectacular feats of charity to the enslaved,” see Brown, *Moral Capital*, pp. 437-441.

back, including the Glasgow subscribers who used the funds as seed money for a public infirmary. £200 of the remaining money went to releasing imprisoned debtors. The rest of the money, the subscribers voted, would go to striking medals honoring Howard. Medal would be given to the King and to the sovereigns of realms where Howard had been treated well (read not France) and all the subscribers would get copies of an engraved print of the medal. Rather than putting the remaining several hundred pounds to charitable ends, then, subscribers chose to reflect Howard's glory back onto themselves with prints that would remind them that they esteemed Howard's labors.<sup>47</sup>

Before the medal and print plan came to fruition, Howard died in Russia. In short order, the idea of a statue was revived. Not everyone, though, idolized Howard. The obituary of Howard in the *Gentleman's Magazine* had charged Howard with "paternal severity" towards his son that "reduced the young man to such an unhappy situation as to require his being placed" in a mad-house. Controversy between detractors and supporters of Howard raged in the pages of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for a while, but did not derail the statue plan. In 1796, a statue of Howard was erected in St. Paul's Cathedral. There may have been an indirect loser, however, in the concern over Howard's treatment of his son. Two decades later, Lettsom "made some efforts to raise a statue to [prison reformer James] Neild, "the modern Howard," "but his treatment of his eldest son was so notorious as to thwart my endeavours." Neild, Lettsom told a friend, "was said to be more cruel [to his son] than Howard to his only son; the death of each is attributed to

---

<sup>47</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine* 56 (1786), p. 447. "Observations on the Statue for John Howard" in Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 2, p. 173. "Hints Respecting the Monument Erected to John Howard" in Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 2, pp. 144-148.

their respective parents.” A statue to one prison reformer who mistreated his son evidently was enough.<sup>48</sup>

The sculpture to Howard underscored where the priorities of the well-off lay. John Bacon, the sculptor who designed the Howard statue, had wanted the monument to depict “Mr. Howard raising up a prisoner from the ground.” Howard’s embrace of “the distressed object . . . with the sentiments of gratitude in the prisoner, would more forcibly have impressed the character of benevolence on the subject of the monument.” But the statue committee vetoed the figure of the prisoner, “for the sake of uniformity with Dr. [Samuel] Johnson’s statue,” put up in St. Paul’s around the same time as the Howard statue.<sup>49</sup> Balance between the two statues may well have concerned the committee. But the lack of attention to the putative beneficiaries of Howard’s labors captured the current in philanthropy. The celebration of John Howard fit into a long-term trend that began with the Reformation in which charitable practice became a rationalized, large-scale enterprise. The distinct late eighteenth-century contribution to that trend was to find a range of ways to aid suffering strangers. That development further distracted attention from recipients of charity. The focus in modern philanthropy, as Bacon’s executed statue shows, belonged on the philanthropist.

### *Conclusion*

Eighteenth-century charitable enterprises were not impersonal since access to aid often depended on relationships between subscriber and recipient. But philanthropy was

---

<sup>48</sup> “Hints Respecting the Monument Erected to John Howard” in Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 2, p. 149. *Gentleman’s Magazine* 60 (1790), p. 277, 287-290, 416-418, 491-492, 714. See also Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain*, pp. 48-49. Lettsom to James Plumtre, April 20, 1805; Lettsom to Plumtre, November 31, 1814, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, p. 129, 170.

<sup>49</sup> “Hints Respecting the Monument Erected to John Howard” in Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence*, vol. 2, pp. 224, 225.



expanding to include active or passive investment – financial, time-wise, emotional – in aiding strangers including prisoners in Europe, enslaved men and women in the West Indies, drowning victims anywhere. Part of that development rested on the impact of consumer culture in philanthropy.

As consumer societies developed in the Anglophone world, Britons and Americans sought sensations. In John Howard they had found a figure suited to an era of global quests for knowledge, global war, and global commerce. But he was only the most outstanding example of the larger trends affecting humanitarian activity. Successful philanthropists, including Howard, knew they needed to attract and maintain public interest. Supporters' loss of interest in a given venture could hurt an institution's finances, but consumers' expectations of novelty and variety helped drive growth in the field. The growth of consumer societies helped propel a broadening-by-targeting understanding of moral responsibility and a growing distance between benefactor and beneficiary. Those developments gathered pace in the 1780s as Americans and Britons grappled with revolutionary changes in the Anglophone Atlantic community. Howard's admirers used him to assert new ideas about charitable obligation in tumultuous times. Likewise, other Americans and Britons would try new means of aiding suffering strangers in the wake of imperial disunion.

## Chapter Four

### Universal Good-will and Shipwrecked Mariners How (Not) to Help Strangers

In 1807, Benjamin Rush received a letter from Joseph Coppinger, a stranger to Rush. Coppinger wrote, from St. Louis, Upper Louisiana, to Rush because he had no doubt that Rush would be interested in any plan “tending to increase the sum of human happiness.” Coppinger had such a plan. He aimed to improve society by helping migrants – who, if jobless, might become criminals – find work, and so Coppinger enclosed a proposal for an employment office in London to help the city’s many newcomers. Coppinger had drawn up the plan before he had left his country, Ireland, for America and had sent it, futilely, to an English gentleman. Now Coppinger was sending it to Rush. If Rush thought publicizing it was “likely to do any good either, in our own or any other Country[,] you are at liberty to make what use you please of it.” If Rush wanted, Coppinger could also send him the plan for public granaries he had come up with in Kentucky a few years before.<sup>1</sup>

Although he sounds vaguely mad, Coppinger was typical of many late eighteenth-century American and British men in drawing up blueprints for public projects that might be applied in this or that city as opportunity allowed. The same enterprising way of thinking led some philanthropists to try to resolve one of the central philosophical and practical problems in welfare provision, namely, how to realize universal goals. Over the eighteenth century, Americans and Britons had been stretching the boundaries of moral

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Coppinger to Benjamin Rush, August 13, 1807, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, f. 108, LCP.

responsibility, but helping distressed strangers at a distance remained a challenge. In the 1780s, the Scots Society of Norwich, England, and the Massachusetts Humane Society each tried to overcome obstacles to extending beneficence internationally. The Scots Society, founded in 1775, first aimed to provide charitable relief to needy foreigners in England. Then in the early 1780s, when it became known as the Society of Universal Good-will, the Society expanded its mission to aid people in need anywhere in the world who were unprovided for by any government or charity. The Massachusetts Humane Society (MHS) had a more modest goal. It wanted to aid mariners shipwrecked on the Isle of Sable, in British waters off the coasts of Nova Scotia, and it asked the London-based Royal Humane Society (RHS) to collaborate with it towards that end. Neither group met its goal, although each had other successes. This chapter analyzes the undertakings and shortcomings of the two charities to appreciate the perceptions of the possible that drove activists' ambitions and to set in greater relief ways of helping faraway sufferers that would work.

The two groups' missteps merit attention for highlighting the pitfalls that might undermine transnational ventures in philanthropy – or business, governance, or religion: Recognizing those pitfalls adds to the history of philanthropy, and of the Atlantic world, by making clearer what organizational methods did succeed. First, networks made the Atlantic community work only some of the time. People in the Atlantic world were enmeshed in networks and turned to them to achieve economic, religious, social, and intellectual goals. Contemporaries, however, did not necessarily understand the strengths and weaknesses of those webs. In some cases, such as with the Society of Universal Good-will, misunderstanding a network sank undertakings; in other cases, as with the

Massachusetts Humane Society, people learnt what a particular network could do and adapted goals to those conditions. Second, communities in the Anglophone Atlantic world varied greatly. In spite of the shared culture and many close ties, communities in the British Isles, North America, and the West Indies differed in terms of their economies, social structures, governments, and religious backgrounds, as well as in the more amorphous category of tastes. Those differences required adaptations to meet local norms whether the realm was government, commerce, religion, or philanthropy. When those differences went unrecognized, they could doom chances for success in governance, in the sale of goods, in the transplantation of institutions, or in cooperation with faraway colleagues. This problem particularly hurt the Massachusetts Humane Society's effort at close cooperation with the Royal Humane Society.

Third, philanthropic activities, like business ventures, were always a matter of trial and error. In the 1780s, as they grappled with the imperial divorce, Britons and Americans experimented with ways to give charitable relief to strangers. Their efforts paralleled the beginnings of the British abolitionist movement. Imperial reorganization led Britons to rethink the place of people of African descent in the empire, but the impact of the civil war for philanthropy went further. Disunion and communal restructuring led citizens of the Anglophone Atlantic community to try out ways of solving the perennial administrative difficulty in beneficence of how to aid strangers in distress. The efforts of the Society of Universal Good-will and the Massachusetts Humane Society failed, but other methods would succeed.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> On the beginnings of the British antislavery movement, see Brown, *Moral Capital*.

## *The Society of Universal Good-will*

### *The Scots Society*

At first glance, it comes as no surprise that the Society of Universal Good-will, with its plans to operate on a global scale, collapsed: Its goals seem laughably high-flown. But the Society could have had some success in spreading its mission and model had it not been for a series of mistakes. First, the Society aimed too high, too fast, and, second, it did so at the wrong time, during the civil war in the British Atlantic community. Third, the Society's model for institutional expansion was too centralized. And, fourth, the Society turned to the wrong people to build the organization. For all those mistakes, the Society could also claim successes. It had identified a way to imitate the Good Samaritan, but its effort to act internationally faltered because the Society, though prompted by the imperial breakup to think about new ways of providing aid, tried to expand based on the new imperial method of vigorous top-down leadership.<sup>3</sup>

The origins of the Society of Universal Good-will lay in the experiences of one of the groups most central to the integration of the British Atlantic community: Scots. In 1774, Scots natives in the Norwich area at the annual dinner in honor of St. Andrew, patron saint of Scotland, had found an "overplus" after paying the dinner bill. Someone suggested using the money to aid needy Scots in Norwich. As the assembled party well knew, natives of Scotland living in England were generally ineligible for public poor relief in England, and the party took up a collection to increase its funds. At the 1775 St. Andrew's Day festivities, the group formally instituted themselves as the Scots Society of

---

<sup>3</sup> On imperial reform, see P. J. Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America c. 1750-1783* (Oxford, 2005), esp. chap. 9.

Norwich, and at the 1776 gathering a constitution was approved. Full membership was restricted to Scotsmen, with Englishmen eligible to be honorary (later called associate) members. In 1777, the Earl of Roseberry, a Scot who had a home in Norfolk, pledged to help the Society in any way possible and was elected as the governor (patron) of the Society. To that point, however, no needy Scot had yet been relieved. Indeed, “somewhat remarkabl[y], . . . no person had applied for relief, or appeared to stand in need of it.”<sup>4</sup>

Ethnic sociability, not the existence of an identified group of distressed folk, had driven the founding of the Scots Society, and once founded the Society sought out beneficiaries. Perhaps in part because the Society had yet to aid anyone, the group decided in 1777 or 1778 that as soon as its funds allowed, it would extend its mission to natives of other countries. That decision may have been prompted by the need to find people to help, but it drew on cosmopolitan ideas and ideals, familiar to educated Europeans, which dated back to antiquity and which Renaissance and early-modern thinkers had revived. Although, according to the Society’s account, no one had applied for relief by 1777, the group might not have dispensed funds before then anyway: Until the Earl of Roseberry gave the Society £20 in 1778, its capital fell below the £20 the

---

<sup>4</sup> On Scottish migration and the key role of Scots in the integration of the Atlantic world, see Deborah C. Brunton, “The Transfer of Medical Education: Teaching at the Edinburgh and Philadelphia Medical Schools” in *Scotland and America in the Age of Enlightenment*, eds. Richard B. Sher and Jeffrey R. Smitten (Princeton, 1990); Colley, *Britons*, pp. 127-132; Devine, *Scotland’s Empire 1660-1815*; Hancock, *Citizens of the World*; Alan L. Karras, *Sojourners in the Sun: Scottish Migrants in Jamaica and the Chesapeake, 1740-1800* (Ithaca, 1992); Nina Reid-Maroney, “Scottish Medicine and Christian Enlightenment at the Pennsylvania Hospital, 1775-1800” in *Nation and Province in the First British Empire: Scotland and the Americas, 1600-1800*, ed. Ned C. Landsman (Lewisburg, 2001); Eric Richards, “Scotland and the Uses of Atlantic Empire” in *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*, eds. Bernard Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan (Chapel Hill, 1991). *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, in Great Britain. Founded in 1775* (Norwich, 1783), pp. 3-9, 13. The rules of the Society in the early 1780s provided that men married to Scotswomen could be full members, but whether that rule dated to 1776 or later is unknowable from the extant sources. For succinct overviews of the English poor law, see Paul Slack, *The English Poor Law, 1531-1782* (Cambridge, 1995); Fideler, *Social Welfare in Pre-Industrial England*.

constitution required the Society to hold before it could give aid. At long last, an ill Scotsman applied to the society and the society began to engage in its program. Adequate funds to begin operations and the confidence fostered by evidence of the Society's usefulness in its first few cases furthered the Society's determination to extend its charity beyond particularistic confines. In 1778, the Society resolved that as soon as its funds reached £100, its relief would be given to other foreigners on the same terms as applied to Scots. The following year, the Earl of Roseberry gave the Society £50 to bring its capital up to £100. The Earl gave the funds to the Society, he explained, because he "highly approve[d] of [the new plan], not only from the liberality of the idea, but from being by nature and principle, an enemy to all national prejudices and partiality." The need to find a way to be useful, catholic principles, and evidence of success led the Society to redefine its mission.<sup>5</sup>

*John Murray: Far-flung Family*

Cosmopolitanism in philanthropy resonated. As Roseberry's comment suggests, gentlemen wanted to see themselves as liberal, above prejudice and partiality. And cosmopolitanism struck a chord with someone like John Murray (1721-1792), president and leading force of the Scots Society, who had roamed around the Atlantic as a naval surgeon and whose family made the British Atlantic their home. Murray, an Anglican Scot, had been born in 1721 in Unthank, Scotland, to John Murray and Anne Bennet. In 1728, John's father died and left John a legacy of £100. His elder brother James, ten years John's senior, planned a career for John in medicine, and in 1739, after completing

---

<sup>5</sup> Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal*, pp. xxvii-xxv. Perhaps another factor was that, according to Charles Camic, eighteenth-century Scottish education fostered universalism. Charles Camic, "Experience and Ideas: Education for Universalism in Eighteenth-Century Scotland," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 25 (1983): 50-82. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, in Great Britain*, pp. 13-15, 17, 20-21.

his training in pharmacy and surgery, John embarked on a career as a British navy surgeon. By then, all of John's siblings lived in or were just settling in America.<sup>6</sup>

During his years as a naval surgeon, John Murray would spend “much time in the West Indies and other parts of America.” In 1744, he was in Jamaica and was appointed as a surgeon's assistant of the new naval hospital in Port Royal. In the surgeon's absence, Murray was put in charge of running the hospital. On his first day, Murray found one of the wards in “very great disorder” because a delirious patient had “thrown his drinks” and the nurse – an enslaved black woman – “had refused to clean it.” Murray “gently reprimanded” her without effect. The next day the disorder had worsened and Murray learned that the nurse that “laughed at” and “abused” him. Later that day, the future author of a slave-emancipation pamphlet, after addressing the assembled staff and patients on the matter, had the nurse whipped. Murray cited this disturbing incident in his 1789 pamphlet as part of his discussion on the proper way to treat slaves to prepare them for emancipation. His interest in the management of enslaved people prompted Murray to visit St. Domingue in 1749 with Admiral Knowles's squadron. The admiral had gone to visit the governor of the French island and Murray availed himself of the chance to “make himself acquainted with the police and customs of the French; in particular, how they treated their Negroes.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> On the cosmopolitan ideal among eighteenth-century *philosophes*, see Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*. Cleary, *Elizabeth Murray*, p. 16; Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray Loyalist*, pp. 1-2; Cleary, *Elizabeth Murray*, pp. 18, 19, 21-24, 30-35.

<sup>7</sup> [Murray], *An Enquiry into the Origin, Progress, & Present State of Slavery*, p. 3, 29-31, 3, 31. The obituary for Murray in the *Gentleman's Magazine* names Murray as the author of the pamphlet. *Gentleman's Magazine* 62 (1792), p. 961. In that work, Murray related the incident with the enslaved nurse without identifying the young surgeon at the Port Royal naval hospital in 1743. Elsewhere in the pamphlet, Murray says that he was in Spanish Town in 1744 and other evidence in the pamphlet suggests that Murray is the unnamed surgeon.



Murray continued to serve in the British navy until 1759. In 1751, he had moved to Wells, Norfolk, England, and in 1753, he married Mary Boyles. By 1757, when Murray received a medical degree from the University of St. Andrew's, the couple had had the first three of their eleven surviving children. In 1768, the Murrays moved to Norwich because the city offered a larger practice for Murray and better educational opportunities for the Murray children. Better opportunities there may have been, but Murray struggled to maintain his brood and over the years received help from his sister Elizabeth, a wealthy businesswoman in Boston. Being financially pressed, however, did not stop Murray from asserting his role as a gentleman. In Norwich, he helped found the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital and served there as a physician from its founding until close to his death.<sup>8</sup>

After settling in Norwich, Murray did not move again. His children, however, fanned out across the Atlantic. Their dispersal would cause anxiety and heartache for Murray. His three eldest children, Mary, Anne, and John Boyles (known as Jack), had lived in Boston with their aunt Elizabeth in the early 1770s; the girls were to be trained in business by their aunt. (Likewise, the sons of family and friends had lived in John Murray's family.) After a few years in Boston, Jack had gone to work at his cousin's firm Clark and Nightingale in Providence. When the American Revolution broke out, Jack wanted to join the American army. His aunt, who confided to another nephew that if Jack joined the Patriot cause it would be "farewell to his Fathers and Mothers happiness," tried to dissuade him. Scots, concerned to counter their historical image for

---

<sup>8</sup> Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray Loyalist*, p. 101. Receiving a degree did not necessarily mean that Murray had attended St. Andrew's. See Wilson, "An Early Baltimore Physician and His Medical Library," p. 63. *Gentleman's Magazine* 62 (1792), p. 961. On Murray's financial woes and Elizabeth's support, see Cleary, *Elizabeth Murray*, pp. 90-91.

suspect loyalty, widely opposed the Patriots' cause, and John Murray was no exception. Although critical of the British government's handling of the imperial crisis, Murray disapproved of the American rebellion. In 1774, when the imperial conflict had been simmering, he had made his feelings clear to his son. "Loyalty to the lawful Sovereign is the Character of [the Murray] family," he counseled. (Moreover, had Jack joined the American army, the imperial civil war would eventually have pitted John Murray's family against itself: Murray's son George William was in the British navy by 1781.) Jack's activities during the war are unclear, but after the war, he settled in the United States. Murray's next three sons also lived in America in the early 1780s.<sup>9</sup>

In the 1770s and 1780s, then, John Murray had children and siblings across the Anglophone Atlantic. The Murray family used geographic mobility to improve its lot and, in doing so, contributed to the process by which marginal groups – Scots, Dissenters, German Pietists – integrated the Atlantic world. Murray appreciated the role that foreigners played in their host communities. "Agriculture, arts, manufactures and commerce, have severally contributed to the opulence and happiness of this still free nation: all of those have been promoted, some in a manner created by foreigners," Murray declared in his 1779 speech to the Scots Society. "Many families of high rank, many manufacturers of great wealth and eminence, have sprung from those, and are still

---

<sup>9</sup> Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray Loyalist*, p. 261. Cleary, *Elizabeth Murray*, pp. 125-132, p. 142; Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray Loyalist*, p. 98. On the children living in the Murray family, see James Murray to John Murray, February 26, 1755; James Murray to John Murray, August 5, 1760; John Murray to John Dubois, April 21, 1765, James Murray Papers, Reel 1, MHS. On Jack's desire to join the American army and Elizabeth's effort to dissuade him, see Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray Loyalist*, pp. 260-262, and Cleary, *Elizabeth Murray*, pp. 204-205. Colley, *Britons*, pp. 139-141. Dr. John Murray to John B. Murray, Norwich, July 31, 1774, photoduplicate of original letter, Murray Family Papers, Box 5, NYHS. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, in Great Britain. Founded in 1775*, p. 36. The autobiography of Jack's son James B. Murray says that Jack joined the Patriot cause. "Autobiography of the Late Col. James B. Murray," Box 4, Murray Family Papers, NYHS. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, From its Rise in 1775*, p. 3; Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray Loyalist*, pp. 287-288.

in being.” Migration resonated with Murray as a boon to countries that accepted immigrants: The problems that migrants faced resonated too. Murray had faced difficulties in his career, and he worried about the futures of his children in America. “Oh my Children! Orphans in a Strange Land!” Murray lamented to his sister Elizabeth when she remarried unexpectedly in 1771, “what will become of you [Murray’s children], if Providence should remove your Aunt or any Cause alienate her affections?” And Murray’s brother James and family friend Gilbert Deblois, a merchant, had suffered reversals of fortune. Both men had been exiled from their homes in New England as Loyalists. Murray, like his fellow Scots, could imagine being a stranger in need. Moreover, he, like other people whose lives and friends spanned the Atlantic, had personal reasons to think about how to heal the rift in the Anglophone Atlantic community.<sup>10</sup>

*John Murray: Thinking Big*

Concern for distressed compatriots had led Scotsmen in Norwich to found the Scots Society and then liberal impulses had led the Society to extend its aid to all needy foreigners in Norwich. The Society’s next moves, driven by its prime mover John Murray’s penchant for big projects, would prove to be too ambitious. First, in 1779, the Society decided that non-English and non-Welsh “dispersed through the kingdom of England” were now “objects of this society’s attention.” It was not “thought proper” to limit the Society’s charity to supporters or fellow Scots or residents of Norwich. Rather,

---

<sup>10</sup> Hancock, *Citizens of the World*; Hartmut Lehmann, “Transatlantic Migration, Transatlantic Networks, Transatlantic Transfer: Concluding Remarks” in *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century America*, eds. Hartmut Lehman, Hermann Wellenreuther and Renate Wilson (University Park, Penna., 2000), p. 308. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, From its Rise in 1775*, p. 38. John Murray to Elizabeth Murray, November 9, 1771, in Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray*, p. 145. On Gilbert Deblois, see Gilbert Deblois Letterbooks, Rhode Island Historical Society (RIHS), Providence.

the extent of the Society's aid was determined by concern to avoid the "dangerous effects" of the English poor law, which excluded people not born in England or Wales. Without yet really having put itself on sure footing locally, the Society had decided it should pursue its program across England. A few years later, before it had achieved the goal of a national institution, the Society had a yet grander vision. The Society, it commented in rules published in the early 1780s, "regard[ed] the whole of the human race as one family, and wishe[d] to extend the assistance thereof to every fellow-creature in distress, who is not provided for by law, any government or other charity." This small Norwich charity had a plan to overcome the obstacles to aiding far-flung strangers in need.<sup>11</sup>

The Scots Society as a group endorsed that mission, but the idea of operating on such a grand scale probably began with, and depended too much on, John Murray. He was, his obituary reported, the force behind the Society of Universal Good-will, and the Society faded after Murray's death. Moreover, the plan to work on a global scale bears the hallmarks of John Murray's thinking: He was a man who thought big. During the long period of imperial crisis before the outbreak of the American Revolution, Murray had offered the government his ideas on the reform of the government of the colonies. According to the obituary of Murray, in 1770 he penned a plan for better governing the American colonies based on his personal knowledge of America and presented it to the British government "but without effect."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775, Until It Received the Additional Name of the Society of Universal Good-will, in 1784*, pp. 32, 63.

<sup>12</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine* 62 (1792), p. 961; Angela Dain, "An Enlightened and Polite Society" in *Norwich Since 1550*, eds. Carole Rawcliffe and Richard Wilson with Christine Clark (London, 2004), p. 196. If Murray's colonial government plan is extant, it has not yet been found.

In 1789, almost two decades after crafting his plan for the reform of colonial government, Murray published “*a Plan for the Gradual, Reasonable, & Secure Emancipation of Slaves*” in the West Indies. In drawing it up, Murray joined a list of thinkers who proposed emancipation schemes beginning in the 1770s. Murray and his plan, which the historian Christopher Brown does not examine, share many traits with the writers and emancipation plans analyzed by Brown. Like Brown’s subjects with their “active engagement with imperial questions,” Murray had lived and traveled in British colonies and had worked for a critical institution of the British Empire, the Navy. His attention to the management of African laborers dated to his days in Jamaica. Parliament’s consideration of the slave trade prompted Murray to offer his thoughts to the public, and as with his colonial reform plan, Murray rested his authority to speak on the topic on personal experience with the issue at hand.<sup>13</sup>

Like other emancipation plans from the 1770s and 1780s, Murray’s plan heeded the several concerns that bedeviled abolitionism, to wit, how to maintain colonies’ and the Empire’s economic vitality, how to integrate Africans into the British community, and how to satisfy both slaveholders and enslaved Africans. And like other plans, Murray’s was confused and confusing. Murray began and ended his plan with justifications for and condemnations of slavery. Murray justified slavery based on both “sacred and profane history,” with special stress on the timelessness of Noah’s curse on the children of Ham. Ultimately Murray condemned the treatment of slaves as inhumane, unchristian and impolitic. He wrestled with the topic, however, because as a believer in revealed religion, he had to square Noah’s curse, understood by many to legitimate the

---

<sup>13</sup> [Murray], *An Enquiry into the Origin, Progress, & Present State of Slavery*, p. 3. On other British emancipation schemes of the 1770s and 1780s, see Brown, *Moral Capital*, chap. 4; quotation about “active engagement,” p. 238.

enslavement of Africans, with his beliefs that the “Christian religion abhor[red]” inhumanity and that Africans “ought to be considered and treated as fellow creatures.”<sup>14</sup>

Competing considerations marked Murray’s plan – by turns, bigoted, feeling, comprehensive, and inconsistent – in other ways. “The most immediate reform” that Murray thought needed to be made was in slaves’ “language.” Speaking a mixture of broken English and native languages “degraded” slaves as humans, and degraded the language of white children, plus made it hard for masters to communicate with slaves. So he proposed first that white men be appointed to teach enslaved Africans proper English. Murray, whose views reflected widespread ideas about linguistic capacities, felt so strongly about the language issue that he thought eligibility for manumission should depend on enslaved Africans’ mastery of proper English. Murray then proposed that a census should be taken of all slaves and tenures of enslavement, ranging from seven to twenty-one years depending on age and circumstance, specified for them. At the ends of those periods, “the Negroes having served with fidelity” could choose to return to their native countries or the freed slaves could “hire themselves as they think proper or are qualified, in the same manners as the whites in a free country.” Although he betrayed plenty of bias and scorn for Africans, Murray could sympathize across racial lines with people separated from their families and friends. Thus, he proposed “a three day Saturnalia” at the end of each seven-year period so “the Negroes of every plantation . . . all might have an equal privilege in enjoying their friends who are about to part, perhaps never to meet again.” Plus, “some rites . . . a Jubilee, or Isthmian Games, or the like”

---

<sup>14</sup> Brown, *Moral Capital*, pp. 235-237. [Murray], *An Enquiry into the Origin, Progress, & Present State of Slavery*, pp. 4-18, 41, 16. For a synopsis of the idea about Noah’s curse, see Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*, pp. 539-541.

should commemorate the end of the last seven-year period, when all slaves would finally be free. Murray's plan also covered work and training, slaves' formation of families, diet, health, recreation, and religious training, with the various parts working together to benefit Africans, slaveholders, and Britain. To oversee the whole program, commissioners were to be appointed in the various islands, and Murray proposed that the commissioners have a yacht to facilitate their staying in touch with one another.<sup>15</sup>

That combination of thinking big – a reasonably comprehensive plan to dismantle slavery in British colonies – and thinking small – the septenary festivities, the yacht – marked Murray's plans for the Society of Universal Good-will too. For charitable endeavors to succeed, philanthropists needed to bring both vision and attention to detail to their projects. Murray, however, brought too much of each to his plan for the Society of Universal Good-will and thus made it unworkable. The founders of the Scots Society realized that the problem of strangers' ineligibility for aid must exist widely in an interconnected, mobile world. Besides the limits of the English poor law, access to aid from charities in the Anglo-American world at the time generally depended on ethnic, religious, occupational, or personal ties. The Scots Society of Norwich was not alone in filling the gap created by prevailing relief structures. New York's Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children, founded in 1797, served women and children unaffiliated with, and therefore unaided by, any of New York's religious or ethnic societies. Defining the terms of eligibility for aid was a critical issue for charities, and the Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children carefully delimited its mission, as the group's name announced. The Scots Society made a different decision. It

---

<sup>15</sup> On the issue of language, see Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, pp. 194, 196-199. [Murray], *An Enquiry into the Origin, Progress, & Present State of Slavery*, pp. 22, 19, 37, 22-23, 38, 22, 40, 31-41, 40.

went big. The group had first limited aid to Scots in Norwich, then expanded to include all foreigners in Norwich, then decided its mission encompassed all foreigners in England, and finally, resolved to extend its mission worldwide to anyone not provided for by a government or charitable organization. Revolutionary ferment and imperial restructuring led Americans and Britons, Murray included, to think creatively (if somewhat unclearly) about how to end slavery. Likewise, the civil war and disunion prompted Murray and his associates to re-conceive of the community to which they owed moral responsibility and in which they acted. In a mobile and integrated yet newly fractured world, their philanthropy could not be limited to Scots or Britons or British Atlantic folks, but had to comprehend all people.<sup>16</sup>

*Universal Good-will*

Murray's plan sounds incredible, but he and his colleagues were responding to a real weakness in poor relief structures. His thinking on such a grand scale combined with his focus on minutiae, however, led to a misguided top-down approach to expanding the Society. Top-down approaches to spreading institutions worked well in some cases, such as within the closed network of the Anglican Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge. Murray's vision of centralized control, however, undermined a plan that needed to move strangers to act locally.<sup>17</sup>

The Society of Universal Good-will took various steps to meet its global aims and, on the face of it, those steps seemed sound. One, the Society tried to spread knowledge of its mission, often by taking advantage of members' travels to distant places. News of the charity or its London branch had been transmitted to Birmingham,

---

<sup>16</sup> Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, pp. 96-101.

<sup>17</sup> Hitchcock, "Paupers and Preachers."



Bristol, Canada, Devonshire, the East Indies, Ireland, New England, Rouen, Scotland, and the West Indies. To aid the Society's intended beneficiaries in England, it had been proposed to name agents throughout the country to collect and disburse funds. "[U]pon mature deliberation," however, a system of agents throughout England was deemed inadequate. Instead, the Society decided to try to encourage the founding of branch societies, under the aegis of the parent society in Norwich.<sup>18</sup>

In spite of the preference for founding branches, the Society continued to name agents, who had to donate one guinea per year, to conduct the Society's business outside Norwich, with agents named for parts of England, Ireland, Scotland, North America, and St. Christopher's. The duties outlined for agents included collecting and disbursing funds and providing information on applicants for aid to the Society in Norwich. Applicants who could not apply to the Society's officers or agents in person could do so by letter; a certificate attesting to the applicant's character signed by local officials had to be enclosed. (See Figure 4.1. Note that the model form was written to be suitable in various political or religious systems.) Agents' duties also included trying to found branches. Three or more members (regular or associate) or agents in a place could, with permission from the Norwich society, found a branch. The plans for branch societies highlight the grand scale on which the Society anticipated acting. Article 38 of the Society's rules provided that once enough branches had been set up, a yearly meeting "of deputies from the original society, and all the branches" should be held. The yearly meeting's purpose would be to debate and decide on "the best and most proper methods of carrying on the

---

<sup>18</sup> *An Abstract of the Proceedings of the Scots Society in Norwich, November 30, 1780*, pp. 6, 7; *An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784. To the End of the Year 1787* (Norwich, n.d.), p. 17; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 3, 40.

various good designs, and humane purposes of the society, in different parts of the world.”<sup>19</sup>

Figure 4.1

Form of Parish Certificates or Testimonials for such Strangers or Foreigners, as may apply for relief from the Scots Society in Norwich or any of its Branches, and with which or some other proper form it is expected they will provide themselves before their application for the aforesaid purpose, in English, French or Latin.

We the undersigned certify that  
is the Son (Daughter) of  
born in the Parish of \_\_\_\_\_ in the Country (City, Province, Canton or District) of \_\_\_\_\_  
in the Kingdom (Republic) of \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_  
in the Year \_\_\_\_\_ has been bred to  
and has borne the character of an honest, industrious and sober man (woman) to the best of our knowledge.  
Given under our Hands this \_\_\_\_\_ Day of \_\_\_\_\_

Minister or Curate.  
Mayor (Justice of Peace or some Magistrate.)  
Church-Warden, (Elder)  
Overseers of the poor, (Deacon)

Source: *General Instructions for the Agents of the Scots Society at Norwich, and the Branches Thereof* (Norwich, 1780)

Like other eighteenth-century voluntary organizations, the Scots Society placed a great deal of importance on its constitution, and changes to its constitution underscore the Society’s evolution from a parochial to a cosmopolitan group. In 1780, to meet its enlarged mission, the Society promulgated a revised constitution that ran to an amazing fifty-two articles. Rules dealt with membership, governance, agents and branches, and conflict-avoidance at meetings. Two articles covered the private fund, to aid members in distress, begun by the Society in 1779. Furthermore, the revised constitution provided that associate members – members who were neither Scottish nor married to Scotswomen – could become regular members after four years as associates. (There were no differences, however, between the two categories. Women too could join as members.)

---

<sup>19</sup> *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, in Great Britain*, p. 31; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 3, 81-83, 50, 56-57; *General Instructions for the Agents of the Scots Society at Norwich, and the Branches Thereof* (Norwich, 1780), p. 17; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 58, 59.

Moreover, the Society changed its name in response to changes in membership: By 1783, Scots no longer made up a majority of members. In light of the change in membership and in mission, The Scots Society in Norwich now seemed too local a name. In 1784, the Society decided to be known as The Scots Society in Norwich, or the Society of Universal Good-will. The next year, the Society changed its name to just The Society of Universal Good-will. It had completed its shift from an ethnic-aid society to a group devoted, as John Murray had declared several years earlier, of “being stewards for the whole world.”<sup>20</sup>

The Society’s lofty goals immediately showed signs of success. At the 1779 annual meeting, the same meeting at which Murray had set forth the mission of aiding all needy foreigners in England, the Society approved the formation of a London branch. John Murray was actively involved in the London branch; his role there, however, is a sign that the Society was trying to expand without finding energetic local leaders. Over the years Murray attended several of the London branch’s meetings as president-general of the worldwide body, and at one of those meetings, in 1787, he explained the centrality of the London branch to his Society’s global mission. Alas, Murray’s hopes for the London branch were not to be. The London group’s membership and funds did increase, and small numbers of people received aid from it. But the London society failed to

---

<sup>20</sup> On the importance of constitutions in eighteenth-century voluntary organizations, see Kathleen Wilson, “Urban Culture and Political Activism in Hanoverian England: The Example of Voluntary Hospitals” in *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Century*, ed. Eckhart Hellmuth (London, 1990), pp. 172-174 and Margaret C. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 1991). See also Mann, *Republic of Debtors*, chap. 5. *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 47-64, 20, 21; *An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784*, p. 5; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, p. 29.

attract a patron early on or much prominent support, and in 1786 or '87 its treasurer went bankrupt with monies in his hands owed by the London branch to the Norwich body.<sup>21</sup>

Efforts to found branches elsewhere met with even less luck. At the 1782 annual meeting, Murray related various agents' progress, or lack thereof. The Edinburgh agent had made no progress "owing to his not understanding the nature of the business intrusted to his care. Upon being again informed how to proceed, he promised to comply with our directions. We have however never heard from him since his return to Scotland." At the behest of the former Ireland agent, the Society had sent its materials to a bookseller in Dublin, "but we have heard nothing from that quarter since." "No intelligence has been received from our agent in St. Christopher's." "[T]he present unfortunate situation of that and the neighbouring islands," Murray suggested, "may possibly have obliterated from his memory, the very existence of this society." The Canada agent, to his credit, relayed news of his endeavors, albeit unpromising news. "I have not been able to render your society any service, although I have mentioned it to several." "[T]hose who emigrate from Europe to this country," he explained, "have purposes far different from those of charity." Lastly, "[o]ur members who went to the hostile parts of America," Murray reported, "have sent us no official accounts." Murray admitted that "we have no great reason to boast of our success, yet [he saw] no cause for despair."<sup>22</sup>

Murray persevered with his plan for a worldwide body. In 1789, he drew up a constitution for the evidently-floundering, if not defunct, London branch. The

---

<sup>21</sup> The London branch was initially known as The Scots Society of Norwich, in London. *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, p. 82; *An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784*, pp. 5, 18; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, in Great Britain*, pp. 33, 34, 37, 39; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, p. 16; *An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784*, p. 16.

<sup>22</sup> *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 81-84.

constitution could also be used as a model for branches set up elsewhere. In spite of all the setbacks with his plans, Murray's vision of what his Society could do had not narrowed. He looked forward to finding that "an institution for the purpose of cultivating Universal Goodwill, is fully established throughout the world" and thought that that goal could best be pursued from a base in London. The plan provided for membership to be open to women and men "of all ranks and degrees," and called for members "of all nations, religions and sects, or of no religion or sect, of all descriptions or denominations already known, or which may hereafter become known." The plan also called for envoys from every nation to serve as agents and provided for interpreters to aid and vet non-English-speaking applicants. In addition, Murray wanted to promote the morals that, in his view, underlay universal goodwill. Article 24 of his model constitution endorsed belief in a "CREATOR" as essential to advanced civilization and cited Jesus as the exemplar of the values on which the Society would be founded. Therefore, the Society should elect a chaplain, who could come from any monotheistic faith. Article 25 went even farther. Because Jesus had taught moral duties, the Society should send out missionaries, if its funds allowed, to teach the morals necessary for peace and happiness. As a result of their work, the moral missionaries might prepare the way for Christianity, but their purpose would be moral instruction.<sup>23</sup>

Those articles seem to show confusion creeping into the projected Society's impartiality. Another view, however, is that they reveal Murray grappling to balance

---

<sup>23</sup> *Articles and Regulations Proposed for the Society of Universal Good-will, in London, or Elsewhere, 1789* (Norwich, 1789), p. 3, 6, 11, 12, 13-15. Dr. John Murray to John B. Murray, Norwich, July 31, 1774, photoduplicate of original letter, Murray Family Papers, Box 5, NYHS. Because Murray was the key force behind the Society of Universal Good-will, because the tone is so similar to his speeches and his plan for the gradual abolition of slavery, and because the authors of both the proposed constitution and the abolition plan (both published in 1789) pay particular attention to the issue of language, I assume Murray is the unnamed author of the proposed constitution.

cherished religious beliefs with beliefs in religious pluralism and moral responsibility to humanity at large. That sort of balancing defined cosmopolitan practice and fit Murray's catholic vision. It also serves as a reminder that although "[i]n the schemes for slavery reform," like other philanthropic projects of the late eighteenth century including the Society of Universal Good-will, "lie . . . the seeds of the nineteenth-century imperial mission that lauded Christianity, civilization, and commerce," the two eras differed. Murray believed in Christianity, but allowed for equality among religions when he wrote his model constitution.<sup>24</sup>

Murray's vision for the Society of Universal Good-will was never realized on the scale he wanted, but he had had understandable reasons for thinking it would be feasible. The Murray family, like other Scottish families, made the British Empire its home. In spite of being spread out from Scotland to Norwich to North America to Madeira and to wherever John Murray's brother Will's military service took him, the family stayed involved in each other's lives. Far-flung relatives wrote, helped each other with business matters or with finances, raised each other's children, and had periodic visits with one another. The Murray family collapsed distance, and so building a chain of societies to provide charitable aid on a worldwide scale seemed possible. But what made Murray's plans seem possible actually undermined it. To create new societies, Murray turned to his family and friends. Of all his mistakes, his reliance on family and friends was the fatal flaw. The Society of the Universal Good-will named three of John Murray's sons plus one of their business associates, Cyprian Sterry (a leading slavetrader) of Providence, as agents in the United States. (Naming them during the Revolutionary War did not help matters.) The Canada agent was Murray's son-in-law, William Dummer

---

<sup>24</sup> Brown, *Moral Capital*, p. 256.

Powell, the future chief justice of Upper Canada. At least one of the London branch founders was a Murray friend. Several of those men – Murray’s sons and son-in-law – were too young or in too much flux to effectively lead the founding of new societies. Moreover, they and other agents were chosen opportunistically, because they lived or traveled abroad. The Society did not let leaders emerge naturally.<sup>25</sup>

One last potential leader underscores that point. Mrs. Mary Hayley, John Wilkes’s “eccentric” sister, was named as Directress of the projected Society of Universal Good-will in North America. Mrs. Hayley’s ties to several people in this study highlight the intimacy of the Anglophone world in the late eighteenth century. At the time she was named as Directress of the Society of Universal Good-will, she was the widow of George Hayley. George Hayley, a wealthy London merchant, alderman and Member of Parliament, was one half of Hayley and Hopkins, a partnership trading to America. Hayley, who had supported the cause of the American colonies, died in July 1781. John Murray had a tie to the Hayleys through his daughter, Mary, who had bought goods from George Hayley for her short-lived mercantile venture, under her aunt Elizabeth’s tutelage, in Boston in the early 1770s. About three years after George Hayley’s death, Mrs. Hayley, who continued her husband’s business, headed to the United States primarily to collect debts. The timing of her arrival, in May 1784, made her one of the earliest celebrity visitors to the United States. Newspapers followed her moves, and leading Americans (often her debtors) feted her. No sources about Mrs.

---

<sup>25</sup> The idea of collapsing distance is borrowed from John J. McCusker, “The Demise of Distance: The Business Press and the Origins of the Information Revolution in the Early Modern Atlantic World,” *American Historical Review* 110 (2005): 295-321. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, From its Rise in 1775*, p. 3; *Proceedings at the Annual and Other Meetings of the Scots Society in Norwich, in 1778, 1779, and 1780* (Norwich, 1780), p. 6. Gilbert Deblois to Sterry and Murray, London, October 12, 1782, Gilbert Deblois Letterbook, vol. 1, RIHS.

Hayley's trip, however, mention any efforts, if she made any, to promote the Society of Universal Good-will in America. She probably had been named as Directress because of her ties to the Murray family, her prominence, and her plans to travel to the United States, rather than for any traits that would make her a good leader.<sup>26</sup>

Mrs. Hayley played a (small) part in one charity in the United States, however. She was the second person to subscribe, and the only woman among the initial subscribers, to the Massachusetts Humane Society. Mrs. Hayley had had ample chance to learn about the humane society cause on her voyage to Boston: Dr. Henry Moyes, with his charge from the English humane-society advocate, Dr. Alexander Johnson, to promote humane societies in the United States, had crossed the Atlantic in 1784 with her. The story of Mrs. Hayley's walk-on roles in the histories of both the Society of Universal Good-will and the Massachusetts Humane Society underscores how small the Anglophone Atlantic community was. An intertwined world, and the tumult in it in the 1770s and '80s, was the context in which John Murray crafted a global mission for the charity he presided over. Mobilizing support for charitable institutions through networks was commonplace. Murray's network of dispersed and mobile family and friends made a vision of a worldwide philanthropic organization seem within reach. He turned out to be

---

<sup>26</sup> Arthur Cash, *John Wilkes: The Scandalous Father of Civil Liberty* (New Haven, 2006), p. 379. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, From its Rise in 1775*, p. 3. The Society's records show that Mrs. Hayley became a member on September 29, 1782, and her name on the membership list includes her title as Directress of the Society of Universal Good-will, N. America. The account in which that membership list is printed, however, was published in 1784 or later. Since the first mention I have found of Mrs. Hayley's plans to visit the United States dates from a letter from Gilbert Deblois in late 1783, I suspect she may have joined the Society in 1782 and been named as Directress later, once she planned to go to the United States. *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, p. 3; Gilbert Deblois to William Deblois, November 22, 1783, Gilbert Deblois Letterbooks vol. 1, RIHS. *Gentleman's Magazine* 51 (1781), p. 443. Sir Lewis Namier and John Brooke, *The History of the House of Commons*, vol. 2 (New York, 1964), p. 602. Letters from Gilbert Deblois establish the relationship between Mary Murray and the Hayleys. James Murray was a correspondent of George Hayley too. Gilbert Deblois to James Murray, February 25, 1781, Box 3, James Murray Robbins Papers, MHS. *Norwich (Conn.) Packet*, January 15, 1784. *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, June 18, 1784. *Norwich (Conn.) Packet*, December 30, 1784; *New York Independent Journal*, October 23, 1784; *Boston Independent Ledger*, August 9, 1784.



wrong. Networks of family and friends were good for raising funds for local charitable institutions, but did not necessarily provide the right leaders for building transnational institutions.<sup>27</sup>

### *Impact in Norwich*

The Society of Universal Good-will failed to function on a global scale. But in Norwich, it responded to a real social problem. To qualify for public poor relief in England or Wales, an individual needed to have a parish settlement. (Scotland had its own poor-relief system dating to before the Union of 1707; parish settlement was not a feature of the Scottish system.) Settlements were gained in several ways including by birth, for women by a woman's marriage to a man with a settlement, by legal apprenticeship, by paying parish rates, and by property rental or ownership of certain amounts. People who fell into need away from their parishes of settlement could either be removed to their home parishes (an expensive process) or supported by their home parishes in their parishes of residence. Although critics at the time charged that the settlement laws limited labor mobility, it allowed the locally-funded, national poor relief system to work by laying out administrable conditions for eligibility. Moreover, settlement laws conferred much-prized guarantees of aid on the poor and fostered feelings of belonging to an intimate community. The settlement laws made sense, but they excluded the needy foreign-born from parish relief.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> *A Statement of Premiums Awarded by the Trustees of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, from July 1817 to April 1829* (Boston, 1829), p. 43. *Massachusetts Spy*, June 3, 1784; *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, June 18, 1784. *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 Supplement (1787), p. 1154.

<sup>28</sup> *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 45-46. On the laws of settlement (including heated debate between Landau and Snell on their purpose), see Fideler, *Social Welfare in Pre-Industrial England*, pp. 143-146; Norma Landau, "The Regulation of Immigration, Economic Structure and Definitions of the Poor in Eighteenth-Century England," *The Historical Journal* 33 (1990): 541-571; Norma Landau, "The Laws of Settlement and the Surveillance of Immigration in Eighteenth-Century Kent," *Continuity and Change* 3 (1998): 391-420; K. D. M. Snell, *Annals of the Labouring Poor: Social*

In response, Scots in Norwich had initiated what became the Society of Universal Good-will to provide for distressed countrymen, but the Society, with its diverse membership, wound up aiding a diverse group of beneficiaries. (See Table 4.1.) Scotsmen made up a plurality of male beneficiaries. Of the 602 men aided by the Society between 1778 and 1787, 263 were Scots. In addition to the 602 men, 474 wives and children of the men also received aid. The women and children, however, are not identified by nationality, but only as the wives and children of male beneficiaries, although single women sometimes received aid too. The next largest groups were Irishmen and Americans, with 130 Irishmen and 83 American men receiving aid from the Society. The majority of male recipients, 476 in all, then, were from the Anglophone Atlantic world. The other 126 men, or twenty percent of the total, came from a range of places including places outside Europe. Italians and Germans made up the next two largest groups, followed by Jews. All other national categories had fewer than 10 male recipients.<sup>29</sup>

---

*Change and Agrarian England, 1660-1900* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 17-18, 72-73, 146, 232; K. D. M. Snell, "Pauper Settlement and the Right to Poor Relief in England and Wales," *Continuity and Change* 6 (1991): 375-416; Taylor, "The Impact of Pauper Settlement 1691-1834." The best explication of the meaning to parish residents of the laws is K.D. M. Snell, *Parish and Belonging: Community, Identity and Welfare in England and Wales, 1700-1950* (Cambridge, 2006), chap. 3. My understanding of the laws of settlement follows Snell's.

<sup>29</sup>*An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784*, p. 20.

Table 4.1: National Origins of Recipients of Aid from the Scots Society of Norwich, or Society of Universal Good-will, 1778-1787.<sup>30</sup> N.B. The order in which groups are listed follows the order in the Society's records.

Natives of:	Number
Scotland	263
Ireland	130
America	83
France	4
Germany	25
Italy	31
Turkey	6
Prussia	8
Sweden	6
Spain	5
Flanders	3
Portugal	2
Holland	4
Switzerland	1
Africa	2
Greece	1
East Indies	4
Jews	14
Uncertain countries	10
Wives and children of the above	474
Total men	602
Total	1,076

Source: *An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784. To the End of the Year 1787* (Norwich, n.d.)

Who were the recipients and what brought them to apply to the Society? To qualify for aid, applicants' distress had to be "occasioned by sickness of some other unavoidable distress," namely loss in trade, fire, or shipwreck. The Society's records provide few details about recipients beyond aggregate numbers, but there are some stories that reveal the types of persons and problems – types of people and problems that the Society's supporters could relate to – that elicited the Society's sympathy and aid. Typical of the people relieved by the Society was a middle-aged man from Edinburgh who "had served in the navy, merchant service, and on board private ships of war, with

<sup>30</sup> Earlier tables of recipients in the Society's records had included one Hungarian, two men from Barbary and a handful from Norway. The cumulative table for 1778 to 1787, however, did not list natives of those places. Because I do not know how the Society decided to compile its data, I am using the table as is. *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 65, 66.

equal ill fortune in all, by suffering shipwreck, imprisonment, and loss of health.”

“[N]aturally [he] became tired of so inauspicious a course of life, settled on shore, married and became a father. Adversity still pursued him.” His business failed to profit, and he wound up imprisoned for debt. The man applied to the Society, which, with the aid of medical men and a magistrate, helped the man and his family get on their feet. Besides men with backgrounds similar to those of the Society’s supporters, the Society aided others. For instance, recipients in 1782 included the 84-year old “deaf, blind and helpless” widow of an Irishman whose family could no longer provide for her.<sup>31</sup>

Foreigners helped by the Society were in similar straits as the charity’s beneficiaries from British or formerly British dominions. The first non-Scotsman or non-Irishman aided by the Society, Ismael, aka James, Bashar, a Constantinople native, had prospered in commerce but had suffered reverses and a “variety of misfortunes [had] brought him” to England. There, he scraped out an existence through by peddling and “working in the tin and wire way.” “[T]hose failing him, he became at last an indigent vagrant in a strange land, in which he married, was converted to [C]hristianity, and had children.” When he became sick, the Society relieved him and tried, without much success, to set him up in business. A foreign recipient in 1784, a German named Lewis LeFebure, was a demobilized soldier who had fought in America and was trying to get home. He was found perishing one freezing day outside Norwich and referred by a justice of the peace to the Society, which sent him home.<sup>32</sup>

The Scots Society’s mission was to fill a gap between the English poor law and the population of England and, in doing so, the Society followed the poor-law model in

---

<sup>31</sup> *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 68, 70-71.

<sup>32</sup> *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 37, 73; *An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784*, pp. 3-4.

its provision of aid. Thus recipients might receive weekly allowances as recipients of parish relief generally would. Or they might be sent to the city's workhouses at the Society's expense. And, similar to – although less litigious than – parish officials' removal of those people who were eligible for relief in another parish, the Society gave errant applicants money to get home. Another type of aid the Society provided was medical care. Like other charitable organizations in the Anglophone world, the Society subscribed to a local medical charity, in this case the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, so that it had a right to send patients there. Finally, the Society paid the funeral expenses of its beneficiaries who died, with any assets of decedents used to reimburse the Society's costs for those people. If no heirs could be found for anything left in decedents' estates, the rest went to the Society's coffers.<sup>33</sup>

The Society of Universal Good-will followed a tried-and-true model of providing relief to people in distress. Where it innovated was in not distinguishing between compatriots and strangers, and that policy of treating the stranger as a neighbor had led to a concern. Some people worried, John Murray explained in his 1782 annual address, that the Society's aid to needy foreigners would harm natives of England by inducing migrants, who would compete for jobs, to come to the country. Murray thought that worry – which reveals the assumption that the charity would be widely known outside Britain – was unfounded. “[A]lthough it may afford great comfort to such as for various reasons emigrate from their native home, to know, that in cases of unavoidable distress, they and their families will not be left destitute, yet no one, on that account only,” Murray argued, “would quit his parent soil, his dearest connections, and abandon the probable, if

---

<sup>33</sup> *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, From Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 56, 71; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, in Great Britain*, pp. 27, 18.

not certain means of subsistence, by his labour, skill and industry in his own country, merely that he may not be suffered to starve in a strange land.” Murray’s view – and not the fear that a small Norwich charity that helped strangers would lead to an influx of foreigners eager to take advantage of British welfare institutions – prevailed. The Society had begun with a parochial conception of moral responsibility but had shifted to define charitable obligation as universal. While there had been challenges to that understanding, concern over a flaw in the existing system of public and charitable relief resonated more.<sup>34</sup>

Poor relief systems in England, as in Northern Europe in general, were based on place of birth or residence. Public poor relief systems thus excluded the foreign-born and transient residents of a community, and charities based on particularistic or personal ties often did too. As the men who founded the Scots Society recognized, those institutions were inadequate in a mobile world. They responded to that problem by creating a cosmopolitan charitable organization in Norwich and they tried to build a charitable operation to respond to gaps in the provision of poor relief on a global scale. The Society could never have achieved its grandest aims, but it did expand to London and might have spread further. The Society’s hasty and centralized plans for enlargement plus its poor timing and, most especially, its poor choice of would-be founders of new branches, however, thwarted its prospects for success. Unlike his cousin Charles Murray who had brought the humane society movement to Portugal, John Murray worked in the wrong

---

<sup>34</sup> On seventeenth-century protests in England against skilled Huguenot refugees, see Jon Butler, *The Huguenots in America: A Refugee People in New World Society* (Cambridge, Mass, 1983), pp. 34-35. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, From Its Rise in 1775*, p. 89.

way to expand a movement. He thought creatively – and compassionately – but he and his colleagues had not found a viable way to help strangers faraway.<sup>35</sup>

*The Massachusetts Humane Society and the Isle of Sable*

*International Problem*

Across the water, in Boston, the men of the Massachusetts Humane Society also sought to extend their beneficence beyond the local area. The MHS wanted to address a narrowly targeted problem, that of mariners shipwrecked and stranded on the Isle of Sable, about 100 miles off the coast of Nova Scotia. The scales of the problems that the Society of Universal Good-will and the Massachusetts Humane Society set about to remedy differed dramatically. Both organizations, however, focused their energies on weak spots in the integrated Atlantic economy and, to redress them, both tried to take transnational philanthropic action. Like the Society of Universal Good-will, the MHS made mistakes, though its misconceptions were in not understanding how much had changed with American independence. What the MHS men found was that in trying to help strangers in distress they were grappling with imperial disunion.

Shipwrecks on the Isle of Sable were a longstanding problem. According to a proclamation issued by the Massachusetts governor in 1738, the island was “so situated as it often happens, that Ships and other Vessels are unfortunately cast on said Island.” (Sable Island, as it is known today, is actually a thirty-mile long sand dune that shifts.)

---

<sup>35</sup> According to Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham, by the late eighteenth century, “the old principle of relief [in Northern Europe], based on residence, generally based on parish or district of residence, was completely unable to cope with the wandering labourer.” Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham, “Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Northern Europe” in *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Northern Europe*, p. 13. Several of the essays in the volume deal with this topic. See, in particular, Fritz Dross, “Health Care Provision and Poor Relief in Enlightenment and Nineteenth-Century Prussia,” p. 73, and on both residency requirements and religious affiliation as a basis for relief, see Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra, “Dutch Approaches to the Problems of Illness and Poverty between the Golden Age and the *Fin de Siecle*,” pp. 261-262.

Newspapers periodically reported shipwrecks on the island. In 1774, “a tea ship from London to Halifax, was lost on the isle of Sable, and every soul perished.” The crew of the brig *Telemachus*, carrying a cargo of rice and tobacco from Georgia to Amsterdam in 1786, was luckier. The ship “was cast away” on the island and the vessel and cargo lost, but “[t]he men were saved.” Because of its remote location, people who were cast ashore on the island might die “for want of Food and other Necessaries there.” To remedy that problem, the Massachusetts government had in 1738 lent support to a settlement on the island; the settlers were to provide “Subsistence and Relief” to anyone shipwrecked on the island. (The government’s support consisted of approving the idea and ordering people not to steal the livestock of settlers.) During the American Revolutionary War, however, the families who lived on the island, “being plundered and harassed by the hostile parties,” had left.<sup>36</sup>

In 1788, the problem of the lack of anyone to help castaways came to public attention after the deliverance of two crews that had each been marooned on the island for several months. The unnamed vessel under Captain Gerrish’s command, returning from Newfoundland to Newburyport, had been driven onto the island by a storm in early November 1787, and the leaking and badly battered schooner *George*, Captain Chadwell, from Antigua to Ile St. Jean (later Prince Edward Island), had landed on the island later in the month. The two crews built shelters – though the starving crew of the *George*, at one point ready to eat a dying companion, could only do so after finally catching and eating

---

<sup>36</sup> [Proclamation, September 4, 1738], By His Excellency Jonathan Belcher; *Pennsylvania Packet*, May 30, 1774; *New York Independent Journal*, July 29, 1786. [Proclamation, September 4, 1738]. *A Continuation of the Proceedings of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, from the second Tuesday in June 1788, to the second Tuesday in June 1789* (Boston, 1789), p. 2. For more on the efforts to settle Sable Island, see Lyall Campbell, *Sable Island, Fatal and Fertile Crescent* (Windsor, NS, 1974), pp. 30-36.



seals a month after landing – and lived on seals, horses, and cranberries. In late January, the crews came upon each other and from then cooperated in their survival efforts until in April 1788, American vessels rescued and relieved the men.<sup>37</sup>

News of the ordeals turned the Massachusetts Humane Society's attention to the Isle of Sable. The MHS, a public-subscription charity, had been founded in 1785 to promote the rescue and resuscitation of victims of drowning and other accidents by disseminating lifesaving information and equipment and by paying rewards to encourage passersby to aid people in distress. From its founding, the MHS had also concerned itself with the plight of shipwrecked mariners. To shelter crews in distress, the Society built huts along the coast.<sup>38</sup> Finding a way to aid people shipwrecked on Sable Isle not only fit naturally with the Society's work, but also gave the young charity a way to win attention and accolades by addressing a high-profile hazard. What the MHS seemed at first to have forgotten, or maybe it just took time to grasp all the implications of withdrawing from the British Empire, was that the Isle of Sable was now foreign territory.

### *Transnational Cooperation?*

The Massachusetts Humane Society appointed a committee, chaired by merchant Thomas Russell, to consider how to go about settling families on the Isle of Sable to

---

<sup>37</sup> One of the crews did not leave with the rescuers but finished building a boat to get themselves off the island. The account given by Capt. Gerrish appeared in the Middletown, Conn. *Middlesex Gazette*, May 12, 1788; the New York *Impartial Gazetteer*, May 17, 1788; the Philadelphia *Independent Gazetteer*, May 22, 1786; the *Worcester Magazine*, May 22, 1788; the *Fairfield (Conn.) Gazette*, May 28, 1788, plus other newspapers. The account given by the crew of the *George* appeared in the *New York Packet*, August 8, 1788; the Philadelphia *Independent Gazetteer*, August 12, 1788; the *New Haven Journal*, August 13, 1788; the *Columbian Herald*, August 21, 1788; the *Middlesex Gazette*, August 25, 1788; and the *Windsor Vermont Journal*, September 22, 1788, plus other newspapers.

<sup>38</sup> On the founding of the MHS and the local adaptations, including the huts, it made to the lifesaving mission, see Wright, *The Transformation of*, pp. 49-50, 138-139. For an overview of the movement, see Thomson, "The Role of Physicians in the Humane Societies of the Eighteenth Century." For more on the Royal Humane Society and, to a lesser extent, the movement in Britain, see Davidson, "Raising Up Humanity."

assist shipwrecked mariners. In October 1788, the committee issued its report. The Society lacked the funds to build houses and settle families on the island and therefore, the committee urged “that [the project] ought to be made a *governmental or national concern*.” (Emphasis added.) John Hancock, then governor of Massachusetts, was thought to own much of the island, and so the MHS asked Hancock to intervene with the state or federal government to secure funds for the project. As asked, Hancock sent a request for help to the General Court of Massachusetts. His address to the General Court, however, inadvertently identified the stumbling block the MHS would hit in its Sable Isle project. “Though this Island is situated in a foreign kingdom,” Hancock commented, “yet it would be no less advantageous to the navigation of the United States, than to that of other commercial nations” “to place a Light House, and a few families there.”<sup>39</sup> True enough, but the fact that the island was now “situated in a foreign kingdom” made the MHS’s effort to aid mariners castaway there an international matter. The MHS men had initially overlooked that reality, but once the international dimensions of the project became clear, the MHS sought foreign cooperation to address the problem.

The Massachusetts Humane Society reached out to a few potential partners in an effort to win help from parties that could take action. The MHS trustees discussed the matter with the commander of a British naval vessel then in Boston harbor, and with “some influential citizens of Halifax [Nova Scotia].” The appeal to the citizens of Halifax must have seemed promising: A Halifax newspaper in July 1787, according to MHS records, had opined that due to the frequent shipwrecks on Sable Island, “some steps should be taken by government to settle a family or two there. . . there cannot be a

---

<sup>39</sup> *A Continuation of the Proceedings of the Humane Society of . . . Massachusetts*, pp. 1-4.

doubt, that New England States would cheerfully join” an effort to protect property and lives. Nothing, however, came of either effort.<sup>40</sup>

The third party that the MHS turned to was the Royal Humane Society. The MHS “ha[d] no doubt” that the RHS would agree with the MHS that preserving life was “equally an object of the Institution of a Humane Society” as resuscitating apparently-dead folks was. Thus, in 1789, the MHS asked the RHS for unspecified help with the problem of seamen shipwrecked on the Isle of Sable. The two humane societies were engaged in a “common cause of humanity,” and the MHS had concluded that their shared mission and exchange of correspondence laid the base for a deeper type of cooperation. Working together, the two societies would be able to overcome obstacles in long-distance beneficence.<sup>41</sup>

The Massachusetts Humane Society, however, had misjudged matters in several ways. First, by appealing to the RHS to cooperate on Sable Isle, the MHS had tried to redefine the program of the RHS. Although the RHS often cited saving the lives of mariners as one of its benefits to Britain, the RHS did not think of its mission as involving sheltering shipwrecked seamen. The MHS, though it did not expand its ambit enough for its critics, had expanded the basic humane society model with its program of huts for mariners. The MHS assumed that the RHS would too have a broad understanding of the mission of lifesaving. The RHS, however, operated as part of the most highly elaborated charitable infrastructure in the Anglophone world. When, in 1782, the new Fire Company of London had donated one hundred guineas to the RHS to pay rewards to rescuers of children or infirm people in “Danger of perishing by Fire,” the

---

<sup>40</sup> *A Statement of the Premiums Awarded by the Trustees of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, from July 1817, to April 1829*, p. 46. *History of the Humane Society of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1845), p. 7.

<sup>41</sup> Samuel Parker to William Hawes, July 6, 1789, in *RHS Reports 1787-89*, pp. 352-353.

RHS resolved that that idea was “not consistent with the original plan of this Institution” and returned the Fire Company’s money. Whereas in other parts of the Anglophone Atlantic world charities added new functions to existing institutions, in London the expectation was that new functions required separate institutions. Second, the MHS misjudged if it assumed the RHS would fork over funds for the Isle of Sable project. The RHS spent thousands of pounds over the years to distribute printed materials and lifesaving equipment to found new societies. The RHS only paid rewards for lifesaving efforts, however, within certain – changing, generally with donations – geographical limits, and each year it spent most of its income, including some investment income. When the RHS decided to build receiving houses where half-dead bodies could be brought for resuscitation, it had to undertake a capital campaign for the new program. Financial support by the RHS for settling families on Sable Isle was unlikely. Third, if the MHS had hoped the RHS would lobby the British government for help with the Isle of Sable, it misjudged again. For years, the RHS had hoped for Parliamentary support to help it realize its goal of being established as a national institution. Parliament, however, did not accede to the RHS requests on that count, and the RHS would presumably not have thought it wise to lobby Parliament, even if it wanted to, about a project that originated with a group from the former colony that had been the hotbed of rebellion. The Royal Humane Society allowed its reach to be extended through the efforts of self-selected instigators, but otherwise stayed focused on its mission.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Royal Humane Society Committee minutes, December 9 and 11, 1782, Royal Humane Society Archives, London. *RHS Reports 1792* ([London, 1792?]), pp. 69-70. William Hawes, *An Address to the King and Parliament of Great Britain, on the Important Subject of Preserving the Lives of its Inhabitants* (London, 1782); *RHS Reports 1787-89*, pp. 433-434. On the specialization of Boston’s charitable infrastructure in the early nineteenth century, see Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, p. 186. As with charitable institutions, the wealth of communities generally determined whether eighteenth-century scientific societies

The Massachusetts Humane Society was not alone in failing to appreciate how much had changed with the American Revolution and what that might mean for philanthropic cooperation. Well before the Treaty of Paris was signed, Benjamin Rush had appealed to British Dissenting cleric Richard Price for donations for the new Presbyterian college in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Price, who mentioned that other Americans had made like requests, set Rush straight about the changed situation between Britain and the United States. It was “too early,” Price explained, and Britons were “much overburden’d” with taxes. “America, he hoped, “will learn to take care of itself.” Another of Rush’s British friends, John Coakley Lettsom, received a plea for books for Carlisle College, and he characteristically responded positively. The gift he sent however, – thirty volumes of *The Journals of the House of Commons* – showed that Lettsom was misguided as Rush was. Since the Americans were busy writing laws, Lettsom thought the journals would prove useful – never mind that the Americans had just declared independence from the British government: Rush deemed the books not “worth to us their carriage to Carlisle.” Besides not understanding how the American Revolution had affected the British Atlantic community and thus might affect transatlantic philanthropic cooperation, Anglo-American activists failed to recognize that what worked in beneficence in one community might not work in another, very different community. Thus the founders of the Barbados General Dispensary missed the way tensions in a small, insular community could bring down a charity. Similarly, the American-born Count Rumford had overlooked entirely that his beloved maize, which he advocated as a cheap food for the English poor in the hard 1790s, was animal feed in

---

were specialized or multi-purpose. James E. McClellan III, *Science Reorganized: Scientific Societies in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1985), p. 23.

England and thus undesirable. The MHS's misperceptions fit into a common trend of good intentions and poor local knowledge.<sup>43</sup>

*Amos Windship: Network Failure, Network Success*

Although the Royal Humane Society had ignored the Massachusetts Humane Society's 1789 request for help, the MHS made one last effort to address the Isle of Sable problem by again calling on the RHS for help. Again, the MHS had no success with the proposed Isle of Sable project, but it did come to initiate a new practice in the humane society movement – the naming of honorary members – that buttressed ties in the movement. The unlikely agent in that development was Amos Windship (1745-1813), a man who is best described as a ne'er-do-well.

A new opportunity to appeal for joint MHS-RHS action on Sable Isle came when Windship, an MHS member, visited London in 1792. Windship was not only an MHS member, but also a friend of RHS treasurer John Coakley Lettsom. While he was in London, Windship attended the 1792 RHS anniversary festival, held on March 1, and addressed the crowd. Windship drew his listeners' attention to Sable Isle, where mariners cast away "with nothing left them, but the liberty of complaining." To deal with that problem, Windship proposed that the RHS, richer than the MHS, should take the lead in a cooperative effort "of benevolence and humanity to their fellow creatures."<sup>44</sup> The two humane societies, he suggested, should jointly support a venture on the island. The

---

<sup>43</sup> Rush to John King, April 2, 1783, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 300. Richard Price to Rush, January 1, 1783, Rush Manuscripts Dickinson College, Part I, LCP. Rush to John Coakley Lettsom, April 8, 1785, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 351; Lettsom to Rush, July 1788 [sic], Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, LCP. Rush to John Montgomery, February 20, 1786, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 379. *Barbados Mercury*, July 21, 1787, and October 21, 1788; *Barbados Gazette*, July 18 to 21, 1787, and August 8 to 11, 1787; Alleyne, "It So Happened." Rumford, *Essays*, vol. 1, pp. 248-277. *The Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Improving the Comforts of the Poor*, vol. 3, p. 69.

<sup>44</sup> *RHS Reports 1793* ([London, 1793?]), p. 35. *New London Connecticut Gazette*, May 31, 1792.

RHS again ignored the MHS request, but Windship's presence at the RHS festival – ironically, a result of misperceptions about Windship – ultimately led to closer bonds between the two humane societies.

Windship had been born in Holliston, Massachusetts, in 1745. He entered Harvard in 1767, but left the following year after being exposed as a thief. Windship spent the next several years training and working as a doctor in various Massachusetts towns until he moved to Boston in 1774. After leaving Boston in 1775, Windship went to work as a surgeon at the American military hospital in Cambridge and was “very intimate” with Dr. Benjamin Church, the traitor to the Revolutionary cause; as a result suspicions briefly fell on Windship. During the war, Windship served as a naval surgeon. Soon after the war's end, the enterprising Windship sailed up the Thames to land American whale oil there after a scheme he, his brother-in-law, and some British merchants had hatched to smuggle the oil into London was rendered obsolete with the peace treaty. But in the absence of a commercial treaty between Britain and the United States, the result was the seizure and sale of the oil and vessel plus years of lawsuits between Windship and his in-laws. That episode did, however, have another outcome. While he was in London, Windship met Dr. John Coakley Lettsom through a mutual acquaintance, Mr. Dickinson, a merchant who was Lettsom's patient and Windship's correspondent. During a brief absence by Lettsom, Windship tended to the ill Mr. Dickinson, who recovered. As a result, Lettsom and Windship became friends, and Dickinson got Windship started in business as a druggist.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> This sketch of Windship's early life is drawn from “Amos Windship,” *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, vol. 17, ed. Clifford K. Shipton (Boston, 1975), p. 673-676, and the “Biography of Dr. Amos Windship (1745-1813),” *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, 25 (1924): 141-171, pp. 149-155. A letter by Col. Ephraim Eliot, printed in the *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, is the main

Windship returned to Boston, set up his druggist business, and, after incidents with a maidservant and venereal disease, “lived respectably” for several years. He joined Christ Church, where he served as a vestryman and warden, and joined the Freemasons, although the Boston Episcopal Charitable Society rejected his application for membership in 1788. Also in 1788, the Medical Society of London elected Windship as a member on Lettsom’s nomination. The following year, the London Medical Society printed a medical case purportedly by Windship. In fact, Windship had passed off as his a case that another Boston doctor had presented to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1787. If Lettsom ever discovered that fraud (which came to light in 1794), his letters do not say. Lettsom did find out that Windship held no medical degree, although a degree was a condition of Medical Society membership. The big-hearted and, perhaps embarrassed, Lettsom advised Windship to attend medical classes at Harvard and offered to pay for the courses – once they were completed – if Windship could not afford them. In June 1790, Windship received an M. B. “without examination, as he had been a Senior Surgeon of the United States Navy and was now a member of the London Medical Society.”<sup>46</sup>

---

source on Windship’s life. Some of the details are substantiated or expanded on by the editor; the editor corrects a few of Eliot’s details. The entry on Windship in *Sibley’s Harvard Graduates*, contains a few episodes not in Eliot’s letter. The *Colonial Society* and *Sibley’s Harvard Graduates* articles explain that theft among students at Harvard was common in that period and usually was not treated as serious. My thanks to Conrad Edick Wright for pointing me to sources on Amos Windship.

<sup>46</sup> This paragraph is drawn from the “Biography of Amos Windship,” *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, p. 156, 160, 159; “Amos Windship,” *Sibley’s Harvard Graduates*, pp. 676, 677; *Memoirs of the Medical Society of London, Instituted 1773* 2 (1794), p. 372; Abijah Cheever, *History of a Case of Incised Dropsy; With a Dissection of the Several Cysts: As Communicated to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Jan. 31, 1787*, (Boston, [1794]) first two unnumbered pages.



After receiving his M.B. Windship traveled to London a few times, at least once to purchase drugs, in the early 1790s.<sup>47</sup> On one of those trips, in 1792, Windship addressed the Royal Humane Society's anniversary festival, as its annual report announced. In a way, the RHS report was unrevealing and even misleading. The account of Windship's speech at the RHS festival presents a visiting American doctor who represented a Boston charity, supported by the likes of John Adams, John Hancock, and Paul Revere, to its London counterpart with an even-more brilliant list of supporters. Windship must be someone important, or at least reputable. But knowing the history of this man – and that he went on to practice as a surgeon in Maine, get thrown into debtor's prison, rejoin the American Navy as a surgeon during the Quasi-War with France and desert in a conflict with a subordinate, practice medicine in Exeter where he had to pretend to be insane to avoid theft charges, almost commit bigamy until prevented by his intended's friends, become a Methodist itinerant preacher in Maine, and be thrown out of Havana for "voic[ing] his democratic ideas too loudly" – raises questions both about information presented in historical sources and about the flow of information in Windship's time.<sup>48</sup>

What does Windship's presence at the festival say about how much people in transatlantic philanthropic webs knew about each other? Lettsom, of course, had

---

<sup>47</sup> The *Sibley's* entry on Windship refers to one trip to London, in 1791, to buy drugs, but Windship evidently made at least two other trips. He had returned from his 1791 trip sometime before July. The RHS reports printed for the 1793 anniversary festival refers to Windship's addressing the 1792 festival. He apparently went to London again in 1794: the *Philadelphia Gazette* reported that Windship arrived back in the United States in August 1794. "Amos Windship," *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, p. 677; Lettsom to Sir Mordaunt Martin, July 11, 1791, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, p. 55; *RHS Reports 1793*, p. 35; *Boston Argus*, May 1, 1792; *Concord Herald*, May 23, 1792; *Philadelphia Gazette and Universal Daily Advertiser*, August 23, 1794.

<sup>48</sup> "Biography of Amos Windship," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, pp. 167-171; "Amos Windship," *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, pp. 677-679. Windship may have practiced medicine in Maine too. Martha Ballard's diary has references to a Dr. Winship or Wenship for the years that Amos Windship is reported to have been a Methodist preacher in Maine. <http://dohistory.org/diary/index.html>.

evidently been impressed with Windship's medical skills with Dickinson. The business with the M.D. that Windship lacked may have raised questions, but in 1792 Windship's deception with the history of the medical case had not come to light. Later accounts of Windship judge him consistently – “rascal,” “knavery,” and “frauds” are words associated with his life – but contemporaries, at least in the 1780s, did not. The Freemasons accepted Windship. So did Christ Church, until the senior warden discovered around September 1791 that Windship had altered church records to assign the pew reserved for the governor to himself. (Windship confessed to his misdeed, left Christ Church and joined the New Brick Church, under the Rev. Dr. John Lathrop.) Other contemporaries, however, took dim views of Windship. Abigail Adams, for one, had nothing good to say about him in a 1777 letter to John relating how Windship had occupied a house in Boston that Abigail had been trying to rent out – “without either writing to me or applying to me in any shape whatever” – and then refused to vacate it for the tenant Abigail had engaged. In fact, Abigail referred sarcastically to Windship as “famous,” indicating that his reputation already suffered. But Lettsom's correspondent John Lathrop referred to Windship as their “common friend,” and Lettsom knew that the two Bostonians passed on to each other materials sent by Lettsom. The flip side of a network failing, as business networks might, when it could not provide good information was that it could work without good information. Lettsom loved to have correspondents in America, he loved to be influential there, and he loved entertaining visiting Americans in London. The less Lettsom – one of the movers and shakers in the RHS – knew about Windship, the better. Bad information plus distance helped transatlantic philanthropic webs work.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> “Biography of Amos Windship,” *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, p. 149; “Amos

### *American Leadership*

For the Massachusetts Humane Society and Royal Humane Society, network failure meant network success too. The MHS never got the help it wanted from the RHS with Sable Island. Direct cooperation on a project was not the right model for overcoming the problem of how to aid distant people in distress. Nevertheless, the ties between the two societies became closer, and stayed that way for fifteen years after Windship's visit to the RHS anniversary festival. Whether Windship gave the MHS leaders specific advice or whether they deduced something from his experience, somehow Windship's visit gave the MHS men new insight into their London counterparts that allowed them to lead, not just follow, their British colleagues.

Several months after Windship's return to Boston, the Massachusetts Humane Society began the humane society movement's practice of naming honorary members. The initial constitution of the MHS had not provided for honorary members, but circa 1792, the society amended the rules to allow them. Honorary members could not live in Massachusetts and three-quarters of the trustees had to vote for their admission. In mid-1792, the Massachusetts Humane Society elected three leaders of the Royal Humane Society – the Earl of Stamford, President; John Coakley Lettsom, Treasurer; and William Hawes, Register – as its first honorary members. (It is possible that the MHS named those men as honorary members to try to move the RHS to action on the Isle of Sable. The copy of the MHS's letter to the RHS announcing the honorary memberships printed

---

Windship," *Adams Family Correspondence*, vol. 5, p. 58; *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, p. 677. "Biography of Amos Windship," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, p. 166. Abigail Adams to John Adams, March 26, 1777, in *Adams Family Correspondence*, ed. Lyman H. Butterfield (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), vol. 2, pp. 187-188. John Lathrop to J. C. Lettsom, November 16, 1791, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, p. 445. David Hancock, "The Trouble with Networks: Managing the Scots' Early-Modern Madeira Trade," *Business History Review* 79 (2005): 467-491.

in the RHS's 1793 report, however, makes no mention of the Isle of Sable; either the MHS had dropped the issue or the RHS excised material from the letter. After Windship's address to the RHS festival, the Isle of Sable is not mentioned again in either society's records.)<sup>50</sup>

At about the same time that the three RHS leaders were chosen as MHS honorary members, Thomas Russell (1740-1796), president of the Massachusetts Humane Society and a merchant trading to Russia and the East Indies, made a bid for leadership on the transatlantic philanthropic stage with a sizeable donation to the RHS. Russell, a generous supporter of the MHS, sent his "mite" – £100 – to the Royal Humane Society, because, he explained, he felt "particularly interested in the encouragement of HUMANE SOCIETIES *throughout the world*, which may be productive of so much usefulness to individuals, and benefit to mankind." Russell, a citizen of an "infant country," could cast himself as a benefactor to a prominent London charity because of his wealth and by invoking a universalist understanding of philanthropy. Within months of Russell's gift and the MHS's naming the three RHS men as honorary members, the RHS responded to the example and assertiveness of the MHS by naming honorary life governors of its own. First, at a special meeting, the RHS made Russell an honorary life governor. It then named three other honorary life governors in time to list them – prominently – in the 1793 RHS annual report. Over the years, the RHS would name other British and foreign honorary governors. The Philadelphia Humane Society would follow suit.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> John Bartlett, *A Discourse on the Subject of Animation* (Boston, 1792), p. 23. Clarke, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, p. 31. N.B. The MHS report gives August 1792 as date that the first three honorary members were named but the letter announcing the honorary membership from the MHS printed in the RHS report is dated July 25, 1792.

<sup>51</sup> Thomas Russell to Lettsom, August 1, 1792, *RHS Reports 1793*, p. 31. John Warren, *An Eulogy on The Honourable Thomas Russell, Esq, Late President of The Society for Propagating the Gospel Among the Indians and Others, in North America; the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; the*

In 1793, the year after the MHS named its first honorary members, it took another new step towards bolstering ties with the RHS. That year, the Massachusetts Humane Society for the first time printed correspondence with leaders of other humane societies in the appendix to the annual discourse. The Society also published its first list of its honorary members, now including several Americans and the well-known Rev. John Erskine of Edinburgh, in that report.<sup>52</sup> The MHS would name other honorary members in future years. From its founding, the MHS had presented itself as following an international trend. By naming honorary members and publishing letters with its counterparts in London and Philadelphia, the MHS publicly repositioned itself as allied with humane societies and individuals elsewhere in a common cause, no longer as trailing European leaders. For the next decade and a half, the MHS and RHS collaborated in their common cause. (The Philadelphia Humane Society, struggling to put itself on sure footing during the 1790s, only intermittently corresponded with colleagues. For more on honorary memberships, see Chapter Six.)

The MHS men had wanted to find a way to help shipwrecked mariners on Sable Isle. Their initial model for aiding people at a distance had been wrong. They, like other Americans, had not realized that if they wanted to cooperate on philanthropic projects with their British associates they first had to figure out what had changed in the transatlantic community. It took several years, but the MHS learnt to think of itself as an equal, not a follower, of its European peers. In 1783, Benjamin Rush had beseeched

---

*Agriculture Society; the Society for the Advice of Immigrants; the Boston Chamber of Commerce; and the National Bank in Boston* (Boston, 1796), pp. 16-17, 26-27. *RHS Report 1793*, pp. 29, 31, 32, 12, 28. *Minutes of the Humane Society of Philadelphia*, vol. 1, March 29 and June 12, 1799, PHA.

<sup>52</sup> The RHS had printed letters from the MHS from the MHS's founding. Bartlett, *A Discourse on the Subject of Animation*, pp. 32-34. Clarke, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, p. 36.

Richard Price for donations for Carlisle College. Ten years later, Thomas Russell found a way to aid strangers – his large donation to the RHS – that allowed him to declare that Americans need not rely on Britons. Experimenting with ways to aid strangers and redefining the Anglophone Atlantic community were intertwined.

### *Learning from Mistakes*

The MHS may have made one more effort to address the problem of the Isle of Sable when it named Rev. Andrew Brown of Halifax an honorary member in 1793. (See Chapter Two.) Presumably the MHS hoped to spur the founding of a humane society in Halifax that would cooperate with the MHS on the Isle of Sable. (If so they succeeded only in part. In 1794, a humane society was founded in Halifax with Brown among the founders. But it took a government-funded lifesaving station called the Humane Establishment, set up in 1801, to tackle the Sable Isle problem. The Humane Establishment was in existence until 1959, by which point new navigational technology had basically eliminated the danger of shipwrecks on the island.) At some point, the MHS dropped the Isle of Sable issue after repeatedly failing to get cooperation towards solving that problem. The MHS's idea about philanthropic cooperation had been wrong. The Society learnt from its missteps, however, and propelled greater integration in the humane society movement by initiating the practice of naming honorary members.<sup>53</sup>

Likewise, lessons were learnt from the Society of Universal Good-will about what did and did not work. Within a few years of John Murray's death in 1792, the Society of

---

<sup>53</sup> *A Statement of the Premiums Awarded by the Humane Society*, p. 49. Brown traveled to Boston with a letter of introduction to Jeremy Belknap. S. S. Blowers to Belknap, September 24, 1791; Andrew Brown to Belknap, June 14, 1793; Brown to Belknap, December 31, 1793; Belknap Papers, 161.B (Reel 5), MHS; Jeremy Belknap Papers, 161.B (Reel 6), MHS. *RHS Reports 1795*, p. 55. Marq de Villiers and Sheila Hirtle, *Sable Island: The Strange Origins and Curious History of a Dune Adrift in the Atlantic* (New York, 2004), pp. 146-231. On the learning processes of charitable organizations, see Wright, "Experimenting in Charity" in *Transformation of Charity*.

Universal Good-will faded. A decade later, in 1806, foreign Protestant clergy in London, along with Murray's son, Charles, a solicitor active in London's charitable scene, formed the Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress (SFFD), with seed money coming from the Society of Universal Good-will's leftover funds. The SFFD's mission was to aid to "indigent Foreigners here, without distinction of country or religion; especially to those *who are not entitled to parochial aid*" plus to fund "such as are desirous, to return to their own country." The idea for the SFFD, the group explained, lay in the plan of the Society of Universal Good-will. The SFFD noted that John Murray had tried to extend the Society of Universal Good-will "upon a comprehensive scale" to London, but had "only partially effected" that goal. The program of the SFFD, which lasted into the twentieth century, was less grandiose than Murray's plans for a worldwide body. But for over a century, the SFFD pursued the mission that had begun when a group of Scotsmen in Norwich found an "overplus" after paying the bill at its 1774 St. Andrew's Day meal. Likewise, John Murray's model was replicated in Upper Canada by the Society for the Relief of Strangers in Distress, formed in 1817 with involvement by his daughter Anne Murray Powell.<sup>54</sup>

The Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress and the Massachusetts Humane Society each learnt what did and did not work from earlier efforts. The mistakes of the Society of Universal Good-will and the Massachusetts Humane Society, then, proved valuable in that way. Other charitable groups and philanthropists learnt from mistakes, too, or prepared the ground through seemingly fruitless ideas for successful philanthropic

---

<sup>54</sup> *Account of the Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress; With the Nature and View of the Institution: Also the Plan and Regulations . . .* (London, 1814), pp. 4-5, 66. *The Times* of London, May 7, 1931, p. 9. Katherine M. J. McKenna, *A Life of Propriety: Anne Murray Powell and Her Family, 1755-1849* (Montreal & Kingston, 1994), p. 234.

projects later. Even short-lived charitable groups and ideas that ultimately went nowhere helped build the philanthropic arena because knowledge of those groups and ideas could be circulated extensively. The circulation of those ideas or of news of the founding of new charitable institutions, even if they later failed, added to the sense of progress and possibility and thus to further growth in the philanthropic arena.

### *Conclusion*

“Our powers are limited.” So apologized New Englanders before the American Revolution for their failures to realize the grandest goals of Christian charity. As organized charity proved successful in the decades after the Revolution, New Englanders’ confidence about their abilities grew.<sup>55</sup> More generally, the thriving of associated charity along with increasing integration in the Anglophone Atlantic world led to the expectation that charitable movements would spread farther and accomplish more. The Society of Universal Good-will and the Massachusetts Humane Society, small charitable societies in mid-sized cities, had shared that expectation. Both were oriented towards the Atlantic community within the global economy and both were pragmatically cosmopolitan in methods and concerns. Both also tried to go beyond the local arena, but discovered their limits – limits that serve to remind us that in the late eighteenth century, American and British charitable organizations remained primarily local in their operations.

Citizens of the Anglophone Atlantic community, however, increasingly sought and found ways to go beyond the limits of particularism or distance in beneficence. There were local and transnational aspects to that search. Transnational endeavors were harder. In spite of their shortcomings, the efforts of the Society of Universal Good-will

---

<sup>55</sup> Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 16-47, 73-75, 116-121, 184-189, quotation from Arthur Browne, *Universal Love Recommended* (Boston, 1755), cited on p. 16.



and the Massachusetts Humane Society highlight two things. First, Britons and Americans had to re-imagine the nature of the transatlantic relationship. And secondly, since philanthropy is about imagined community, the unmaking of empire spurred activists to experiment with ways to overcome geographic boundaries in the practice of beneficence. The problem of how to aid distant sufferers gained more urgency and became trickier when fellow-nationals became foreigners. But eventually citizens of the Atlantic world would find methods that succeeded by building on the success they were having at the local level succoring strangers.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Stephen Conway, "From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783," *William and Mary Quarterly* 59 (2002): 65-100.

## Chapter Five

### No Improper Prejudices: Pursuing Impartial Charity Locally

When, circa 1794, the founders of the Halifax (Nova Scotia) Marine Humane Society, an offshoot of the mutual-aid Marine Society, first outlined their new venture, they “contemplated nothing more than to watch over the safety of each other while in harbour, and to provide relief in case of those grievous accidents which so frequently happen among sea-faring people.” “But upon further” contemplation, “the Society was persuaded that it became a duty to extend its exertions in this department of charitable assistance, as widely as possible.”<sup>1</sup>

At first, the Halifax men had not realized the illogicality of confining the aid of an emergency-rescue group to members. Their confusion about who their charity should be directed to fit into a larger phenomenon. As part of the elaboration of philanthropic infrastructures, citizens of the Atlantic world grappled with the nature of charitable obligation and with the extent of their capacities. John Howard had been celebrated as a “*Friend to Every Clime*,” and the Society of Universal Good-will and the Massachusetts Humane Society had both striven to enlarge their programs to help distant sufferers. The idea of succoring strangers evidently had broad appeal, but finding viable ways to do it across over wide spaces was another matter.

The local realm was less complicated. By the end of the eighteenth century, the urban charitable infrastructure included organizations that provided aid impartially, that

---

<sup>1</sup> Halifax *Royal Gazette and Nova Scotia Advertiser*, December 16, 1794.

is, without regard to some or all the categories of local residence, religion, ethnicity, and race. By far, the most impartial charities were humane societies. Yet founders of humane societies had not set up the groups from catholic motives nor had they even been sure about the extent of need for the organizations. Drowning was a familiar problem, but, as data on Philadelphia reveals, not one that claimed many lives. Nevertheless, humane societies facilitated lifesaving and, though they exaggerated, an analysis of the impact of the London, Massachusetts, and Philadelphia humane societies shows the groups could accurately claim to be impartial. Humane societies belonged to a broader trend. Motivated by a variety of factors, activists set up organizations that provided relief to “strangers.” By the end of the century, diverse charities on both sides of the Atlantic celebrated their liberality – highlighting the still-new nature of cosmopolitan beneficence.

*Humane Societies: The Paragon of Impartiality*

*Were Humane Societies Needed?*

Like the Halifax men, the founders of humane societies in the 1770s and 1780s were unsure about the scope of need for the charities. Royal Humane Society founder Dr. Thomas Cogan admitted that fewer people drowned in London than in Amsterdam, home to the first such organization. But, he thought, in a maritime state like Britain, many people must drown and, moreover, London needed to keep up with a Europe-wide medical trend. Likewise, the speaker at the Massachusetts Humane Society’s first anniversary meeting explained that the MHS had been formed in light of “[t]he astonishing success” of humane societies elsewhere. In its first year, however, the MHS had found no one to resuscitate. And when, in 1787, John Crawford of the Barbados General Dispensary and Humane Society thanked the RHS for its gift of lifesaving

equipment and information, he confessed “We have hitherto had no cases which required our medical aid in this way.” For its part, the Philadelphia Humane Society made the typical comments that humane societies around the Atlantic made about benefits to family and friends, the community and the country of lives saved. But the PHS confided in a 1790 letter to its Massachusetts counterpart that few drowning incidents had occurred in Philadelphia, “where almost every boy of 10 years of age can swim. [T]he unfortunate persons who suffer this untimely death, with us,” the PHS added, “are chiefly Europeans.” The PHS, that remark implies, imagined it would mainly save foreigners.<sup>2</sup>

Those comments raise questions about the extent of drowning in eighteenth-century communities and about the impact that the humane society movement had. Were these societies responding to a significant problem? The existence of several sources of data for Philadelphia makes that city a good choice to evaluate incidence of drowning. Also, the Philadelphia Humane Society was founded twice, initially in September 1780 and again when it was revived in March 1787. Perhaps drowning incidents spiked in 1779-1780 or 1786-1787 and thus Philadelphians formed a humane society in response.

Based on data from the Christ Church bills of mortality, the Old Swede Church burial records, and newspaper accounts, drowning was a well-known killer in Philadelphia but not one that claimed many lives. Each church recorded between zero and three deaths by drowning per year sampled, with three unusually high for each church. (See Tables 5.1a and 5.1b.) Newspapers also suggest that deaths by drowning in

---

<sup>2</sup> Cogan, *Memoirs of the Society Instituted at Amsterdam in Favour of Drowned Persons, for the Years 1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771*, pp. ii, iv. [Philadelphia Humane Society], *Directions for Recovering Persons, Who Are Supposed to Be Dead, from Drowning, Also for Preventing & Curing the Disorders, Produced by Drinking Cold Liquors, and By the Actions of Noxious Vapours, Lightning, and Excessive Cold and Heat, Upon the Human Body* (Philadelphia, [1788]), pp. 3, 5. Lathrop, *A Discourse Before the Humane Society*, pp. 22, 23. *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 93. Managers’ meeting, February 10, 1790, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA.

Philadelphia were infrequent. The two Philadelphia newspapers, the *Pennsylvania Packet* and the *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, analyzed for 1779 and 1780 reported no incidents of drowning in Philadelphia. The two Philadelphia newspapers analyzed for 1786 through March 13, 1787, when the revived Philadelphia Humane Society first ran an announcement in the *Packet*, reported a total of three people drowned in the Philadelphia area. The *Pennsylvania Packet* had accounts of two of the deaths and the *Pennsylvania Evening Herald* had an account of the third. As that difference in reporting suggests, newspapers are an unreliable source for determining rates of death by drowning. Each newspaper reported different drowning incidents in Philadelphia for the period studied. Furthermore, those newspapers reported many more drowning deaths from other places. That situation prompted a search of newspapers from New York and Charleston, the *Daily Advertiser* and the *Columbian Herald*, respectively, for accounts of drowning incidents in Philadelphia not mentioned in the Philadelphia newspapers. The Charleston newspaper had no accounts of drowning deaths in Philadelphia for the period covered, but the New York *Daily Advertiser* reported three deaths not reported in the Philadelphia newspapers. Thus, for 1786 through early March 1787, at least six people in the Philadelphia area died by drowning.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Susan E. Klepp, *"The Swift Progress of Population": A Documentary and Bibliographic Study of Philadelphia's Growth, 1642-1859* (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 68, 70-71, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 84, 88, 93, 95. Old Swedes Church Gloria Dei Burial Records, HSP, pp. 49, 57, 78-79, 81, 82, 93, 97, 197, 217, 232, 290, 336, 359, 393, 400, 449, 453, 481, 482, 495. *Pennsylvania Packet*, *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, *Pennsylvania Evening Herald*, *New York Daily Advertiser*, *Charleston Columbian Herald*, *Readex America's Historical Newspapers*, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, <http://infoweb.newsbank.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/>. N.B. Not all drowning incidents use the word "drowned," the word I used to search the digital versions of the newspapers. A comprehensive search of a New York newspaper for several years in the 1780s, however, found very few reports of drowning incidents that do not use the word "drowned," so searching the digital versions of newspapers with the word "drowned" yields most reports.

No bill of mortality exists for Philadelphia for 1786 or 1787, but deaths in the city in those years can be estimated at somewhere around 1,000: In 1782, over 820 people were buried, and in 1788, 1,036 people were buried. Based on those numbers, drowning caused roughly 0.5 or 0.6 percent of deaths in Philadelphia in 1786. By comparison, the London Bills of Mortality for 1773, the year before the RHS’s founding, reported that 123 people had died from drowning, out of 21,656 buried (0.56 percent). Deaths by drowning made up the largest category of accidental deaths in the London Bills and, thus, one historian explains, “of all accidental deaths, drowning was likely to provide the most plentiful supply” of bodies to experiment with new resuscitation methods. In London, as in Philadelphia, drowning was familiar, but other causes took more lives.<sup>4</sup>

Table 5.1a: Incidence of Deaths by Drowning among Christ-Church (Philadelphia) Parishioners Semi-decennially, 1760-1815

N.B. The bills actually report data from December 25 of one year to December 25 of the next year. When I refer, for instance, to 1760, the data provided covers December 25, 1759, to December 25, 1760. Where available data becomes erratic, I include the years closest to the semi-decennial years. There is no data for 1779-1780 or 1786-1785. This data includes St. Peter’s Church.

Source: Bills of Mortality Published by Christ-Church, Philadelphia, collected in Susan E. Klepp, *“The Swift Progress of Population”: A Documentary and Bibliographic Study of Philadelphia’s Growth, 1642-1859*

Year	Number of Christ-Church Parishioners Buried	Number of Deaths by Drowning
1760	178	1
1765	182	1
1770	127	1
1774	156	2
1782	198	3
1788	128	2
1792	125	0
1795	223	2
1800	135	0
1805	155	1
1811	139	2
1815	113	0

<sup>4</sup> Klepp, *“The Swift Progress of Population,”* pp. 77, 78. Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity,” pp. 27, 26.

Table 5.1b: Deaths by Drowning Record in the Burial Records of Old Swedes Church Gloria Dei (Philadelphia), 1788-1815

Source: Old Swedes Church Gloria Dei Burial Records 1750-1831, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, N.B. Until 1791, there is scant information in the records about people who were buried and cause of death is almost never given. From 1791, the cause of death for people buried by the church is not always given. This information is recorded in diary form and I only collected data on number of deaths by drowning recorded by Collin. The burial records include members of the congregation and also strangers buried by the church. I have only included years in which deaths by drowning are reported.

Year	Total Number of People Buried by the Church Who Had Drowned	Number Identified as Foreigners or Foreign-born
1788	1	
1791	2	
1795	2	1
1796	3	2
1802	1	
1803	1	1
1804	1	
1805	3 (plus 2 other boys drowned in one of the incidents)	
1806	2	1
1809	2	
1811	2	1
1812	1	
1813	1	

These numbers, however, slight the tragedy of drowning incidents. Because victims were often people who worked on or by the water in low-paid occupations, deaths by drowning often disrupted fragile family economies. A Philadelphia clergyman recorded one such case in 1811. Richard Fry, a laborer aged about 45, lived in Christian Street, Philadelphia. In late May the New Jersey native “[w]as found drowned by the wharf,” noted the cleric. “The wheelbarrow he had was also in the water with him. He was a sober, industrious, quiet man, indigent with several children. His wife being unable for the funeral expenses [sic], the neighbours furnished it.”<sup>5</sup>

But no source better conveys the horror and turmoil of a drowning emergency than this disaster related in the PHS minutes: On August 6, 1807, “three boys were bathing in a pond on Walnut Street . . . , which was full of water. Two of them walked

<sup>5</sup> Old Swedes Church Gloria Dei Burial Records, p. 481, HSP.

hand in hand into a well in the pond & disappeared.” The third boy’s reaction captures the trauma of the event. Rather than raise an alarm in the vicinity of the accident, the child “ran home, & in his fright was going to bed.” But his behavior prompted questions, and he was “interrogated [and] he said the boys were drowned. Several persons ran to the pond, & many more soon collected & search[ed] the pond, but the children could not be found.” Two sets of PHS grapnels were brought to the scene. Meanwhile, one William Brant showed up and finally, in the third well he searched, retrieved the body of one boy, whose last name was Carlisle. “William Brant was down so long that people thought he would never come up alive.” When he did come up, “[t]here were so much noise & confusion among the croud that Brant did not know or recollect that there were two boys drowned, & being much exhausted with the fatigue & anxiety of descending into the three wells he went home.” Efforts were made to resuscitate the Carlisle boy, without success. After the first child’s body had been found, another man “descended into the well & brought up the second child named Benjamin Lewis, whom he took to his mother’s.” By then, it was too late to even try resuscitating the second boy’s body.<sup>6</sup>

Even if cases of drowning in one city were few, however, exposure to news of drowning deaths could be high: Newspapers gave play to stories of drowning from far and wide. Tables 5.2a and 5.2b show all recent incidents of drowning identified by a search of the word “drowned” reported in the New York *Daily Advertiser* and the Charleston *Columbian Herald* from January 1, 1786, to March 13, 1785. Both newspapers reported deaths by drowning from around the Atlantic and occasionally from further away. Newspapers informed readers of lives lost to the sea in the course of relating the outcome of maritime voyages. And printers broadcast sensational cases, such

---

<sup>6</sup> Managers’ meeting, October 14, 1807, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA.



as the mother who drowned one child and killed two others. But mundane cases made it into print too. Although drowning accounts usually had few gory details, they might provoke feelings of “dreadful pleasure,” the new emotional response of the eighteenth century to stories of pain and violence. Moreover, humdrum reports reveal that in its ever-presence and unpredictability, the problem of drowning united people across space and background into a single community facing a common hazard. That common hazard was made more upsetting because often, it seemed, people drowning were almost within reach of rescue. “. . . Persons standing by the water [when three people were drowning in the Delaware], by fear, incapacity, or consternation, strangely restrained from yielding assistance. Assistance indeed, shortly came, but, came too late.” Newspapers need give few details to conjure up the terrible scene and the impotence observers, in person or through print, might feel in the face of murderous water.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> I used data from those two newspapers because each newspaper falls in the mid-range for hits of the word “drowned.” The Pennsylvania *Packet* yields an extremely high 113 hits for the word “drowned,” whereas hits for some other newspapers are in the teens. On the new “dreadful pleasure” of stories of pain and violence in the eighteenth century, see Karen Halttunen, *Murder Most Foul: The Killer and the American Gothic Imagination* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998), 66-65. William Staughton, *A Discourse, Occasioned by the Sudden Death of Three Young Persons, by Drowning. Delivered on the 28<sup>th</sup> of May, 1797, at the Baptist Meeting House in Bordentown, New Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1797), p. 21.

Table 5.2a: Drowning incidents in the New York *Daily Advertiser*, January 1, 1786, through March 13, 1787

N.B. This data was compiled by searching the digital versions of the New York *Daily Advertiser* and the Charleston *Columbian Herald* by the word “drowned.” I have excluded references to drowning incidents in the past, such as during a Revolutionary War battle. If the incident was reported in one of the other four newspapers I examined, I have included the date. When the location is listed as Place A to Place B, it means the drowned person was traveling on a vessel between those places. When I chose the *Boston Gazette* for a comparison, I knew it had more hits for the word “drowned” than other Boston newspapers.

Date reported in the <i>Daily Advertiser</i>	Where	Who	In Penn. <i>Packet</i>	In Penn. <i>Evening Herald</i>	In <i>Columbian Herald</i>	In <i>Boston Gazette</i>
1/9/86	Conn. River btw Hartford and Rocky Hill	Hartford man (James Barton)	1/4/86		1/12/86	
1/23/86	Boston to Muscongus	2 captains, a woman, 3 mariners			2/16/86	
2/4/86	Newburyport-Derryfield, Mass. Area	3 people in a family	2/2/86			1/23/86
3/6/86	Charleston	1 white woman, 2 men, 3 negroes	3/23/86			
3/27/86	The Wateree River (Carolinas)	A child, killed by mother	4/1/86	3/27/86	3/16/86	4/10/86
3/29/86	New York	Man, native of Ireland				
4/17/86	The <i>Fountain</i> from Savannah	Captain and crew	4/24/86			
5/3/86	Canaan, Conn.	Local man	5/3/86			
5/13/86	Lima to Cadiz	180 people				
5/23/86	Rochelle to Providence	Irish crew member			6/22/86	
5/24/86	Philadelphia to Charleston	French captain (suspicion of murder but ruled suicide due to insanity)	5/27/86	5/27/86	5/11/86	
5/24/86	Newport	2 brothers, aged 26 and 21	5/31/86			
6/19/86	Jamaica to Norfolk	Mariner				
6/29/86	Newburyport to Cadiz	3 mariners	7/1/86		7/31/86	
7/17/86	Philadelphia to Fayal	Most of the crew				
7/22/86	Battle btw 2 Genoese ships and Algerines	Some of the Genoese crews	7/22/86		7/31/86	
7/24/86	Philadelphia	Lad				

Table 5.2a, continued

Date reported in the <i>Daily Advertiser</i>	Where	Who	In Penn. <i>Packet</i>	In Penn. <i>Evening Herald</i>	In <i>Columbian Herald</i>	In <i>Boston Gazette</i>
7/24/86	Philadelphia	2 men, 1 of whom was mulatto				
7/25/86	Lake Champlain	6 people	7/27/86			7/31/86
7/31/86	Algerine-Venetian battle	Algerine crew	8/3/86			
8/30/86	Alexandria, Virginia	Flatman	7/29/86			
9/5/86	Richmond, Virginia	Boy belonging to a vessel	7/31/86			
9/27/86	Wilmington to New Castle	Local man				
9/28/86	Near Staten Island	Man from Jamaica				
10/14/86	Baltimore	2 men (1 a butcher) in 2 incidents	10/14/86			10/23/86
10/17/86	Near Albany	Vermont man				10/30/86
10/18/86	Near Hudson, NY	Man				
10/20/86	Near Trenton	Man				
10/28/86	Sheffield, Mass.	Gentleman, his wife and child				
1/27/87	Jamaica to Nassau	4 mariners	2/3/87			

Table 5.2b: Drowning incidents in the (Charleston) *Columbian Herald*, January 1, 1786, through March 13, 1787

N.B. See explanation for Table 5.2a

Date reported in the <i>Columbian Herald</i>	Where	Who	In Penn. <i>Packet</i>	In Penn. <i>Evening Herald</i>	In New York <i>Daily Advert.</i>	In Boston <i>Gazette</i>
1/1/86	Near Hartford	Hartford man, identified as native of Ireland (J. Barton)	1/4/86		1/9/86	
1/16/86	New York to St. John's	Mariner				
2/16/86	Boston to Muscongus	2 captains, woman, 3 mariners			1/23/86	
3/20/86	The Wateree River (Carolinas)	Child, killed by mother	4/1/86	3/27/86	3/16/86	4/10/86
3/20/86	Ashley River	Man				
3/23/86	Montego Bay, Jamaica	Boatswain, another person				
3/23/86	Norfolk, Virginia, to Charleston	Mariner	4/29/86			
4/24/86	Charleston	Man from Dantzig (trying to catch hat)	5/110/86	5/10/86		
5/11/86	Philadelphia to Charleston	French captain (suspicion of murder but ruled suicide due to insanity)	5/27/86	5/27/86	5/24/86	
5/18/86	Savannah	Silversmith, suicide				
6/8/86	Charleston to Savannah	Captain				7/3/86 (per BG, he was from Charlestown, Mass.)
6/22/86	Rochelle to Providence	Irish crew member			5/23/86	
7/3/86	Nassau	Soldier				
7/20/86	Africa to Jamaica	300 captive Africans	7/27/86			
7/31/86	Battle btw 2 Genoese ships and Algerines	Some of the Genoese crews	7/22/86		7/22/86	
7/31/86	Newburyport to Cadiz	3 mariners	7/1/86		6/29/86	
8/10/86	Near Nyack, New York	Man	7/13/86			

Table 5.2, continued

Date reported in the <i>Columbian Herald</i>	Where	Who	In Penn. <i>Packet</i>	In Penn. <i>Evening Herald</i>	In New York <i>Daily Advert.</i>	In Boston <i>Gazette</i>
8/21/86	Vessel from N. Carolina, near Beaufort	Negro boy				
11/9/86	Demerara to New London	4 men – 1 from Essequibo & 3 from different Conn. towns		11/1/86		
12/14/86	Cochin, India	14 people				
1/1/87	St. Elizabeth, Jamaica	2 valuable negroes	12/21/86			
2/4/87	St. George's Parish, Jamaica	4 negroes	3/8/86	3/10/86		
3/8/87	Shetland	6 people from a Dutch ship				

*Lives Saved*

Although the threat from drowning was omnipresent in the eighteenth-century Anglophone Atlantic world, the extent of the problem in any particular community did not lead people to found humane societies. Who, then, did the societies help? Did humane societies' increasing cosmopolitanism reflect their local impacts? That is, did the PHS mainly help Europeans, not locals? Did the MHS's charity extend to people "of whatever nation or climate [they] may be?" Was the RHS right when it declared time and again that it aided people regardless of "age, sex or fortune?" The answer to those questions overall is no and yes. The societies exaggerated, but contemporaries had found in lifesaving a practical, focused means to engage in universal beneficence.

The data on rewards and honors given by the PHS, MHS, and RHS provide a way to analyze the demographics of humane societies' beneficiaries. (See Tables 5.3a, 5.3b, and 5.3c.) Many of these cases were instances where people were rescued without needing to be resuscitated from apparent death. Each society's data is different, and

therefore slightly different data is presented for each society. The PHS, unlike the other two societies, did not publish annual reports, so data on its rewards comes from its minutes from 1780 to 1815, with additional information coming from accounts of rescues that the PHS had published in newspapers. In a few of its cases, rewards were declined or the rescuers could not be identified, but those cases have been included. A few cases where the society heard about a rescue but did not pursue a reward investigation have been excluded. The PHS's rewards were for incidents in the Philadelphia area.

The MHS published annual reports starting in 1787, and data was examined through 1813. The reports included lists of the premiums the society had paid; those lists provide information on who the rescued and rescuers were. The MHS was established as a statewide body but few applications for rewards seem to have come from western Massachusetts. Data on MHS rewards for rescues from drowning does not capture the Society's full impact because it excludes people who took shelter in the huts the Society erected along the shore for the benefit of shipwrecked mariners and others. In addition, the data here excludes cases printed in the reports for which no rewards were paid.

The RHS published annual reports starting in 1774. Because London had a vastly larger population than American cities and thus many more drowning emergencies, data was intended to be sampled for one year every decade. The RHS, however, stopped printing detailed cases of rescues and recoveries in 1790 and from then only gave aggregate numbers. Thus, the analysis of RHS data is only for 1776 and 1785. The RHS gave rewards for incidents in the greater London area and beyond, with its catchment area changing over the years. With all three societies, data is incomplete, and the people

involved in the cases often cannot be identified beyond general descriptions such as “boy” or “male.”<sup>8</sup>

Table 5.3a: Philadelphia Humane Society Cases, 1782-1815

N.B. In 1783-1790, 1796, 1800, 1802, and 1804, the Society gave no rewards. That situation presumably was not a reflection on the incidence of drowning emergencies but on the Society.

Source: Humane Society of Philadelphia Minutes, vols. 1 and 2, Pennsylvania Hospital Archives, Philadelphia

<b>Rescued</b>	
Incidents	71
People aided, total	83
Children up to age 15	60 (incl. 2 brothers, presumably children)
Children who were boys	At least 44
Men	At least 17
Women	At least 3
Identified as black/mulatto	3 (plus 1 unsuccessful case)
Identified as strangers/non-locals	2 (1 “stranger”; 1 son of a man newly arrived from Ireland)
Identified as attempted suicides	1 woman
<b>Rescuers</b>	
Total	Over 74
Female	1
Identified as lad or aged 14-18	10 (all male)
Younger children	1 9-year old boy
Identified as Black/mulatto	2 (plus 2 in other cases)
Identified as strangers	2
Foreigners	2 (1 Portuguese lad; 1 man, probably a mariner, named Juan Suares)

<sup>8</sup> “At least” indicates there *might* be more people of a certain category and “over” indicates there definitely were more people in a category (for instance, when records refer to “several children,” I counted all the individually-identified children and then included the children referred to in “several children” by using “over.”)

Table 5.3b: Massachusetts Humane Society Cases, 1786-1812

N.B. The MHS records identify many people only by name. They are overwhelmingly male and probably adult men or youths, but it is possible some are younger.

Sources: Appendices to the Discourses before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1787-1813

<b>Rescued</b>	
Incidents	317
People aided, total	Over 397
Children	Over 172
Males (probably not boys or lads)	Over approx. 200
Women/female (probably not girls)	Over 12
Black/mulatto	At least 6
Identified as foreigners	At least 2 (probably more b/c crews of a few vessels were saved incl. a Danish ship)
Identified as attempted suicides	3 women, 1 man, and 1 “person”
<b>Rescuers/Aid-providers</b>	
Total	Over 414 (incl. 2 men who lost their lives in one attempted rescue but were posthumously rewarded)
Female	At least 4
Identified as young/lad/child	10 (all male)
Identified as black	2
Identified as foreigners	3 (2 Frenchmen and a Malay or Sandwich Islander)

Table 5.3c: Royal Humane Society Cases, 1776, 1785

N.B. The 1776 cases are of incidents where the person in danger was either rescued without needing to be resuscitated or was rescued and resuscitated. The 1785 cases are only cases in which the person in danger was both rescued and resuscitated. Information on rescuers is often imprecise or not given.

Sources: *RHS Reports 1776* ([London, 1777]), *RHS Reports 1785-1786* ([London, 1787?])

<b>Total number of cases in which the RHS gave rewards, 1774-1815</b>	7,912 cases; in 3,698 of those cases the person’s life was saved
<b>Rescued, 1776 and 1785</b>	
Incidents	93
People aided, total	101
Children, to age 15 or identified as children, lad, &c.	36
Women/females (probably not girls)	23
Men/male (probably not boys)	38
Identified as foreigners	3 (a French mariner, an American Loyalist, a Philadelphia native)
Identified as attempted suicides	14 females; 6 males
Not identified	4 “people”
<b>Rescuers/Aid-providers</b>	
Identified as female	3
Identified as child/young/apprentice	3
Incidents in which watermen are identified as rescuers	At least 16 incidents (largest identified occupational category)

There are several general traits of the people involved in cases before humane societies. As the tables show, people rescued from drowning were primarily male and in large part young. In many cases, the records do not identify the rescued or rescuers by



occupation, but where occupations are given, most of the men and youths in both categories were people who worked on the water or in other manual jobs. Because of the prevalence of mariners in these cases, especially in Massachusetts, the number of foreigners given in the tables may be an undercount. Children in these cases were either at work or, if boys, at play or bathing when they fell into the water. The high percentage of children among the totals reclaimed from drowning in all three places reflects, in part, the types of situations in which children fell into rivers. Children often fell off wharves and may therefore have been close enough to riverbanks to make saving them likely. Besides rivers, children fell into millponds, wells, cisterns, and privies. Adults, in general, were rescued from rivers or, in the Massachusetts cases, along the coast or at sea.

There are two related differences between the demographics of RHS cases and those of the American societies. One is the greater percentage of women in the RHS cases, and the other is the higher percentage of attempted suicides, mainly by women, among those rescued in London. The latter difference could reflect differences in reporting of attempted suicides. The majority of women in the RHS cases, however, were attempted suicides and there were few women in the Philadelphia or Massachusetts cases. Therefore, it seems likely that the PHS and MHS did not significantly underreport suicide attempts and that women and older girls did not face much risk of drowning except in suicide attempts. A possible explanation for the greater number of attempted suicides in London than in Philadelphia or Massachusetts may be the greater prevalence of poverty in England than among the white population of the United States: The RHS reports often explain that dire poverty drove people to try to take their own lives by drowning. It is impossible to know if the people recovered from suicide attempts shared

their true reasons for wanting to end their lives with rescuers, but destitution seemed plausible to Londoners of all ranks as a reason for self-destruction.<sup>9</sup>

The demographics of the people – mainly workingmen and –boys – rescued from drowning raise questions about economic motivations and impact of humane societies. Early twenty-first century historians are not the first to be interested in those questions. The Royal Humane Society, in particular, repeatedly addressed the issue of its economic impact and argued that it had a positive effect in two ways. First, like many other charitable organizations in eighteenth-century London, the RHS argued for its worth based on the commonplace that a state’s wealth lay in its population. The RHS reiterated time and again that its program benefited the state by preventing population loss. Second, the RHS stressed that one of its key contributions to society was to preserve family economies by saving the lives of breadwinners. American societies, and the Amsterdam group in its early reports, dwelt on those issues less, but all humane societies explained that their endeavors would save the lives of valuable – in various ways including economic – members of the community. RHS explanations of its rewards point to another economic impact of the society. One rationale the RHS gave for its giving rewards was not only that they motivated insufficiently benevolent lower-class people to rescue those in distress, but also that rewards compensated working people for the time taken away from earning money while they were involved in time-consuming

---

<sup>9</sup> Suicide by drowning was a predominantly female phenomenon in early modern England and America. Michael MacDonald and Terence R. Murphy, *Sleepless Souls: Suicide in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990), p. 247; Richard J. Bell, “Do Not Despair: The Cultural Significance of Suicide in America, 1780-1840” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2006), p. 159. See Bell, “Do Not Despair,” on the perceived suicide epidemic in the early American republic, and see chap. 2 for analysis of humane societies’ anti-suicide agenda; for a discussion of suicide intervention by the RHS compared to American societies, see Bell, “Do Not Despair,” pp. 155-162. For analyses of RHS lifesaving techniques and some data on those saved by the RHS, see John Anthony Tercier, *Contemporary Deathbed: The Ultimate Rush* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire, 2005), pp. 51-80.

resuscitation efforts. RHS prejudices aside, the society was right that workingmen in England, many of whom could not swim, might hesitate to risk their lives to save someone from drowning. But there is ample evidence, from American newspapers over the eighteenth century at least, that when rescuing someone from drowning seemed possible, people did so well before the advent of humane societies. The existence of humane societies meant that rescues that might have occurred in their absence now were compensated. Thus, part of the impact of humane societies was that they functioned as income-redistribution organizations with a social and intellectual purpose for members based on an existing, although unacknowledged, behavior.<sup>10</sup>

The economic impact of humane societies is a straightforward issue. Any direct self-interested economic motivation for support for the societies, however, is unclear. Few of the MHS's members are identified as captains, a group that would seem to have a clear reason to support the society; many of its leaders were clergymen or doctors. PHS leaders in the group's first twenty-five years included doctors; the two druggists, Christopher Marshall Jr. and Charles Marshall, who were the long-time treasurer and secretary, respectively; two goldsmiths; an iron merchant; a printer/bookseller/stationer; merchants; a brush manufacturer; and assorted gentlemen. The leaders of the RHS were medical men, clergymen, and other professionals. While RHS leaders used the Society to

---

<sup>10</sup> Donna Andrew argues that charities founded in London in the mid-eighteenth century focused on population and that that concern declined later in the century. Bronwyn Croxson and Luke Davidson have both pointed out, however, that population concerned the founders of dispensaries in the late eighteenth century and the leaders of the RHS. Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*; Croxson, "The Public and Private Faces of Eighteenth-Century Dispensary Charity," p. 133; Davidson, "Raising Up Humanity," p. 102. On the RHS promoting benevolence, see Davidson, "Raising Up Humanity," pp. 102-104. The RHS reports reiterate the population argument throughout the entire period under study. For examples of rescues before the advent of humane societies, see *Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 9, 1729; *Pennsylvania Gazette*, May 6, 1751; *New York Daily Advertiser*, May 24, 1786.

burnish the professional reputations of medical men and clergymen, the American humane societies put little emphasis on that function of the societies.<sup>11</sup>

Perhaps the best evidence that economic self-interest did not motivate supporters and leaders of humane societies is their failure in slave societies, where in theory slaveholders might have had a strong self-interest in organizations that preserved lives, read valuable property. The Barbados Humane Society, founded in 1788, promptly failed when the Dispensary did. Likewise, the Jamaica Humane Society, founded in 1789, seems not to have had many cases of rescues or resuscitations to report. (Had it reported successes to the RHS, the RHS almost surely would have published them.) Yet the only Jamaica Humane Society case published in the RHS reports was one in which four slaves, Robin, James, Bessa Abba and Gaudson, were rewarded for their “services in restoring the life of a white person” circa 1791. (The construction of that sentence suggests that Robin, James, Bessa Abba and Gaudson performed the resuscitation techniques, probably under the direction of someone with access to humane society directions. The body had been restored in the house of a free black woman, Mary Barrow, who also received a reward.) In Charleston, too, the South Carolina Medical Society’s efforts to start a humane society seem to have come to naught in spite of getting support from the City Council. In all three of those places, as elsewhere, doctors figured prominently among the founders of the short-lived groups. Intellectual excitement and

---

<sup>11</sup> For PHS officers, see PHS Annual Meeting Minutes. The doctors are identified as such in the minutes. On the Marshalls, see Hardie, *The Philadelphia Directory and Register* (1794), p. 96. The goldsmiths were Samuel Pancoast Jr. and Joseph Lownes; the iron merchant was Caleb Lownes; the printer/bookseller/stationer was Joseph Crukshank. Merchants included Thomas Greeves and Isaac Snowden Jr. The brush manufacturer was Robert Coe. Men identified as gentlemen included Caleb Cresson Jr. and Robert Parrish. See Hardie, *The Philadelphia Directory and Register* (1793), pp. 109, 86, 30, 110. Edmund Hogan, *The Prospect of Philadelphia and Check on the Next Directory* (Philadelphia, 1795), p. 142. Cornelius William Stafford, *The Philadelphia Directory for 1798* (Philadelphia, 1798), pp. 37, 132. Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity,” p. 70; see pp. 121-128 on how the RHS promoted the trustworthiness of medical men.

curiosity about lifesaving – and the psychic benefit of knowing that, as humane societies told their members so often, one supported the paramount philanthropic cause – more than economic self-interest drove support for humane societies.<sup>12</sup>

What, then, of humane societies' claims to have overcome prejudice and partiality in their charity? The PHS did not mainly help Europeans, although, since most of the people prevented from drowning in Philadelphia were children, the PHS may have been right that most Philadelphians over age ten could swim. And, by and large, in Massachusetts and London, the people who drowned were workingmen and local boys, not “any age, sex and fortune,” nor of “whatever nation or climate.” But, the societies were impartial in their charity in a way that was unusual, if not unique. Occasionally gentlemen or other men in high-status jobs were among the rescued or rescuers. (When they were rescuers, elites, such as gentlemen, captains, and medical men, were not given monetary rewards but were honored with medals or certificates or simply with thanks, as befitted their status.) Women, foreigners, newcomers, and, in the United States, African Americans, were sometimes among the rescued and rescuers too. Few, if any, other philanthropic movements at the time understood their missions in such broad terms. Of course, that impartiality came about from the peculiar nature of humane societies' programs: They encouraged passersby to rescue drowning people. The nationality, religion, color, gender, age, party, and status of beneficiaries and rescuers were beyond the societies' control.

Nevertheless, the societies could claim to be cosmopolitan in their missions, and cases in which the rescued or rescuer was a stranger had a special resonance. In each

---

<sup>12</sup> *RHS Reports 1791* ([London, 1791]), p. xxix. Waring, *A History of Medicine in South Carolina*, pp. 121, 123, 350-352.

1810 and 1811, the highest reward given by the PHS went to a stranger, one a new arrival to the city named John Wattles (\$12) and the other a man, evidently a mariner, named Juan Suares (\$10). Similarly, the RHS played up cases in which those saved were not British. The case of a Danish captain rescued in 1794 was highlighted over and over, along with the rescuer's comment that a "British heart knows no distinction." And the RHS reprinted time and again two different cases, one from Cape Coast Castle on the Gold Coast and the other in Hudson's Bay, in which an African girl and an Indian youth, respectively, were preserved from drowning and were revived. In addition, the RHS paid rewards in those cases, although cases that far away were ordinarily ineligible for rewards. The societies' heed to cases where rescued or rescuer was a stranger suggest both the still-newness of impersonal or impartial charitable aid and the groups' desire to affirm universal philanthropy.<sup>13</sup>

Besides encompassing people from all walks of life, the PHS and MHS were impartial in another way: The societies did not discriminate in rewards when the rescued or rescuer was black. Admittedly, the number of cases in which either rescued or rescuer was black is tiny. Of the 83 people rescued in PHS cases, three were black, and of the over 74 rescuers in PHS cases two were black. There were also two cases in which the drowning victims died in which black or mulatto men gave assistance. In MHS cases, of the over 397 people aided, at least six were black or mulatto (that is, six were identified as black or mulatto, but it is possible that people of African descent were among the

---

<sup>13</sup> Managers' meeting, July 11, 1810, August 14, 1811, January 8, 1812, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA; James Robinson, *The Philadelphia Directory for 1809* (1809); James Robinson, *The Philadelphia Directory for 1810* (1810). *RHS Reports 1795*, p. 10; *RHS Reports 1797* ([London, 1797?]), p. 36; *RHS Reports 1799* (London, [1798]), p. 48; *RHS Reports 1794* ([London, 1794?]), pp. 62-63; *RHS Reports 1804* (London, [1804]), p. 26; *RHS Reports 1808* (London, [1808]), p. 35.

groups identified, for instance, as “several people” or “39 people.”) Two rescuers in MHS cases were identified as black. (See Tables 5.4a and 5.4b.)

Table 5.4a: Philadelphia Humane Society Cases where Rescued or Rescuer was Black

<b>Year</b>	<b>Rescued</b>	<b>Rescuer</b>	<b>Reward</b>	<b>Reward Range for that Year</b>
1808	Black man named Dick	Daniel Saint, 17-year old son of a corder	\$10	\$5-\$10 (5 cases)
1809	Robert Anderson, black boy, aged 13	Sailmaker named George Muschert	\$10	\$6-\$10 (in one case, 2 men shared a \$10 reward) (5 cases; 1 of the \$10 rewards was for a case that involved the rescue of 4 people)
1813	Unnamed mulatto boy, aged 12 or 14	Male named James Thompson	\$12	\$6-\$12 (4 cases, 1 with no info on reward; only one \$12 reward)
1810	7-year old boy named Benjamin West	Jacob Davidson, “a poor & industrious black man,” evidently a carter	\$10	\$4-\$12 (5 cases; 1 rescuer declined reward)
1814	Child of Eli Davis, from a privy	Jacob Gibbs, a black man	\$10	\$4-\$12 (9 cases; no reward info for some)

Sources: Humane Society of Philadelphia Minutes, vols. 1 and 2, Pennsylvania Hospital Archives, Philadelphia

Table 5.4b: Massachusetts Humane Society Cases where Rescued or Rescuer was Black

Year	Rescued	Rescuer	Reward	Reward Range for that Year
1802/03	Quaco, a black man	Mr. Parsons received body into his house for purposes of using resuscitative process (outcome unclear)	\$5	\$1-\$30 (18 cases; \$30 was to a man who saved several lives; without that case, mean is \$5.18)
1802/03	Unnamed black man	Story Chandler	\$1	See above
1802/03	Unnamed mulatto boy	Simeon Hemenway	\$2	See above
1803/04	Newborn mulatto child	Peter Long, Jacob Long and Samuel Bailey	\$4	\$1-\$10 plus 2 medals (18 cases; mean for the 15 cases with monetary rewards and that involved 1 rescued person/case is \$6.13)
1805/06	A black person	J. Dannels	\$5	\$2-\$80 (19 cases; mean for the 16 cases involving 1 rescued person/case is \$5.81)
1808/09	A black man	Lolly and Rich	\$5 total; \$3 to one and \$2 to the other	\$3-\$36 (14 cases; mean for the 9 cases involving 1 rescued person/case is \$4.89)
1794/95	Child of George Churchill of Plymouth	Dolphin Garler, black man who worked in store in Plymouth	\$10	\$1.50-\$17 (\$10 was the highest reward to an individual that year)
1795/96	A young man	Boston Jackson, a black man	\$4	\$3-\$8 (13 cases; mean for the 10 cases involving 1 rescued person/case is \$3.7)

Sources: Appendices to the Discourses before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1787-1813

The number of cases involving people of African descent as rescued drowning victims or rescuers was small. But those cases do not reveal any pattern of discrimination



either in valuing the lives of African Americans delivered from drowning or in recognizing the efforts of African Americans as lifesavers. The evidence from the 1802-03 MHS cases shown in table 5.4b might seem to contradict that statement about how the lives of African Americans were valued. The other rewards given that year, however, cut against drawing that conclusion from the amount of rewards for rescuing African American compared to the mean. Besides the \$5 reward for the rescue of Quaco, a black man, three other rewards of \$5, out of eighteen total rewards, were given. There were no other \$1 rewards, but there was a reward of \$1.25. And the reward for \$2 for saving the life of a mulatto boy was matched by a \$2 reward given for saving the life of a (white) boy.<sup>14</sup> Likewise, the \$5 reward to J. Dannels in 1805-06 for rescuing a black man fell in the middle of rewards for cases of rescues of one person in a given incident. The breakdown of all rewards for rescues of single persons at a time that year is four \$2 rewards; three \$3 rewards; one \$4 reward; three \$5 rewards; one \$7 reward; one \$8 reward; two \$10 rewards; and a \$25 reward to three men who “sav[ed] the life of a person who was perishing upon a raft which had floated away from the South Bridge, in a dark evening of the month of May.”<sup>15</sup>

That \$25 reward for rescuing the person floating away on a raft in the dark highlights how humane societies determined reward amounts. The greater the effort and risk by the rescuer, the greater the reward. Based on the qualitative evidence available, the leaders of the humane societies in Philadelphia and Massachusetts applied that principle regardless of the race of the parties involved. For instance, in the case of Robert

---

<sup>14</sup> Gardiner, *A Sermon Delivered Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1803*, pp. 35-36.

<sup>15</sup> Thaddeus Mason Harris, *A Discourse Delivered before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1806), pp. 31-32.

Anderson, the 13-year old black boy saved in Philadelphia in 1809, the rescuer “George Muschert, sailmaker, heard the alarm while at work in his sail loft, & ran to the place, & dived under the water with all his clothes on, & also missed [Anderson, as had another would-be rescuer], but observing some bubbles coming up he dove down a second time, & brought up the lad.” That Muschert had been at a distance and had run to the scene and dove in with all his clothes and dove down twice were the types of factors that weighed strongly in observers’ reports and in the humane-society leaders’ decisions about rewards amounts. Muschert’s \$10 reward – at the top of the range for rewards that year – reflected those views. By contrast, in the case of the reward for the mulatto infant in Massachusetts in 1803-04, the incident is described as three men “taking a newborn mulatto Child out of the water.” That phrase “taking a . . . Child out of the water” suggests the baby was near water’s edge or somehow positioned to make the rescue easy; thus the men shared a \$4 reward.<sup>16</sup>

In both those cases, people with African ancestry were rescued. When the rescuer was African American, the same criteria applied. Dolphin Garler, a black man in Plymouth, Massachusetts, received the MHS’s highest reward to an individual in 1794-95. (Three men shared an award of \$17, the highest reward paid that year.) The incident in which Garler rescued a boy had all the criteria to command a high reward – and make good publicity. In general, the MHS related few details – little more than who was involved and how much the reward was – of its rewarded cases in the appendices to the annual MHS discourses. Most years, a few of the letters recommending rescuers for rewards were also printed, and in 1795, the dramatic Garler case was one of the selected

---

<sup>16</sup> Managers’ meeting, October 11, 1809, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA; John Clark Howard, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 12, 1804* (Boston, 1804), p. 46.

letters. Around the first of September 1794, as the aged Capt. Churchill passed by a bridge in Plymouth, a child stopped him, “and told that a boy was in the water. Capt. Churchill looking from the wharf, observed a hat swimming on the water, but nothing more.” He could get no more information from the young child, so Capt. Churchill “immediately made an outcry.” Mr. B. Hedge, jun., and two persons working for him at a nearby store “repaired to the spot. It was nearly high water, and the bottom could not be discerned. While they were earnestly looking a bubble was perceived to rise from the bottom.” Enter the hero. “*Dolphin Garler*, a negro man (one of the persons at work with Mr. Hedge) instantly dived down at the spot from whence the bubble ascended. He rose without the boy. He plunged again” and brought up the eight-year old child. “There were no signs of life in him when first brought on shore.” Various resuscitation methods, including the folk technique of rolling a body on a barrel that humane societies deplored, were used, and the boy revived. Four of the “most respectable” men in Plymouth wrote to the MHS in hopes that Garler would merit a reward for his “prompt and spirited” exertions, and the MHS – alert to point out, as did the Plymouth men, that this man was black and thus different – gave Garler a reward based on the same criteria it used for white rescuers.<sup>17</sup>

Race did not affect how humane societies recognized rescuers, but status did, and the difference in types of honors based on status mattered to one PHS rescuer. In 1806, Alexander Philips, evidently a ferryman, rescued a seven-year old child who had fallen

---

<sup>17</sup> John Brooks, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1795* (Boston, 1795), pp. 15-16, 25. On the skills of people of African descent as swimmers and divers, see Kevin Dawson, “Enslaved Swimmers and Divers in the Atlantic World,” *Journal of American History* 92 (2006): 1327-1355. On African Americans’ place in New England communities in the late eighteenth century, see Irene Q. Brown and Richard D. Brown, *The Hanging of Ephraim Wheeler* (Cambridge, Mass., 2003), pp. 171-173.

off the Market Street Wharf into the Delaware. “Alexander Philips,” according to the PHS minutes, called on a PHS officer twice “& appeared extremely anxious for a medal, but he was informed that the Funds of the Society [would] not enable them to bestow a medal on him.” The PHS gave framed certificates to higher-status people involved in lifesaving, and Philips “was asked whether an honorary Certificate [would] not be agreeable?” Philips “replied that it would not. He was informed that a premium of Ten Dollars [would] probably be granted to him[;] he said that money was not his object, he wanted a Medal.” (Alas, he got \$10.) For whatever reason, an honorary certificate did not satisfy Philips, but money was beneath him. He wanted to be recognized with a medal.<sup>18</sup>

In many cases, drowning people may well have been rescued in the absence of any proffered premiums or honors, but the rewards and recognition meant something to recipients. Often, rescuers were recommended for rewards – respectable people had to attest to the facts – and the sources generally do not indicate who in a particular case, rescuer or someone eager to correspond with a humane society, initiated applications for rewards. In other cases, however, rescuers applied directly to humane societies for rewards. No doubt rewards meant something because they brought people extra income. But the recognition mattered too, as Philips’s anxiety for a medal and James Forten’s feelings about his honorary certificate show. In 1821, the PHS honored Forten, the wealthy black sailmaker and antislavery leader, with a certificate for having saved the lives of twelve people in various incidents. Forten hung the certificate in his parlor and told one visitor he would not give it up for \$1,000.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Managers’ meetings, August 13 and September 10, 1806, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA.

<sup>19</sup> Julie Winch, *James Forten, Gentleman of Color* (Oxford, 2002), p. 86.

Although there had been uncertainty in different cities about how much impact humane societies would have, the societies did facilitate lifesaving and, more importantly, were seen by contemporaries to help save lives. For example, after a rash of drowning deaths in Germantown, Pennsylvania, in 1813, residents there asked the PHS for one of the Society's apparatus to deposit in the area. Moreover, people applied the societies' resuscitation techniques in efforts to restore the half-dead to life. Those techniques could be used anywhere that the information had reached, and people in places without humane societies restored drowning victims to life following humane societies' directions, as reports in newspapers and letters to the societies reveal. The movement's impact, then, went beyond the urban areas that supported voluntary associations.<sup>20</sup>

Founders in different places had not been sure initially about the impact of their new charities. The societies, however, had a meaningful impact on the philanthropic landscape of the Anglo-American world. First, they facilitated lifesaving. Second, they elaborated communities' charitable infrastructure by adding a type of institution that aided people regardless of background. As the data from the RHS, MHS, and PHS shows, most people rescued from drowning were local. But, as Thomas Cogan had explained in 1773, in his preface to the translation of the Amsterdam resuscitation organization's reports, there could not be "a case in which the compassion of *strangers* is more strongly excited, than in those sudden and fatal disasters."<sup>21</sup> Humane societies' leaders and members did more than feel compassion: They institutionalized aiding

---

<sup>20</sup> Managers' meetings, September 15, 1813, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA.

<sup>21</sup> Cogan, trans., *Memoirs of the Society Instituted at Amsterdam in Favour of Drowned Persons*, p. i.

strangers on an exceptionally broad scale thanks to the narrowly targeted problem to which they responded.

### *A Broader Trend*

The peculiar nature of humane societies made them especially good at overcoming particularistic limits in beneficence, but they were not unique. By the end of the eighteenth century, a variety of charities extended their charity without regard to “improper prejudices.” (Charities, of course, drew lines by establishing conditions of worthiness and by targeting their aid to particular types of suffering.) The needs of people in distress and the needs of activists were both factors that encouraged cosmopolitan beneficence.

Sometimes activists set up impartial organizations to fill gaps they had become aware of through other charitable endeavors. New York’s Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children, which served women and children unaffiliated with any of New York’s religious or ethnic societies and thus unaided by existing institutions, is one example. (See Chapter One.) Similarly, some of the governors of the London Hospital established, in 1791, the “Samaritan society for convalescents from the London Hospital, and for cases not within the provision of public hospitals.” The charity’s beneficiaries included people from distant parts of Britain or from Ireland in need of getting home and “destitute *foreigners*, labouring under distresses *not within the provisions of HOSPITALS.*” The men had been moved to set up the new charity because they found

that the Hospital was taking patients, “whose relief was not within its general regulations.”<sup>22</sup>

But besides very real need, other factors could encourage cosmopolitan philanthropy, not least partial (as in, not impartial) bonds. Minority religious groups asserted themselves publicly by aiding strangers. The Society of Friends in Pennsylvania carved out a public role for themselves after withdrawing from formal politics by ministering, as a group, to African Americans and American Indians. English Methodists formed Strangers’ Friends Societies in various cities in the late eighteenth century; the London Strangers’ Friend Society was founded in 1785. Besides living out the parable of the Good Samaritan, Methodists may have hoped to burnish their image. Similarly, American Freemasons put their belief that charitable concern should be universal into practice as a distinct group. Engaging in beneficence as a group allowed members to do more than they could do as individuals, but also it meant that Freemasons as a body were (they hoped) recognized for their philanthropy.<sup>23</sup>

Particularistic ties could prompt cosmopolitan activities. So too could pluralism. New York Hospital, one of the last of the general hospitals founded as part of the mid-eighteenth-century British general hospital movement, had been chartered in 1771 (and first admitted patients in 1791), in no small measure because of New York doctors’ concern about lagging behind Philadelphia in the creation of medical education facilities.

---

<sup>22</sup> Boylan, *The Origins of Women’s Activism*, pp. 96-101. For fascinating portraits of Graham, Bethune and Seton, see pp. 96-124. “Hints Respecting a Samaritan Society” in John Coakley Lettsom, *Hints on Beneficence, Temperance and Medical Science*, vol. 2, pp. 3-27.

<sup>23</sup> James, *A People Among Peoples*, esp. chaps. 9-11. Eric McCoy North, *Early Methodist Philanthropy* (New York, 1914), pp. 46-51; Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 67; Margaret B. Simey, *Charitable Effort in Liverpool in the Nineteenth Century* (Liverpool, 1951), p. 21. Steven C. Bullock, *Revolutionary Brotherhood: Freemasonry and the Transformation of the American Social Order, 1730-1840* (Chapel Hill, 1996), pp. 71-72, 186-198. According to Margaret Jacob, British Freemasons lauded universal benevolence, but it is not clear if they put that ideal in practice. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment*, pp. 56-57.

Because of New York's diversity, the Hospital leaders had embraced ecumenicalism from the beginning: Ministers from all the different denominations served as ex-officio members of the board, and the hospital disavowed parochialism in its provision of aid.<sup>24</sup>

The Hospital's founders and governors had proclaimed impartiality from its founding because New York's pluralism demanded that approach, but the Hospital's patient population added credence to its catholic professions. Between 1797 and 1803, over half the 4,056 patients admitted were foreign-born. People born in Ireland made up almost half of the Hospital's foreign-born population, and people from England, Germany and Scotland made up the next three biggest groups of foreign-born patients. The Hospital's beneficiaries included people, presumably mainly mariners, from farther-flung places. (See Table 5.5.) The Hospital's founders had probably given little thought to the needs of mobile East Indians or Italians when they proposed founding the charity. They had espoused universalism because of the need for the cooperation from the various religious communities in the city. But as the Hospital's governors knew, New York's position as a port brought strangers to the city. Caring for those strangers who were injured or fell sick enhanced the usefulness of the Hospital to the city and deepened the meaning of the Hospital's boast that its aid was "extended to the sick and afflicted of all nations."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> For evidence about keeping up with Philadelphia as a motivation for founding New York Hospital, see Samuel Bard to John Bard, Edinburgh, December 29, 1762; John Bard to Samuel Bard, New York, April 9, 1763, Bard Collection, NYAM. Samuel Bard, *A Discourse Upon the Duties of a Physician, with Some Sentiments, on the Usefulness and Necessity of a Public Hospital* (New York, 1769), p. iii. Larabee, *The Benevolent & Necessary Institution*, p. 17. *Charity Extended to All. State of the New York Hospital for the Year 1797* ([New York, 1798]), first page.

<sup>25</sup> The Hospital lists 50 patients born in Africa for that period. I do not know if African-American patients were listed as American-born or African-born. *A Brief Account of the New York Hospital* (New York, 1804), p. 65; New York Hospital Report to the Legislature for 1800, transcribed in New York Hospital Board of Governors' Minutes, vol. 1, February 3, 1801, New York-Presbyterian Hospital-New York Weill Cornell Medical Center Archives (NYH), New York.



Table 5.5: Account of the number of patients discharged from the New-York Hospital, from January 31, 1797, to December 31, 1803. N.B. The order in which nationality is listed follows the order in the Hospital's records.

Natives of:	Number
Asia	2
Africa	50
America	1895
Algiers	1
Denmark	21
England	406
East-Indies	35
France	41
Germany	147
Holland	40
Ireland	1088
Italy	18
Norway	5
Prussia	12
Poland	1
Portugal	23
Russia	4
Scotland	148
Spain	32
Sweden	30
West-Indies	57
Total	4096

Source: *A Brief Account of the New York Hospital* (New York, 1804)

A variety of factors led charitable groups to engage in cosmopolitan beneficence. Discovering gaps in the welfare system was one reason. Both partial ties and pluralism were others. Whatever the reasons were, because urban philanthropists so often participated in a number of charitable ventures and because information about philanthropy circulated so widely, activists had a range of opportunities to become familiar with the impartial provision of aid, as did the broader public.

*Conclusion: No Improper Prejudices*

Highlighting these organizations for their impartiality is not to be a cheerleader for them. They might pry into the worthiness of poor supplicants for relief or demand

certain behaviors of their beneficiaries. New York Hospital segregated black from white patients. So to point out their cosmopolitanism is not to make a moral judgment. Moreover, there were good reasons for charities to restrict aid to group members. Doing so eased activists' work in evaluating claims for relief and bolstered community. In addition, minority groups could take care of their own folks and thereby protect themselves from control or hostility from the majority. Rather, the reason to point out these charities' aid to "strangers" is to call attention to a development that contemporaries saw as new.<sup>26</sup>

In the 1760s, when John Morgan and Benjamin Rush had each traveled in Europe, both men had found it noteworthy when they visited hospitals that took patients of "all religions and countries," in Rush's words. By the end of the century, they would have been much less likely to have that reaction. "CHARITY EXTENDED TO ALL," trumpeted New York Hospital in its first printed report, for 1797. "[N]ational, civil, or religious Distinctions" had no part in determining who received care from the Hospital. The *Gentleman's Magazine* obituary for John Murray, of the Society of Universal Goodwill, highlighted the same trend when it praised Murray's organization for "extend[ing] its humane assistance to the forlorn and needy stranger, of whatever country." Likewise, the speaker at the 1800 Massachusetts Humane Society festival lauded the MHS for having overcome parochialism in its charity. "No improper prejudices or partial interested views are admitted" in the provision of aid, he explained. The MHS extended its munificence "to him who is ready to perish, and to him who saves a soul alive, of whatever nation or climate he may be." Overblown language, perhaps, and, yes,

---

<sup>26</sup> On the segregation of African-American patients, see Larabee, *The Benevolent & Necessary Institution*, p. 107.

impartiality was foisted on those paragons of cosmopolitan philanthropy, humane societies. But contemporaries saw the formation of local charities that gave aid without regard to particularistic ties as new and praiseworthy. Increasingly, they would build on that experience to extend their charity beyond the local arena.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, p. 69. *The Journal of Dr. John Morgan of Philadelphia*, p. 151. *Charity Extended to All. State of the New York Hospital for the Year 1797. Gentleman's Magazine* 62 (1792), p. 961. Thomas Thacher, *A Discourse Delivered at Boston, Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1800* (Boston, 1800), p. 12.

## Chapter Six

### The Empire of Humanity

In 1808, Thomas Clarkson rejoiced that modern beneficence meant “the new and sublime spectacle of . . . of seeing [men] associate for the extirpation of private and public misery; and of seeing them carry their charity, as a united brotherhood, into distant lands.” He wrote those words in regards to the abolition of the slave trade, but he could have been referring to philanthropy more broadly. For much of the eighteenth century, moral philosophers had generally commended universal benevolence as a curb on the passions of selfishness or patriotism but had deemed it impractical to act on love for all humankind. By the end of the century, however, Britons and Americans had found ways to engage in far-reaching beneficence. How did that change come about? A comment by Benjamin Rush to John Coakley Lettsom hints at the answer. “To a person who rejoices in the extension of the empire of humanity and, above all, to a pupil and admirer of the celebrated Mr. Howard, the enclosed publication [a pamphlet of the Philadelphia Society for the Alleviation of the Miseries of Public Prisons], I am sure, will be an acceptable communication,” wrote Rush in 1787. “I beg you would show it to Mr. Howard . . . or publish it in some of your periodical papers.” Rush’s phrase, “empire of humanity,” implies that philanthropists thought of themselves as belonging to an identifiable

international community of activists. He did not use the term “network,” but his request to Lettsom captures the essence of networked communication.<sup>1</sup>

Historians have long paid heed to the role of networks in prison reform and in philanthropy more generally. Networks have transmitted ideas and institutions; provided leaders, members and funds; and created communities. They have also obstructed initiatives and reinforced existing hierarchies and exclusions. Scholars have examined these connections as parts of studies of specific movements. But they have not focused on the implications of networked activity for the conception of beneficence writ large. Rush’s comment, however, calls for analysis of the phenomenon behind the casual, confident phrase.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Clarkson, *The History of the Rise, Progress and Accomplishments of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade, By the British Parliament* (Philadelphia, 1808), pp. 209, 10. Joseph Butler, “Sermon 12: Upon our Love of the Neighbour” in *Butler’s Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel*, ed. T. A. Roberts (London, 1970), pp. 111-112; Samuel Cooper, *A Sermon Preached in Boston, New-England, Before the Society for Encouraging Industry, and Employing the Poor; August 8, 1753* (Boston, 1753), pp. 6-7; William Wood, *The Christian Duty of Cultivating a Spirit of Universal Benevolence Amidst the Present Unhappy National Hostilities. A Sermon Preached at Bradford in Yorkshire, Before an Assembly of Dissenting Ministers, and Published at Their Request* (Leeds, 1781), pp. 12-13. For an in-depth discussion of the inability to realize universal benevolence including of Jonathan Edwards and his followers as exceptions to dominant views about universal benevolence, see Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, chap. 1; see also Fiering, “Irresistible Compassion”; Radcliffe, “Revolutionary Writing, Moral Philosophy, and Universal Benevolence in the Eighteenth Century.” Benjamin Rush to John Coakley Lettsom, May 18, 1787, in Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, p. 417. Clarkson also used the term “empire of humanity.” Clarkson, *The History of the Rise, Progress and Accomplishments of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade*, p. 433.

<sup>2</sup> Works that examine the role of networks in philanthropy include: Donna Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 83-92; Boylan, *The Origins of Women’s Activism*, pp. 37-47; Burgoyne, “‘Imprisonment the Best Punishment’”; Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*, pp. 213-242; Fladland, *Men and Brothers*; Hitchcock, “Paupers and Preachers”; Jones, *The Charity School Movement*, pp. 37, 40; Lambert and Lester, “Geographies of Colonial Philanthropy”; Lloyd, “Peace, Politics & Philanthropy”; Katherine Lloyd and Cindy Burgoyne, “The Evolution of a Transatlantic Debate on Penal Reform, 1780-1830” in *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform From the 1690s to 1850*, eds. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire 1998); McDaniel, “‘Our Country is the World,’” esp. chap. 3; Meranze, *Laboratories of Virtue*, p. 142; Mohl, *Poverty in New York*, pp. 152-154; Mohl, “Humanitarianism in the Preindustrial City,” pp. 590-592, 595; Roberts, *Making English Morals*, pp. 109-113, 117, 119-121; Turley, *The Culture of English Antislavery*; Williams, “The ‘Industrious Poor’ and the Founding of the Pennsylvania Hospital,” pp. 432-433; Wilson, *Pious Traders in Medicine*. See also Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*. For the conceptual abstraction arising from belonging to a system of charities in a given city, see Lawrence, *Charitable Knowledge*.

How was the “empire of humanity” constituted? How did it operate? What did it accomplish? There were numerous precedents and buttresses for the web of connections among activists. Protestant religious philanthropy used closed and centralized networks to pursue charitable ventures in support of Protestantism. Eighteenth-century science relied on networked cooperation to realize projects, such as the observation of the transit of Venus, which would have been impossible otherwise. Besides those structures for organizing long-distance activity, there was the federal model of imperial union, based on bonds of affection, which Americans had favored over the consolidating thrust of the British government. In the “empire of humanity,” the American conception of empire persisted: It matters in a special way because the rift in the British Atlantic community spurred charitable concern for faraway sufferers.<sup>3</sup>

Compared to religious and scientific networks, fewer formal ties constituted the “empire of humanity,” although it was no less significant for its looseness.

Philanthropists participated in a broad, open, uncentered web that allowed varying degrees of involvement thus mirroring local charitable associations. They used that network to go beyond their local areas, but insisted that it retain the personal nature of belonging to philanthropic societies. Both in recognition of the importance of their long-distance connections and to advance the ability to “carry their charity . . . into distant

---

<sup>3</sup> On the Francke Foundations and the SPCK, see Duffy, “*Correspondence Fraternelle*”; Duffy, “The Society of [sic] Promoting Christian Knowledge and Europe,” Hitchcock, “Pauper and Preachers”; Wilson, “Halle Pietism in Colonial Georgia”; Renate Wilson, *Pious Traders in Medicine*, chap. 1. On the eighteenth-century network of scientific societies, see McClellan, *Science Reorganized*. On American ideas of empire, see David Armitage, Introduction to *Theories of Empire*, ed. David Armitage (Aldershot, 1998), p. xxix; Norbert Killian, “New Wine in Old Skins? American Definitions of Empire and the Emergence of a New Concept” in *Theories of Empire*, ed. David Armitage (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 308, 315; Jack P. Greene, “Transatlantic Colonization and the Redefinition of Empire in the Early Modern Era: The British American Experience” in *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500-1820*, eds. Christine Daniels and Michael V. Kennedy (New York, 2002), pp. 272-274, 279; Peter Onuf, “‘Empire for Liberty’: Center and Peripheries in Postcolonial America” in *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500-1820*, eds. Christine Daniels and Michael V. Kennedy (New York, 2002), p. 305.

lands,” activists began formalizing the empire of humanity through honorary memberships and other constitutional provisions of local charitable organizations. In the eighteenth century, the fullest realization of the possibilities of networked activity occurred in the humane society coalition thanks to its incremental, interconnected endeavor. For all the boasting of humane society advocates, the movement helped relatively few people (as shown in Chapter Five). Its legacy, however, was the smallpox vaccination crusade. Activists drew on the structures built by the humane society movement to pursue a global program. By working through the networked “empire of humanity,” philanthropists breached the barriers to universal beneficence.

### *Structure*

No one set out to build the “empire of humanity.” Sometimes activists forged ties with other philanthropists explicitly for beneficent ends. But, by and large, their translocal and transnational philanthropic cooperation grew out of other interconnections, just as the membership of any given ecumenical associated charity drew on various local networks. The far-flung web of activists was broad, open, and decentralized, and it mirrored the associated charity practiced at the local level by allowing various degrees of participation.

For even the most devoted philanthropists, barring an exceptional case like John Howard, beneficence was an avocation, and activists’ relationships grew out of other ties based on the principal aspects of people’s lives. Merchants, for instance, turned to other merchants to raise funds for charitable institutions. Religious affiliations created another set of long-distance connections that helped organize the commerce in philanthropic

information. Many exchanges took place within particularistic religious networks, but many too crossed the lines that separated Protestants from one another.<sup>4</sup>

Especially important to the formation of the “empire of humanity” was the “republic of medicine.” Elite medical men in the mid- and late eighteenth century had often received training abroad and traveled on medical tours around Europe and thus had often met one another in person at some point.<sup>5</sup> In addition, correspondence among gentlemen of the faculty (the contemporary term for the medical profession) was deemed essential to progress in medical knowledge and to their self-image. Therefore, medical men often had strong bonds with their brethren throughout Europe and America, for Anglophone men especially with fellow English-speakers. Medical philanthropy flourished in the late eighteenth century as medical men tried to improve their professional status by casting themselves as benefactors of mankind. As a result, the republic of medicine played a leading role in steering philanthropic correspondence. Medical conversations, however, in the eighteenth century, were not a realm closed to laypeople. Rather, practitioners and laypeople belonged to a shared medical culture, and gentlemen who were not members of the faculty judged themselves capable of commenting intelligently on medical matters, just as medical men contributed to the broader republic of letters.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 90-92; James, *A People Among Peoples*, chap. 5; Marshall, “Who Cared about the Thirteen Colonies?”

<sup>5</sup> I am using the term “medical men” for historical accuracy. The term “medical men” incorporates physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries. In Britain, only physicians, who were university-educated, were called “Doctor” (whereas in eighteenth-century America and rural England, the tri-partite division of physicians, surgeons, apothecaries did not obtain). See Richard Harrison Shyrock, *Medicine and Society in America 1660-1860* (Ithaca, 1960), pp. 10-11.

<sup>6</sup> Rush uses the term “republic of medicine.” See *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, p. 44. On medical students studying and traveling abroad, see: Bell, “Philadelphia Medical Students in Europe, 1750-1800”; O’Donnell, “Cullen’s Influence on American Medicine,” pp. 236-237; Booth, *John Haygarth, FRS*, pp. 27-29; Bell, *John Morgan Continental Doctor* (Philadelphia, 1965); *Memoir of the Life and Writings of*



Particularistic networks of religious or professional affiliation, then, created the sinews of a broader structure and also taught members to go beyond ties of partiality. Moreover, building on other bonds made the bonds of philanthropy more durable. If coadjutors disappointed, as the Royal Humane Society had disappointed the Massachusetts Humane Society with Sable Isle, being enmeshed in a larger community stopped individuals or groups from turning away from their partners. Conversely, humanitarian activity was not the core of relationships between most individual philanthropists (as opposed to relationships between charitable groups) and thus attention to beneficence might ebb and flow. An exception proves the rule: The New York Quaker Thomas Eddy, “the [John] Howard of America,” initiated a correspondence with the London-based Scotsman Patrick Colquhoun in 1802 with the explicit aim of trading information on prison reform, education, assistance to the poor, and like topics. The two men’s fruitful epistolary relationship focused mainly on philanthropy. Letters between John Crawford and Benjamin Rush or Rush and John Coakley Lettson or Lettson and John Lathrop, by contrast, ranged over an array of topics. But the multiplicity of ties across the Anglophone Atlantic created the philanthropic web, and ongoing relationships

---

*Thomas Percival M.D.*, pp. xvii-xviii; Abraham, *Lettson: His Life, Times, Friends and Descendants*, pp. 65-67; *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, p. 53, pp. 66-67. Nor was the practice of travel for education confined to would-be doctors. See Black, *The British Abroad*, pp. 289-290, on both travel abroad for education and educational purposes as a defense for foreign travel. On the importance of communication and cosmopolitanism to medical men, see: *RHS Reports 1787-82*, p. v; Adair Crawford to Benjamin Rush, London, July 4, 1783, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 25, LCP; John Bard to Samuel Bard, New York, April 9, 1763, Bard Collection, NYAM; Benjamin Rush to William Claypoole, Philadelphia, July 29, 1782, in Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 284; Amasa Dingley, *An Oration. On the Improvement of Medicine: Pronounced before a Respectable Auditory of Citizens, in the Federal Hall in the City of New York; . . . on the 16<sup>th</sup> January, 1794* (New York, 1795), pp. 9, 39. For a parallel to lawyers’ networks, see Richard D. Brown, *Knowledge is Power: The Diffusion of Information in Early America, 1700-1865* (New York, 1989), chap. 4. On the eighteenth-century shared medical culture, see Roy Porter, “Lay Medical Knowledge in the Eighteenth Century: Evidence from the *Gentleman’s Magazine*,” *Medical History* 29 (1985): 138-168; Charles E. Rosenberg, “Health in the Home: A Tradition of Print and Practice” in *Right Living: An Anglo-American Tradition of Self-Help Medicine and Hygiene*, ed. Charles E. Rosenberg (Baltimore, 2003), pp. 1-20.

allowed its continual renewal as protégés and sons met mentors' and fathers' friends and colleagues. In writing about the transatlantic exchange of ideas about prison reform, Cindy Burgoyne has stressed the importance of bilateral ties across the Atlantic. She may be right; as she points out, Rush and Lettsom were each other's primary transatlantic correspondent on that topic, with each man then sending news to others in his own country. And Burgoyne too is right that certain people, most especially Lettsom, acted as key nodes in a larger philanthropic network. Beyond the issue of prison reform, however, links were not bilateral. Rather, the intertwining of manifold connections gave rise to a structure joined by some strong and some weak ties.<sup>7</sup>

Breadth marked this network in several ways. First, it was geographically broad; it followed the paths of Americans and Britons. Anglophone Americans, then, generally had more linkages to Americans in other colonies/states and to Britons and fewer to Europeans, whereas Britons had ties to European, Americans, and Britons across the British Empire. The empire of humanity had no spatial boundaries but grew and shrank with its members' movements. Second, the web encompassed people of diverse backgrounds. For instance, medical men make up the majority of people Benjamin Rush corresponded with about philanthropy. But two of Rush's closest epistolary colleagues on philanthropic matters were Congregational minister Rev. Jeremy Belknap of Boston

---

<sup>7</sup> On Garrisonian abolitionists' transfer of ties to new colleagues in the wake of disappointment over the 1840 World's Antislavery Convention, see McDaniel, "Our Country is the World," pp. 106-107. On the Eddy-Colquhoun correspondence, see Eddy to Colquhoun, June 5, 1802, in Knapp, *The Life of Thomas Eddy*, p. 178; Burgoyne, "Imprisonment the Best Punishment," pp. 48-53; Mohl, "Humanitarianism in the Preindustrial City," pp. 591-593. Burgoyne, "Imprisonment the Best Punishment," pp. 42-56. On the differences between weak and strong ties, see Mark Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties," *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (1974): 1360-80; Morten T. Hansen, "The Search-Transfer Problem: The Role of Weak Ties in Sharing Knowledge across Organizational Subunits," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44 (1999): 82-111; Walter M. Powell and Laurel Smith-Doerr, "Networks and Economic Life," in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, eds. Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg (Princeton, 1994), pp. 372-374.

and the noted abolitionist and radical High Church Anglican Granville Sharp of London. John Coakley Lettsom corresponded about philanthropic matters with an even larger group, including medical men from North America to Central Europe; American clergymen Rev. Dr. John Lathrop and Rev. Dr. Jedidiah Morse of Boston and Rev. Dr. James Madison of Virginia; Anglican cleric Rev. James Plumtre; and Sir Mordaunt Martin of Norfolk, a relation of Earl Spencer. Notably, in three of the main caches of Lettsom's letters, Friends make up only a small group of the men with whom Lettsom corresponded about philanthropy. Third, the web was broad in the sense that its members did not necessarily think well of one another. Although Lettsom and Rush, who had met when Rush had been in London as a medical student, exchanged missives amicably for years and Rush routinely gave his pupils letters of introduction to Lettsom, Rush thought, in one of his student's words, that Lettsom "possess[ed] very moderate medical abilities." For his part, Rush came in for criticism for "his Pedantry" from a friend of Jeremy Belknap to whom Belknap sent an essay by Rush on punishments.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to breadth, the philanthropic web was open. Unlike a closed network such as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which chose and vetted would-be members, the "empire of humanity" had low barriers to entry. Not everyone could belong. In general, participants were European or Euro-American men of gentle status.

---

<sup>8</sup> On the geographic shape of British philanthropists' humanitarian imagination growing out of the locations of their correspondents, see Lambert and Lester, "Geographies of Colonial Philanthropy." On the networks to which German American Pietists belonged, see Wilson, *Pious Traders in Medicine*. For Rush's correspondence, see Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*; "The Correspondence of Benjamin Rush and Granville Sharp, 1773-1809," ed. John A. Woods, *Journal of American Studies* 1 (1967), p. 1-38; and the Rush Manuscripts, LCP. The main caches of Lettsom's letters are the correspondence printed in Pettigrew's *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, the correspondence held by the Medical Society of London and printed in Lawrence and MacDonald, eds., *Sambrook Court*, and the John Coakley Lettsom Papers (MS 5370) at the Wellcome Library. John Redman Coxe to Benjamin Rush, September 15, 1794, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 27, f. 26, LCP; Nicholas Pike to Jeremy Belknap, November 8, 1790, Belknap Papers 161.B (Reel 5), MHS.

But they did not need to have longstanding claims to that status. Indeed, just as enrolling in charitable organizations locally offered middling people a way to enhance their status, so too could joining the transnational web help one to achieve gentility and recognition.<sup>9</sup> The story of the third boy from a middling Massachusetts background to make an appearance in the reports of the Royal Humane Society – the other two were Count Rumford and Amos Windship – makes that point.

Amasa Dingley (1760-1798) came from a farm family from Marshfield, Massachusetts. He graduated from Harvard College in 1785 and received an A.M. in 1788. From 1786 to 1789, Dingley was usher of the South Grammar School in Boston (and during that time he may have known Windship). By the 1790s, Dingley was a doctor living in New York and active in medical and philanthropic groups. In its 1795 report, the RHS printed a letter from Dingley, one of the medical counselors to the nascent and soon-to-be-moribund Humane Society of the State of New York. Plus, the RHS devoted two pages to comments about humane societies from his speech to the Medical Society of New York. In 1796, the London Medical Society, evidently perceiving a new mover and shaker in the republic of medicine, made the doctor an honorary member. Dingley died in 1798 during the yellow fever epidemic in New York, sometime in late September. On October 10, the now-famous midwife Martha Ballard, close to various Dingleys (Amasa Dingley's brother had moved to Maine), recorded his death in her diary. Dingley's ties stretched from rural New England to London's

---

<sup>9</sup> Barry, "Urban Associations and the Middling Sort," p. 99; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p. 464.

charitable and medical societies thanks to the credentials gained by participating in the Humane and Medical Societies of New York.<sup>10</sup>

Besides being relatively open socially, the philanthropic web offered ways for men who might not have opportunities to join charitable ventures locally to play a role in beneficent projects more broadly. For instance, Benjamin Waterhouse's difficult personality made it close to impossible for him to cooperate with fellow activists in Boston. But by answering questions about smallpox prevention measures (smallpox inoculation efforts were often organized as charities) posed by Dr. John Haygarth of Chester, England, he could engage in Haygarth's undertaking. And because Haygarth printed Waterhouse's views on the topic, Waterhouse's ideas reached further than his friend. Besides folks who did not work well in local organizations, people who lived in areas that would likely not support associated charities could participate. Thomas Thoresby, for example, seemed for a while to be running a one-man humane society operation in Holywell, North Wales. Like Charles Murray of Madeira (one of whose letters to the Royal Humane Society he plagiarized), Thoresby did not hail from the isolated place where he lived, and, like Murray, Thoresby wanted to be part of the larger world. Philanthropic activity including correspondence gave him a way to go beyond

---

<sup>10</sup> S. M. Watson, ed. *The Maine Historical and Genealogical Register* (Baltimore, 1973), pp. 122-123. "Biography of Amos Windship," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, p. 159; *Massachusetts Gazette*, July 18, 1788. Besides his involvement with in the Medical Society of New York and as a medical counselor of the short-lived New York Humane Society, Dingley was a New York Dispensary physician and served as the physician for the Society for the Information and Assistance of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries. *The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York*, p. 8; *The New York Directory and Register for the Year 1794* (New York, 1794), pp. 268, 279. *RHS Reports 1795*, pp. 35-36. *Argus. Greenleaf's New Daily Advertiser*, August 31, 1796. On October 10, 1798, the Salem, New York *Northern Centinel* printed a report datelined New York, September 28, on the deaths of several New York City physicians including Dingley. <http://dohistory.org/diary/index.html>. The Nathaniel Dingley who killed a man prompting Ballard to ask "What are we cuming to in this Eastern world?" may be Amasa's brother. Laurel Thacher Ulrich, *A Midwife's Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard, Based on Her Diary, 1785-1812* (New York, 1990), p. 308.

Holywell. His local efforts on behalf of the humane society cause gave him reason to write to the RHS and thus gave him a place in an international eleemosynary project.<sup>11</sup>

In its breadth and openness, the transnational web of philanthropists tracked the trajectory of associated philanthropy in the eighteenth century. There were many charities with religious, ethnic, or occupational identities. But over the century, activists on both side of the Atlantic created organizations with diverse memberships, open to anyone who could pay the subscription. Transnational interactions bore another similarity to local charitable organizations: Members could be very active, participate occasionally, or even be passive. Just as certain individuals did the lion's share of work in local charities, certain people wrote and corresponded voluminously on philanthropy and thus helped foster the trends for successive new types of charitable institutions. Others might participate less often. At the local level, someone might serve as a charity's officer for a year or two. At the transnational level, someone might throw out an idea once or occasionally. For instance, an unnamed clergyman in the Manchester, England, area had written up a plan for "Preserving the Health of the Poor." Perhaps the clergyman had no contacts in America, but through the good offices of Thomas Percival the plan made its way to Benjamin Rush with the explanation that "republication in some of your periodical prints would gratify the benevolent views of the Author." Passive involvement was possible too. People could subscribe to charities, but do no more, and read literature about philanthropy, but not pen their own proposals.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> On Waterhouse, see the *American National Biography*, vol. 22, pp. 775-777. John Haygarth, *An Inquiry How to Prevent the Small-Pox. And Proceedings of a Society for Promoting General Inoculation at stated periods, and preventing the Natural Smallpox in Chester* (Chester, 1784), pp. 137-145. *RHS Reports 1800*, pp. 76-77; *HS Reports for 1801* (London, [1801]), pp. 25, 27

<sup>12</sup> Thomas Percival to Benjamin Rush, March 29, 1790, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, f. 60, LCP.

Although there were leaders in the “empire of humanity,” there was no center of authority as there might be with other networks. The natural-history network, for instance, had an authoritative center, in London. By contrast, the philanthropic body politic, like the mid-eighteenth-century evangelical community, lacked such a center that could pass judgment on members’ activities. Admittedly, the Royal Humane Society saw itself as the head of the humane society movement. And other societies and individuals acknowledged the largesse, example, and parentage of the Royal Humane Society. But they did so without the protestations of inadequacy that colonial or postcolonial Americans professed (in part due to polite conventions) about their knowledge in botany or medicine. Americans had good reason to be confident when writing to British colleagues about philanthropy. The United States, as Americans liked to tell their friends across the water, compared very favorably with Britain in regards to social problems. Not only was the “situation of the lower class of [white] people” “easy,” but also there was less criminality. Americans wanted to keep up with European trends in eleemosynary enterprises, but started from a position of confidence about their place in the world of philanthropy. Nor did provincial Britons or Britons overseas yearn for approval from the metropole. Rather, the intertwined imperatives of universal benevolence and the local sphere of charitable operations meant that people trucked in information as equal members of a common cause to which all participants contributed. When there were experts who could pass judgment, the loci of authority was personal. John Howard could assess on prison reform efforts because of his remarkable labors and, for a time, Count Rumford was called upon to appraise improvements in charities’

kitchens because of his extensive research (if sometimes questionable conclusions) on food and fuel economy.<sup>13</sup>

A broad, open, decentralized web served genteel philanthropists well. A large intellectual community could gather, incubate and broadcast many ideas. That activity brought innovations in charitable operations to many communities and, as a result, helped shape the philanthropic sector of local economies. Moreover, by joining in that community, members not only gained new resources but also amplified their powers to improve, that is better order, the world. The transnational web, then, mimicked the operation of associated charitable organizations and of given cities' philanthropic networks. Through the "empire of humanity," philanthropists bridged the local operations of charitable institutions with their cosmopolitan connections and began to lay the groundwork for global action.<sup>14</sup>

### *Exchange*

The ability to bridge local and global came from the boom in long-distance communications in the eighteenth century. More print media, combined with the

---

<sup>13</sup> Although London was the center of the network Parrish studies, people there relied on colonial contributions for their activities as much as colonials relied on the center for stature. Susan Scott Parrish, *American Curiosity: Cultures of Natural History in the Colonial British Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill, 2006), pp. 107, 123, 111-114, 116-125. Susan O'Brien, "Eighteenth-Century Publishing Networks in the First Years of Transatlantic Evangelicalism" in *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990* (New York, 1994). Parrish *American Curiosity*, pp. 106, 115-118; Rush to Lettsom, November 15, 1783, in Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, pp. 312-313; Benjamin Waterhouse deferred to Lettsom's advice in circa 1787 not to establish a botanical garden in Cambridge, Massachusetts, as he had planned, but to pursue the study of mineralogy. Waterhouse's Memoirs, Box 16.4, Waterhouse Papers, Countway Library. John Lathrop to Lettsom, January 3, 1789, *RHS Reports 1787-1789*, p. 350; Thomas Russell to Lettsom, August 1, 1792, *RHS Reports 1793*, p. 31. Benjamin Waterhouse to Lettsom, November 25, 1794, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, p. 460. Thomas Eddy to Patrick Colquhoun, July 15, 1803, in Knapp, *Life of Thomas Eddy*, pp. 205-206. For letters from provincial and overseas Britons to the RHS, see, for instance, *RHS Reports 1787-89*, pp. 87, 93, 343. Conrad Edick Wright makes a related point about charitable associations extending each other's impacts. See Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 116-121.

<sup>14</sup> On the role of networks in the development and transmission of innovations in general, see Hansen, "The Search-Transfer Problem"; Powell, Koput, and Smith-Doerr, "Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation." On charitable networks within cities, see, for instance, Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, pp. 37-47; Turley, "British Antislavery Reassessed," pp. 188-193.



democratization of letter-writing beginning in the late seventeenth century, gave people the ability to transfer information more widely and more often. Periodicals, annual reports, books, and letters offered philanthropists the means to reach farther especially because of the great weight put on the power of the written word. But the use of those forums meshed with, rather than undermined, bonds amongst philanthropists. The typical public-subscription charity had a few hundred supporters, who could know each other, recognize each other's names on membership lists, and meet at annual meetings. The organizations were public but not remote. Similarly, activists often used print media toward their ends in ways that interwove public and personal communications. They used print media as a platform to amplify their reach but did so in ways that stressed their personal ties both to vouch for information and to highlight that they belonged to a far-flung community devoted to a common project.

The growth of both letter-writing and print media over the eighteenth century broke down limits on philanthropists' activities. Starting in the late seventeenth century, as the British Empire expanded, means of communicating across the Anglophone Atlantic expanded too (as they also did within Europe). The variety of forums grew. Pamphlets and books were joined around the beginning of the eighteenth century by regular newspapers and journals, with American journal publication proceeding in fits and starts. Over time, the types of journals diversified. Medical journals, for instance, began appearing in Britain from the 1730s; the first American medical journal was published in 1797. Along with the increase in variety went a growth in quantity of publications. London's nine newspapers a week including one daily in 1704 rose to five dailies, eight tri-weeklies, and four weeklies in 1770, and the one provincial newspaper,

founded in Norwich in 1701, had mushroomed to thirty-five by 1760 with more expansion over the next decades. In 1811, London had fifty-two newspapers including Sunday papers. Likewise, the American colonies began with the *Boston News-letter*, first published in 1704, and by 1739 had thirteen newspapers from Boston to Bridgetown. By 1790, the United States had around 100 newspapers. Twenty-five years later, with the growth of political partisanship, there were over 400. The book market expanded too. In the decades after the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695, book production in Britain became a thriving industry. Both the number of books published and the variety swelled. Moreover, books became more readily available thanks to falling prices and the spread of circulating libraries. Americans too had access to more books through British booksellers, libraries, and, from the late eighteenth century, peddlers, although the American book industry did not develop in earnest until into the nineteenth century. Besides printed material, letter-writing became a part of more people's lives over the eighteenth century. For some people, such as merchants, letter-writing featured centrally in their work. But beyond merchants, letter manuals taught middling Britons and Americans, plus people lower down the social scale, to correspond as part of the normal course of their occupational, social, and familial lives.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Bannet, *Empire of Letters*, pp. ix-x; Ian K. Steele, *The English Atlantic 1675-1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* (New York, 1986); Jeremy Black, *The English Press 1621-1861* (Thrupp, Stroud, Gloucestershire, 2001), p. 20; Charles E. Clark, "Early American Journalism: News and Opinion in the Popular Press" in *A History of the Book in America Volume One: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World*, eds. Hugh Amory and David Hall (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 360-361; Roy Porter, "The Rise of Medical Journalism in Britain to 1800" in *Medical Journals and Medical Knowledge: Historical Essays* (London, 1992); Norman Gevitz, "'But All Those Authors Are Foreign': American Literary Nationalism and Domestic Medical Guides" in *The Popularization of Medicine 1650-1850*, ed. Roy Porter (London, 1992), p. 236; Steele, *English Atlantic*, p. 136; Black, *The English Press*, pp. 74, 9, 110, 74; Steele, *English Atlantic*, pp. 147, 165; Brown, *Knowledge is Power*, p. 111; David Copeland, "America 1750-1820" in *Press, Politics and the Public Sphere in Europe and North America, 1760-1820*, eds. Hannah Barker and Simon Burrows (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 149-150; Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, chaps. 3 & 4; Amory and Hall, *A History of the Book in America Volume One*; David Jaffee, "The Village Enlightenment in New England, 1760-1820," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., 47 (1990): 327-346; Bannet, *Empire of*

Over the course of the eighteenth century, then, cultures that had been primarily oral increasingly became ones in which print and letters played more important role in more people's lives. Print and letters helped shrink the Anglophone Atlantic world and broaden its members' horizon. These developments affected philanthropy. While people on the move often played key roles in the introduction of new charitable institutions into given cities, the growth of print media and letter-writing gave many more people a way to enlarge their sphere of beneficence.<sup>16</sup>

That said, interactions in person had a special importance as ways to garner attention to a cause or provide or get information on charitable projects. When, in 1786, for instance, Manchester, England, philanthropist Thomas Percival was invited to dine with a Russian notable, his first thought was that he could take up his friend John Haygarth's smallpox prevention plan with the Russian visitor. Besides talking in person about philanthropy, visiting eleemosynary institutions was deemed particularly valuable. Writers encouraged people to visit such establishments to get an understanding of their operations, and travelers routinely did so on their trips. In addition, people might travel specifically to study philanthropic projects, as "[t]wo deputations" from Philadelphia did, when they visited New York circa 1807-1808 "for the express purpose of examining our

---

*Letters*, pp. ix-53; Konstantin Dierks, "The Familial Letter and Social Refinement in America, 1750-1800" in *Letter Writing as a Social Practice*, eds. David Barton and Nigel Hall (Amsterdam, 1999). See also Hannah Barker, *Newspapers, Politics, and Public Opinion in Late Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998); Richard R. John, *Spreading the News: The American Postal System from Franklin to Morse* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995); McCusker, "The Demise of Distance." Newspapers had been published in London in the early seventeenth century, but declined in the hostile political climate of the 1650s. Steele, *English Atlantic*, p. 134. There had been a few ephemeral medical publications in the seventeenth century. Porter, "The Rise of Medical Journalism," p. 8.

<sup>16</sup> On the shift from face-to-face to mass communications, see Brown, *Knowledge is Power*, esp. pp. 277-286. On newspapers magnifying the reach of organizations, see Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, p. 141. On the shift from the emphasis on the written word in eighteenth-century American voluntary associations, which emerged as part of the republic of letters, to the renewed emphasis on oral performance among nineteenth-century American voluntary associations, see Marc Harris, "Civil Society in Post-Revolutionary America" in *Empire and Nation: The American Revolution in the Atlantic World*, eds. Eliga H. Gould and Peter S. Onuf (Baltimore, 2005), pp. 200-202.

[charity] schools.” Not everyone could swap ideas in person with colleagues from faraway places or visit faraway institutions, but the expectations of personal sources of knowledge underlay other types of interaction.<sup>17</sup>

After visits, personal letters were the most intimate form of communication and laid the base of philanthropists’ long-distance exchange of ideas and information. Even with friends, correspondents pursued and organized their epistolary relationships carefully, as letter manuals taught people to do. When John Coakley Lettsom first wrote to Benjamin Rush after the end of the Revolutionary War, Lettsom made clear what he expected in a correspondence. Lettsom asked for botanical and mineral specimens, ruminated on voluntary organizations Philadelphia had and, to Lettsom’s mind, should have, and sent Rush some seeds and pamphlets to “shew [his] desire of engaging [Rush’s] further correspondence.” The lack of letters between the two men for so long meant that Lettsom’s letter was “hasty and diffuse.” So Lettsom directed that in his reply Rush should “specify more particularly, wherein, & in what species of communication” Lettsom could “gratify [Rush’s] wishes.” Members of the intertwined republic of letter and empire of humanity aimed to give correspondents desired information. In addition, they urged their pet charitable projects on friends, although not necessarily with effect immediately, if ever. For example, John Haygarth of Chester pressed Thomas Percival for years to set up fever wards in Manchester in imitation of those established in Chester in 1783; not until 1796 did Percival and his local colleagues follow Chester’s lead. Philanthropists also reported to each other on progress in common causes, as Joshua Dixon of Whitehaven, England, did when he sent Rush copies of the Whitehaven

---

<sup>17</sup> Thomas Percival to John Haygarth, 1786, Percival, *Memoir of . . . Thomas Percival*, p. cix; Clinton, *An Address to the Benefactors and Friends of the Free School Society of New York*, p. 15.

Dispensary's annual report yearly early in the nineteenth century. Philanthropists wrote letters purposefully – to provide colleagues with desired resources from elsewhere, to spread innovations in the world of philanthropy, and to share news about their common undertakings.<sup>18</sup>

A standard practice in the pursuit of purposeful and beneficial correspondences was the exchange of pamphlets along with letters. Correspondents assumed that the sending of letters entailed the sending of worthwhile pamphlets. When, in 1787, Jeremy Belknap could not reciprocate for Benjamin Rush's pamphlet on female education, Belknap rued the situation: He was not keeping up his end of the two men's improvement-oriented correspondence. More often, though, writers did include pamphlets with their letters. Sometimes activists got information on the same topic from more than one colleague. Rush, for example, had received papers about fever houses in Manchester and Liverpool from Dr. James Currie of Liverpool in 1796 and then seven years later Rush received a pamphlet on fever houses from Joshua Dixon, who himself had received the pamphlet from a London doctor. Knowledge that came through multiple channels might be fuller or more persuasive than if it came from fewer sources. In addition, redundant information could convey the sense that staying up to date with philanthropic trends meant focusing on this or that issue. The converse of the receipt of materials from multiple sources was the sending of materials to multiple recipients at once. John Coakley Lettson would dispatch materials to the Bostonians John Lathrop

---

<sup>18</sup> Bannet, *Empire of Letters*, chap. 2; Lettson to Rush, September 8, 1793, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, f. 3, LCP; John Haygarth, *A Private Letter Addressed to the Right Reverend Dr. Porteus, the Late Lord Bishop of London; to Propose a Plan which Might Give a Good Education to All the Poor Children in England, at a Moderate Expense (Printed at His Lordship's Desire)*, new edition (Bath and London, 1812), p. 31; Joshua Dixon to Benjamin Rush, March 11, 1800; May 1, 1801; November 14, 1801; August 11, 1803, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 4, f. 62, f. 63, f. 64, f. 65; Joshua Dixon to Benjamin Rush, August 14, 180[5?], Rush Manuscripts, vol. 25 f. 75, LCP.

and Amos Windship to read and forward to each other and to others. Circulating pamphlets might enhance their import or prompt a conversation about a topic. Either way, it wove bonds between the local and transnational arenas.<sup>19</sup>

Passing around pamphlets fit into a larger practice of passing around letters that blurred the line between personal and public writing about philanthropy. The sharing of letters among philanthropists comes as no surprise. Eighteenth-century letter-writers expected that their missives would be read aloud or shown to family and friends. People who corresponded in the republic of letters or empire of humanity were no exception to that custom, but they enlarged the audiences for letters well beyond friends and family. Since correspondences on improving projects were undertaken purposively, activists tried to magnify the impact of the ideas and information those letters contained. Recipients often had excerpts of letters printed newspapers – the marks showing what sections were blocked out for insertion into the public prints can still be seen on many letters – so that broader communities would learn about, say, the latest news in prison reform or the cause of resuscitation.<sup>20</sup>

Just as letters blurred the line between the personal and public communication, so too did print media. Unlike the convention of anonymity in writing about politics, writings about philanthropy published in newspapers and magazines often identified the

---

<sup>19</sup> Belknap to Rush, September 29, 1787, September 30, 1788, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 30, f. 1, LCP; James Currie to Rush, May 16, 1796, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, f. 157, LCP; Joshua Dixon to Rush, Whitehaven, August 11, 1803, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 4, f. 65, LCP; John Lathrop to J. C. Lettsom, November 10, 1789; John Lathrop to J. C. Lettsom, November 16, 1791, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, pp. 449, 445. On strong ties providing redundant information, see Powell and Smith-Doerr, “Networks and Economic Life,” p. 372.

<sup>20</sup> Bannet, *Empire of Letters*, pp. 47, 89-94; on the complementary nature of different types of communication on prison reform, see Lloyd and Burgoyne, “The Evolution of a Transatlantic Debate on Penal Reform,” esp. 209-210. Their focus is on types of communication, rather than, as here, on the significance of the blurry line between public and personal sources of information.

authors and, in the cases of letters inserted in the public prints, sometimes recipients too. Books too emphasized the people involved in philanthropy. John Coakley Lettsom's charitable how-to-manual, *Hints on Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science*, is rife with letters to him and acknowledgements of the friends who had sent him the information he included in the volumes. And in *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales*, John Howard mentioned that he had materials on prisons he had studied in Europe that he had excluded from his book. Howard, however, would "readily show [those materials] to any Gentleman who has leisure and inclination to study the subject." Howard's comments directly invited a relationship with him. Similarly, the familiarity through books and periodicals with leading activists encouraged men to share all manner of ideas with those leaders. Certain individuals stood out but one message of the focus on the ties among philanthropists was that their projects took cooperation – whether local or transnational. Another message was that authority in philanthropy was vested in individuals, not institutions. That message did not conflict with the emphasis on cooperation. Associated philanthropy throughout the Anglophone Atlantic world operated on small enough scales, with the same people turning up time and again, that people involved could know each other locally or correspond with colleagues farther away. The world of philanthropic activity was both personal and participatory, as public sources attested.<sup>21</sup>

Activists placed great weight on diffusing information, but what became of their efforts? For all the trafficking in ideas, it is often hard to tell what became of those ideas.

---

<sup>21</sup> Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance and Medical Science* (1797); Lettsom, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance and Medical Science*, (1801); John Haygarth, *An Inquiry How to Prevent the Small-Pox*, pp. 137-145; Howard, *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales*, p. 145.

Institutions were not always adopted and when they were, it is not always possible to tell what sources moved people to action. The involvement of people with direct experience with unfamiliar institutions was ideal. With or without those human resources, however, contemporaries wanted information from multiple sources before launching new charitable programs. Thus, Joshua Dixon of Whitehaven, England, “endeavoured to collect from every source the information necessary for the institution of a week day and sunday school charity.” New York philanthropist David Hosack appreciated the desire for numerous sources about a project. When a Boston man asked Hosack for information on the soup house founded by the New York Humane Society (formerly the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors, not then a resuscitation charity) in 1802, Hosack detailed for the man how New York’s soup house worked and directed the man’s attention to Count Rumford’s *Essays* to learn more about how to build the Count’s fuel-efficient boilers for making the soup. For information on the London soup house that had been the model for the New York undertaking, Hosack sent the Boston man to Lettsom’s *Hints on Beneficence*. Finally, Hosack gave the man the soup recipe used in the New York operation and helpfully noted that “If ground black pepper be used [instead of red] the additional expense of ½ oz will be 2<sup>d</sup> \_ whereas the dried red pepper answers every purpose.” If the Boston man were going to set up a soup house (and there is no evidence anything came of the idea), he would need, Hosack thought, input about the charitable innovation from numerous sources.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Joshua Dixon to John Coakley Lettsom, November 1, 1807, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 3, p. 366. David Hosack to “a Gentleman in Boston,” n.d., D. Hosack: Copies of Letters and Documents, NYAM. For a discussion of the interaction between different sources of information in the adoption of innovations in another context, see Ryan and Gross, “The Diffusion of Hybrid Seed Corn in Two Iowa Communities.”



The Boston man had written to Hosack, the mover and shaker behind New York's first soup house, to get firsthand knowledge of an unfamiliar institution. The Boston man's request and the correct assumptions that he could write to Hosack and get a reply highlight the personal nature of "empire of humanity." That empire was expanding thanks to print media. The boom in print allowed philanthropists to go well beyond their areas, but the use of print media did not weaken the value placed on information through personal channels. Rather, the two reinforced each other. Each source about a venture was meant to support the authority of another, and by gifting so many pamphlets, books, and other items to one another, philanthropists not only disseminated ideas about charitable projects but also strengthened their bonds with one another. The ideas that philanthropists shared with one another did not always come to fruition. Effective intellectual leadership in the "empire of humanity" did not necessarily mean effective hands-on leadership locally. But, thanks to their participation in a system of exchange that used print media in conjunction with personal ties, philanthropists at once acted locally and as part of a larger community.

#### *Formalizing the "Empire of Humanity"*

Individuals corresponded in the empire of humanity to gather ideas and to extend their reach. Some groups, most notably humane societies and antislavery societies, built on those ties and sought, moreover, to bolster them. By naming honorary members and allowing foreign members, these groups formalized the informal associated philanthropy of the empire of humanity.<sup>23</sup>

Many charitable organizations saw no need to name honorary or corresponding members. Or, in some cases, a charitable institution might honor one or two people in

---

<sup>23</sup> For parallels to the scientific societies, see McClellan, *Science Reorganized*, esp. pp. 178-182.

special positions. New York Hospital, for instance, elected John Fothergill as a governor of New York Hospital in 1771. (In 1774, on the same day that New York got word of the closing of the Port of Boston as punishment for the Boston Tea Party, Fothergill lost his place on the board.) Had the American Revolutionary crisis not intervened, Fothergill might well have played an active role as he did in Pennsylvania Hospital, which had named him a manager in 1768. In spite of that possibility, the London doctor's election as a governor to a New York charity included a strong honorary element given his residence in London. Three decades later, in 1798, New York Hospital governors made John Coakley Lettsom an honorary governor, and then between 1800 and 1803 Lettsom was elected as an ordinary governor. (Unlike Fothergill, who actively managed Pennsylvania Hospital finances in London, Lettsom merely gifted books and pamphlets to New York Hospital.) Nevertheless, the hospital did not make a general practice of honoring faraway friends.<sup>24</sup>

By contrast, three types of philanthropic organizations – religious-philanthropic groups, antislavery organizations, and humane societies – stressed the formalization of ties with distant associates. From at least the early eighteenth century, Protestant religious-philanthropic groups, concerned with the Protestant cause internationally, named corresponding members as part of their cooperation with overseas colleagues. Likewise, in the late eighteenth century, antislavery groups, and humane societies turned to honorary or corresponding memberships to forge or strengthen ties with coadjutors.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Langstaff, *Dr. Bard of Hyde Park*, p. 112. Betsy C. Corner and Christopher C. Booth, eds., *Chain of Friendship: Selected Letters of Dr. John Fothergill of London, 1735-1780* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 287-288. NYH Board of Governors' Minutes, vol. 1, February 6, 1798, May 20, 1800, May 19, 1801; NYH Board of Governors' Minutes, vol. 2, May 18, 1802, May 17, 1803, NYH.

<sup>25</sup> Duffy, "*Correspondence Fraternelle*"; Duffy, "The Society of [sic] Promoting Christian Knowledge and Europe"; Hitchcock, "Paupers and Preachers," p. 150. This practice continued among religious-philanthropic groups. For instance, in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, the London

All three movements shared three traits that worked together to incline them towards naming honorary or corresponding members. First, they had similar missions: All three aimed to save lives in the here-and-now or hereafter. Religious-philanthropic groups sought to save souls while antislavery groups and humane societies sought to save bodies and souls. Second, all three movements crossed borders of partiality. Protestant (or Catholic) religious-philanthropic groups, of course, were particularistic in their rejection of other religions as a means to salvation, but rested on universal views. Similarly, antislavery organizations, peopled by Europeans and Euro-Americans (with folks of African descent playing a large role in the cause of abolition, but not generally in the era's antislavery organizations), and humane societies both proceeded from sympathy for strangers. Third, compared to, say, hospitals, dispensaries, orphan asylums, or soup kitchens, the three movements lacked work to do running charitable operations. True, religious-philanthropic groups might have charity schools to oversee, but when it came to remote missionaries, the groups' hubs did not have a hands-on local role. Likewise, although the Royal Humane Society had medical assistants to be called to the scenes of emergencies and the MHS and eventually the RHS had small buildings to maintain, humane societies did not feed, house, teach, or treat crowds of poor, orphaned, unlettered, or sick people. Nor did antislavery groups, whose goal was to effect legal change. The three traits – saving lives, universalism, and comparatively little to do locally – came together to give written communications an unusually important place in the movements' operations. By corresponding with colleagues plus disseminating printed materials,

---

Missionary Society made New York philanthropist Divie Bethune a foreign director. Boylan, *Origins of Women's Activism*, p. 110. On antislavery groups' naming honorary or faraway member, see Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*, p. 90; Turley, *The Culture of English Antislavery*, p. 200.

organizations could reach far in their efforts to save lives. Naming honorary or corresponding members fit well with the three movements' core activities.<sup>26</sup>

For humane societies, naming honorary members fit naturally with their mission for another reason, to wit, their relation to learned bodies. Humane societies blurred the line between philanthropic and learned bodies, and, more generally, the empire of humanity overlapped significantly with the republic of letters.<sup>27</sup> Certain names on humane society honorary lists web recur on the lists of members (ordinary, corresponding or honorary) of several learned bodies. Moreover, the same few people, Lettsom for instance, did more than their fair share of nominating honorary or corresponding members, and they often put up people to whom they already had ties. (See Appendix Two.)

Proposing friends as honorary or corresponding members not only buttressed those ties but also bolstered leadership positions in the international web of philanthropists and improvers. Some people, that is, were named as members of an organization to honor their roles in a certain fields, such as medicine, or in the transatlantic community in general rather than in recognition or hopes of any kind of service from the honoree. For instance, the Royal Humane Society made Benjamin Rush an honorary governor in 1794. The chance to associate itself with Rush's perceived heroism during the 1793 yellow fever crisis in Philadelphia cannot but have been a factor. Likewise, reinforcing existing bonds with a prominent person may have been the reason that the MHS honored the Scottish minister, Rev. John Erskine. MHS officer John

---

<sup>26</sup> On the role of people of African descent in antislavery, see Brown, *Moral Capital*, pp. 282-298, and Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*, esp. chaps. 3 & 4.

<sup>27</sup> Roy Porter recognized humane societies' similarity to learned bodies when he classed the RHS reports as medical journals. Porter, "The Rise of Medical Journalism in Britain to 1800," p. 8.

Lathrop, for one, had a link to Erskine through the Society in Scotland for Promoting Christian Knowledge with which group Lathrop corresponded. Naming Erskine as an MHS honorary member may have had more to do with reciprocity in the sphere of philanthropy in general than with furthering the cause of lifesaving.<sup>28</sup>

In many other cases, groups named honorary members to thank people who had contributed in some way to institutions or, sometimes, to encourage gifts. The Massachusetts Humane Society, for example, may have named two Lisbon wine merchants, John and Thomas Bulkeley, in hopes of shaking loose generous donations. If so, it worked. If the same motive had led the RHS to name Count Rumford as an honorary member – in the wake of a big donation by Rumford to the Royal Society –, it didn't. But charities did not only use honorary memberships to go beyond the areas in which they operated. Groups knew too that they needed to recognize people from the crucial local or regional arenas that sustained charitable organizations through individuals' money, time, and attention. So less well-known names mingled on the MHS and RHS lists alongside the names of international leaders, just as non-honorary memberships in associated charities brought together a given city's great and the merely

---

<sup>28</sup> Lettsom proposed Rush as an honorary member. William Hawes to Rush, April 2, 1794, Rush Manuscripts Y12 7402, f. 61, LCP. On the epidemic and Rush's role in caring for the sick including harsh local criticisms of his therapeutics, see John Harvey Powell, *Bring Out Your Dead: The Great Plague of Yellow Fever in Philadelphia in 1793* (1949; New York, 1970). Clarke, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, p.36. John Lathrop, *A Discourse Before the 'Society for Propagating the Gospel Among Indians, and Others, in North-America.'* Delivered on the 19<sup>th</sup> of January, 1804 (Boston, 1804), p. 33; Francis Parkman, *A Sermon Delivered at the Internment of the Rev. John Lathrop. Pastor of the Second Church in Boston, who Died Jan. 4, 1816, in the Sixty-Sixth Year of His Age, and Forty-Eighth of his Ministry* (Boston, 1816), p. 22.

good. Honorary memberships, then, both tended to groups' local arena and gave them a way to reach beyond that arena.<sup>29</sup>

Another way charitable organizations structured themselves to go beyond the local realm was by formally opening membership to foreign members. Many groups did not address in their constitutions the issue of foreigners' eligibility for membership. Perhaps most assumed there was no need: Public subscription charities took money from all comers, and unlike the need to delimit recipients of charities, no purpose would be served by specifying the boundaries of eligibility for membership. Still, to some contemporaries, that a public subscription charity would open membership to foreigners seemed notable: Dr. Christian A. Struve of Gorlitz, Upper Saxony, lauded the Royal Humane Society – which had no constitutional provision on the topic – for being “willing that *foreigners* should be members of your most excellent Society.”<sup>30</sup>

Some groups, however, explicitly allowed for foreign members. By 1780, the Scots Society of Norwich, England, specified that people of all nations could join, as befitted its global mission. Similarly, the Pennsylvania and Delaware abolition societies provided that foreigners or people resident in other states could become corresponding members. Corresponding members, the groups explained, would not have to pay annual dues, but would be entitled to attend “the meetings of the society during their residence in the state.” And when it was founded in 1794, the Humane Society of the State of New York provided that both Americans and foreigners could become members. Foreigners or out-of-state residents, all these groups took as given, would be aware of them, would

---

<sup>29</sup> Robbins, *A Discourse Before the Humane Society*, pp. 31, 35. Both Bulkeleyes gave bequests to the society in their wills. My thanks to David Hancock for information on the Bulkeleyes' occupation. *RHS Reports 1798* ([London, 1798]), p. 26.

<sup>30</sup> C. A. Struve to the RHS, *RHS Reports 1798*, p. 17.

feel a stake in their missions, would be interested in joining and, implicitly in the cases of the Scots Society and New York Humane Society, could have a role in governance. In addition, the Pennsylvania and Delaware abolition societies assumed that foreign and out-of-state corresponding members might come through those states and take part actively during their visits. The search for ways to go beyond the local sphere led some organizations to define eligibility to participate in cosmopolitan terms.<sup>31</sup>

Membership, of whatever type, of distant voluntary societies mattered to people, and people honored by philanthropic (and learned) organizations valued those marks of recognition, as they showed in various ways. For one, authors often listed their memberships in noteworthy (domestic and foreign) groups on the covers of their books. For another, honorees reciprocated with letters, money, and publications. After the Humane Society of Massachusetts named John Bulkeley and Anthony Fothergill as honorary members, each man wrote to the society – within a day or so of receiving the society’s letter, both claimed – to “acknowledge the honour of being elected a member.” Both averred, in Bulkeley’s words, that they would “be ever ready to promote [the society’s] benevolent purposes,” and Bulkeley put his money where his pen was by sending the Society one hundred Spanish dollars. In addition, honorees evinced the importance of their memberships, and of their involvement in far-flung communities, through their interest in their fellow members. After the Providence Abolition Society voted Jeremy Belknap a corresponding member, he wrote to the society’s secretary to

---

<sup>31</sup> The Pennsylvania Abolition Society was not a public-subscription group; rather members had to be elected. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, in Great Britain*, p. 10; *The Constitution of the Pennsylvania Society, for Promoting Abolition, and the Relief of Free Negroes, Unlawfully Held in Bondage. Begun in the Year 1774, and Enlarged on the Twenty-third of April, 1787. To Which Are Added in the Acts of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery* (Philadelphia, 1787), p. 6; Delaware Abolition Society constitution, *New York Daily Advertiser*, August 26, 1788. *The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York*, p. 7.

accept the membership and asked for “a list of the Names of the Society & its corresponding Members,” plus any future publications of the society. Similarly, when the Londoner Dr. Alexander Johnson wrote to Benjamin Rush in 1790 to suggest the formation of humane societies throughout Pennsylvania, Johnson concluded his letter by noting “I have the pleasure of seeing your Name as Corresponding Member on the Lists of the Society for encouraging Arts, of which I am an old Member.”<sup>32</sup>

That comment came right after Johnson had relayed Henry Moyes’s “Cordial greeting” to Rush. Johnson reference to dual ties to Rush highlights the multiplicity of connections and the overlapping networks that shaped lives and communities around the Atlantic in the long eighteenth century. Johnson invoked both their organizational and personal bonds to approach Rush about a philanthropic goal. Connections through voluntary organizations and mutual acquaintances mattered in the evolution of beneficence in the eighteenth century. The spread of charitable programs did not occur because rich individuals or institutions had the capacities to act in many places. Rather, the many ties that linked people around the Atlantic and beyond structured – although by no means exclusively and not necessarily successfully – the flow of ideas and information used in philanthropic projects. Contemporaries recognized their interdependence with terms such as the empire of humanity and formalized it with practices such as honorary memberships.

---

<sup>32</sup> For a display of an author’s memberships on a book cover, see, for example, William Hawes, *The Transactions of the Royal Humane Society*, vol. 1 ([London, 1795]). Robbins, *A Discourse Before the Humane Society*, p. 31. PHS Minutes, vol. 1, June 12, 1799; April 8, 1801; May 18, 1802, June 12, 1803, July 13, 1803, PHA. Belknap to Thomas Arnold, August 18, 1789, Belknap Papers, 161.B (Reel 5), MHS. Alexander Johnson to Benjamin Rush, London, April 3, 1790, Rush Manuscripts, Vol. 25, f. 80, LCP. On the psychological impact of belonging to organizations with extra-local ties, see Richard D. Brown, “The Emergence of Urban Society in Rural Massachusetts, 1760-1820,” *Journal of American History* 61 (1974): 29-51, pp. 43-44.



*'The Whole Habitable Globe': The Reach of the Humane Society Movement*

Whether it was acknowledged or not, interdependence characterized the field of philanthropy. Activists who chose to could extend their range by participating in the empire of humanity in general. The fullest realization of that possibility occurred within the humane society movement. Indeed, by the end of the century, humane societies credited their supporters with saving lives around the world. The view that humane societies together engaged in a worldwide undertaking had burgeoned over time. Thanks to their participation locally in humane societies, which gave aid impartially but incrementally, and their simultaneous participation in international networks, activists found a structure through which they perceived themselves to be tangibly aiding faraway sufferers.

Humane societies founded in the 1770s and 1780s had not started out with explicit catholic aims. The founders of humane societies in those decades had practiced one type of cosmopolitanism by emulating foreign peers. Similarly, the Royal Humane Society, in particular, had looked well beyond the local arena in its efforts to distribute its materials around the British Atlantic. Nevertheless, the RHS stressed national goals during its first ten or so years (a decade when Britain was at war) and had hoped to be established as a national body. In 1782, William Hawes had even broached an elaborate plan of government-established receiving houses in every parish where half-drowned people could be treated. Furthermore, he pressed Parliament to set up a school “for studying the Art of restoring Animation,” with classes for medical men and separate classes for the general public. Likewise, in 1793, the Chester, England, doctor John Haygarth proposed a government-directed plan for the extermination of smallpox.

Nothing came of either Hawes's or Haygarth's plan. Yet other English efforts to found philanthropic bodies, for example the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (1698) and the Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor (1795), with national (if uneven) reaches succeeded both early and late in the century. The difference between Hawes's and Haygarth's plans, on the one hand, and the SPCK and the SBCP, on the other, was that the latter two were voluntary, networked operations while the former two called for government undertakings. English schemes for government-supported, national charitable programs in the late eighteenth century failed. That failure enhanced the possibilities of transnational cooperation because networked activity *was* a viable way for activists to extend their reach and expand their impact.<sup>33</sup>

Unlike some of their English colleagues, American philanthropists did not envision national philanthropic bodies in the late eighteenth century. Indeed, at first, Americans looked abroad rather than to peers in other states. By the late 1780s, the American humane societies had begun to forge interstate bonds to complement their transatlantic ties. But Americans conceived of those relationships very differently from the models of national institutions proposed by Hawes and Haygarth, or of the London Foundling Hospital with its provincial branches. Americans imagined supra-local cooperation in line with the way they had, before disunion, expected the British Empire

---

<sup>33</sup> On the RHS's national vision and hope for government support at its beginning, see, *Reports of the Society for the Recovery of the Apparently Drowned. Part II* (1774), pp. 34, 35. William Hawes, *An Address to the King and Parliament of Great Britain, on the Important Subject of Preserving the Lives of its Inhabitants . . . With an Appendix, in which is inserted a Letter from Dr. Lettsom to the Author* (London, 1782). On Haygarth's plan, see Lobo, "John Haygarth, Smallpox and Religious Dissent in Eighteenth-Century England," pp. 242-248. On the SPCK, see Hitchcock, "Paupers and Preachers." On the SBCP, see Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 106-108; Roberts, *Making English Morals*, pp. 64-76; Roberts writes that the SBCP aimed for a national reach, but he downplays its reach outside London. As a clearinghouse, however, the SBCP had a national scope. Its reports include many essays on charitable organizations around England. See, for instance, *The Report of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor*, vol. 3.

to work and the way they organized the union of the United States, that is, in federal terms. In 1794, for instance, a federation of American antislavery organizations was founded. The difference between English and American ideas should not be overstated. Hawes's and Haygarth's plans failed. Nevertheless, the English pursuit of centralized institutions contrasted with Americans' strong attachment to federal bodies, in beneficence as in government.<sup>34</sup>

The humane society movement was an especially good arena for federated action. Humane societies understood communication among fellow societies to be part of their institutional missions. While other medical charities on occasion sent materials to distant colleagues or, more often, had access through local doctors to novel practices adopted elsewhere, humane societies' mission entailed trading knowledge about innovations in lifesaving and progress in the cause. The Royal Humane Society served as the hub of this communication. Newly-formed humane societies routinely announced their birth to the RHS. In addition, humane societies reported the number of lives they saved to the RHS. Individuals too wrote into the Society, with observations and sometimes questions on resuscitation, improvements in lifesaving techniques, and news of successes. The RHS broadcast all of that news and information to the rest of the movement through its annual reports. In addition, it and other humane societies swapped letters and pamphlets. Sometimes their correspondence mainly emphasized that the societies shared a common cause. Other times, leaders picked up each other's ideas from sermons or pamphlets and

---

<sup>34</sup> PHS Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, December 2, 1782, May 5, 1783, September 12 and October 10, 1787 PHA. The MHS initiated a correspondence with the PHS; see PHS Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, December 10, 1789. On the London Foundling Hospital, see McClure, *Coram's Children*, pp. 121-123. On the American Convention of Abolition Societies, see Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*, pp. 19-20. For a parallel to American Freemasonry remaining organized in state and local bodies, not in any sort of national structure, after the American Revolution, see Bullock, *Revolutionary Brotherhood*, p. 121.

recycled it for their groups. Less often, but significantly, humane societies' exchanges had a practical impact on lifesaving operations, such as when the MHS built a lifeboat in imitation of the RHS. The RHS borrowed from American societies too: Noting that Americans had more experience than Britons did with extremes of heat and cold, the RHS printed the PHS's directions on restoring people to life from an array of causes but particularly called attention to the directions dealing with apparent-deaths caused by great heat or cold.<sup>35</sup>

Even when no applied changes resulted, contemporaries imbued humane societies' correspondence with great significance. Activists' view that they practiced far-flung philanthropy rested on the common belief in the power of the written word. That idea came from Protestant beliefs about the active power of praying. To the minds of eighteenth-century men and women, written communications themselves were a form of action, not just a precursor to action, and so by writing people engaged in beneficence. Thomas Clarkson highlighted that understanding of the written word when he explained in his history of the abolition movement that Anthony Benezet had opened a correspondence with Granville Sharp so "that there might be an union of action between them for the future." Likewise, Benjamin Rush thought that through his writings on prisons and lazarettos, Howard "ha[d] rendered" "immense services. . . to humanity and science." But J. P. Brissot de Warville put it most starkly when he declared that periodical publications were "one of the most powerful means of succouring" enslaved

---

<sup>35</sup> For example, the New York Hospital sent copies of its 1811 *Account of the New York Hospital* (New York, 1811) to doctors in the United States and Europe. New York Hospital Governors' Minutes, vol. 3, February 2, 1813, NYH. Smallpox vaccination spread rapidly across the Atlantic through doctors' networks, and medical-charitable and municipal poor-relief institutions then added the practice to their missions. For example, see Bell, "Dr. James Smith and the Public Encouragement for Vaccination for Smallpox"; *One Hundred Years of the History of the Baltimore General Dispensary*, p. 6. William Emerson, *A Discourse Delivered in the First Church, Boston, on the Anniversary of the Massachusetts Humane Society, June 9, 1807* (Boston, 1807), pp. 15-16, 27-30. *RHS Reports 1808*, p. 16.

people. Thanks to the faith in the efficacy of writing, publishing and corresponding offered ways to *do* something for people far away.<sup>36</sup>

That idea and participation in a philanthropic federation fostered explicit global aims among humane societies. Those goals developed over the late 1780s and 1790s for a number of reasons, not least that cosmopolitanism burgeoned in the wake of the American Revolution among the type of men who made up the heart of the “empire of humanity.” Those men had been born in the 1740s and grew up during years of confidence and closer ties in the British Empire. Confidence and closer ties, plus faith in improvement and consumer mentalities, fostered the mindset and the capabilities that gave rise to expansive philanthropy. Moreover, the Protestant chauvinism that helped bind the British Empire together did not cut against cosmopolitanism later, but rather bolstered it by promoting Protestant ecumenicalism. As Americans and Britons became foreigners, no longer fellow-nationals, cosmopolitanism offered a way to reconnect because each party to the imperial crisis had betrayed their common Protestantism during the conflict – the British with the Quebec Act and the Americans by allying with the French. Protestant ecumenicalism had laid a base for the broader concept of cosmopolitanism.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> On prayer including praying as a part of a transatlantic Protestant effort to help Indians, see Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, pp. 103-109. Clarkson, *The History of the Rise, Progress and Accomplishments of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade*, vol. 1, p. 140; Benjamin Rush to [John Howard], October 14, 1789, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 39, p. 40, LCP; Thomas Clarkson, *An Essay on the Impolicy of the Slave Trade. In Two Parts. To Which is Added, an Oration on the Necessity of Establishing at Paris, a Society to Promote the Abolition of the Trade and Slavery of the Negroes. J. P. Brissot de Warville* (Philadelphia, 1788), p. 153. Benjamin Franklin made the same point in a letter to Richard Price. Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*, p. 17.

<sup>37</sup> On the importance of common Protestantism for British-American ties and then on the betrayals of that shared heritage, see Conway, "From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners"; Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empires*, pp. 205, 333-335. On the confusing nature of British-American ties after the Revolution, see Bullock, *Revolutionary Brotherhood*, pp. 114-121.

As they interacted in the 1780s and '90s, Americans and Britons turned to liberal language to smooth their relations. Such language could mask political aspects of charities. Likewise, it could be put to instrumental ends. Benjamin Rush wheedled donations for Carlisle College and the African Church in Philadelphia out of British friends John Coakley Lettsom and Granville Sharp by appealing to them as citizens of the world. When he wrote to friends in Boston about charitable matters, Rush stressed the bonds of nationhood. The use of universalist language in those different situations was not empty verbiage or cynical manipulation. Highlighting their bonds as citizens of the world added meaning to relationships among philanthropists by giving play to one aspect of their self-images, and cosmopolitanism, like other aspects of their personas, could be played up or down as occasions demanded. When Benjamin Rush asked New Englander Jeremy Belknap to republish Rush's essay against spirituous liquors, Rush explained that the insult in the essay against New England men was intended only for Pennsylvania and had to be omitted in the Boston publication of the essay. That is, cosmopolitanism, or for that matter regional prejudice, could be a tool that one wielded in some situations and not in others. In the aftermath of the imperial divorce, Americans and Britons had reason to deploy cosmopolitan language routinely as they remade transatlantic ties.<sup>38</sup>

That practice coincided with a spurt in the formation of new humane societies in the Anglophone world. As a result of the interactions among the enlarged body of humane societies, the movement reconceived its mission. In this development, the

---

<sup>38</sup> Barry, "Urban Association and the Middling Sort," p. 111. Benjamin Rush to Granville Sharp, November 28, 1783, "The Correspondence of Benjamin Rush and Granville Sharp, 1773-1809," p. 20; Rush to Sharp [August 1791], *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 608; Rush to Lettsom, April 8, 1785, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 351; Benjamin Rush to Thomas Russell, president of the Massachusetts Humane Society, March 9, 1793, in Clarke, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, pp. 32-33; Rush to Jeremy Belknap, August 19, 1788, Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 482.

American and exterritorial British societies led the RHS. The RHS had not wholly shunned catholic concerns in its reports before the mid-1780s but universalist terms had been used rarely. Starting in the mid-1780s, when humane societies were set up or revived in Massachusetts, Philadelphia, and Barbados, and then really picking up in the late 1780s and early 1790s, as humane societies were formed (whether or not they survived) in Jamaica, New York, Portugal, and elsewhere, the RHS's choice of language and focus changed. The RHS had not been able to establish itself as a national body, but it was finding itself to be at the center of a growing network of humane societies. In many cases, the RHS sent apparatus and printed materials to founders of new societies abroad and in the British Isles. The growing number of humane societies that it could claim credit for helping to launch taught the RHS of its international impact. Moreover, its correspondents told the RHS that "[t]he benevolent and laudable example [the RHS] exhibited to the world" had inspired imitators and they informed the RHS that the new societies joined the RHS in a "common cause of humanity." Thus, its correspondences with overseas societies revealed to the RHS the ongoing international dimension to its activities while the useful tool of cosmopolitan language to conduct those correspondences persuaded the RHS of the universal nature of its mission. By 1790, the RHS, the highest-profile society, began its annual report by hailing each of its supporters as a "Philanthropist and [a] Citizen of the World." And in 1793, in response to the MHS president Thomas Russell's gift of £100 to the RHS to spread humane societies throughout the world, the RHS endorsed John Coakley Lettsom's view that, "The good thus done by [the RHS] is not merely the saving life, . . . but the *diffusion of humanity* becomes an extended focus of action, beyond the boundaries of province or kingdom,

happily uniting in mutual interests the stranger and the citizen.” Beneficence to all humanity defined the RHS, it had learnt from its coadjutors abroad.<sup>39</sup>

Humane societies set up in the 1790s reflected the growing stress that the movement put on a universal mission. Whereas the humane societies founded in the 1770s and 1780s had not initially insisted on their catholic nature, humane societies founded in the 1790s did. The Sunderland, England, Humane Society, for instance, echoed RHS leader William Hawes in looking forward to the day when the lifesaving movement would “embrace without distinction THE WHOLE HABITABLE GLOBE.” The short-lived Humane Society of the State of New York went further. It conceived its mission to be “benevolence to mankind” and constituted itself as a cosmopolitan organization by providing for medical counselors to correspond with other societies and for membership to be open to Americans and foreigners.<sup>40</sup>

Like all charitable organizations, humane societies set bounds to their ambit, and they did so by confining their aid to people suffering sudden death and, for some societies, to people at risk of death from certain preventable causes. But in another way, the lifesaving groups did not have to delimit their target populations. Humane societies worked from the presumption that any endangered life should be saved. Since anyone might drown, all humankind could be the object of the lifesaving movement’s concern. (Rather than having to pick beneficiaries, humane societies’ beneficiaries picked themselves by drowning.)

---

<sup>39</sup> Letter from founders of the Jamaica Humane Society to the RHS, August 11, 1789, *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 359; Samuel Parker, Corresponding Secretary of the MHS, to the RHS, July 6, 1789, *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 353; *RHS Reports 1790* ([London, 1790]), p. 3; John Coakley Lettsom to William Hawes, *RHS Reports 1793*, September 26, 1792, p. 30.

<sup>40</sup> *Reports of the Sunderland Humane Society, From It’s [sic] Institution in September 1791, to the Commencement of the Year 1793* (Sunderland, 1793), p. vii. *The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York*, pp. 3, 4, 7.



By the 1790s, the humane society movement congratulated itself for actually pursuing universal beneficence through cooperation among individual societies. “It must afford exalted satisfaction to every member [of the Society] to find that so many are organized with the same plan, in Europe, the East & West Indies under whose care many thousands have already been restored to the general family of mankind,” the Philadelphia Humane Society opined in 1795. “Every subscriber and donor, has in part contributed to reanimate Society with so many trophies of humanity.” William Hawes invoked the same idea, that all humane society supporters had a share in all lives saved, in his annual letter to the MHS in 1799. His Massachusetts colleagues would be “highly gratif[ied],” Hawes wrote, “to be informed that [the RHS] has increased the stock of human happiness, by exhibiting this year at their *Anniversary Festival*, a greater number than ever, of men, women and children, restored to their friends and relatives.” That is, Hawes implied that thanks to the societies’ interactions MHS members had moral and emotional stakes in the lives of strangers thousands of miles away. In his 1805 address to the Merrimack Humane Society, Daniel Appleton White made the same general point. “[Y]ou act in concert with other societies, and serve to increase and extend their benefits,” he told his audience. By implication, then, all humane society members furthered each other’s impact.<sup>41</sup>

The idea that local charitable institutions increased and extended the benefits of similar institutions could apply generally, not just to the lifesaving cause. The dispensary in Boston brought to its community the benefits of the dispensary movement. But in the

---

<sup>41</sup> *Stephen’s Philadelphia Directory, for 1796* (Philadelphia, 1796), p. 27. William Hawes to the MHS, September 18, 1799, in Thacher, *A Discourse Delivered at Boston, Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1800*, p. 19. White, *An Address to the Members of the Merrimack Humane Society*, pp. 26, 17.

case of the resuscitation movement, that general idea about spreading the benefits of philanthropic action had greater force. Humane societies, unlike the individual institutions in other movements, were referred to as branches of, the implication was, a collective institution. Beyond the exchange of information and the RHS's distribution of materials to set up new societies, however, the societies had no constitutional (never mind legal) ties of the sort that the Society of Universal Good-will had envisioned for its proposed branches. By using the term "branch" and similar phrases, supporters highlighted that they thought of all humane societies as one body. Thus, as Hawes had implied, the humane society coalition had found an ongoing way for people to realize the lesson of the Good Samaritan by helping not only suffering strangers, but even distant suffering strangers at the time of greatest need.<sup>42</sup>

The idea that humane societies worked together to save lives was conveyed to the public time and again. The London and Massachusetts humane societies crafted images through their annual reports as organizations that joined forces with "friends of humanity" elsewhere by printing letters from around colleagues far and wide; by publicizing their naming of honorary members; by incorporating material from distant colleagues into addresses and reports; and by citing successes elsewhere. In addition, the Royal Humane Society routinely printed extensive information about other humane societies, such as news of their founding or proceedings and the names of their officers. Across the water, a throwaway comment reprinted in newspapers from Baltimore to New Hampshire in 1794 underscores that humane societies were widely understood as one

---

<sup>42</sup> Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 115-121. *RHS Reports 1797*, p. 32; Jedidiah Morse, *A Sermon Preached Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1801* (Boston, 1801), p. 26; letter from Falmouth, England, Humane Society to RHS, *RHS Reports 1808*, p. 65.

body. To date, the report said, the RHS had saved “more than 1800 lives. This is the most sublime eulogium that we can pronounce *on this and similar institutions in the United States.*” (Emphasis added.) That is, the American societies received credit for the lives saved by the RHS.<sup>43</sup>

To many humane-society proponents, the ability to restore life represented the apex of Enlightenment progress and the lifesaving cause nurtured benevolence in general. Indeed, in 1789, an RHS correspondent credited “present ardour in the cause of humanity,” evinced in Parliament’s nascent efforts to abolish the slave trade, “to the unremitting exertions of the [Royal Humane] Society.” Crediting antislavery to the humane society movement would be going too far, but advocates had reason for such hyperbole. The humane society movement, its supporters found, had the right institutional form – a network of self-selected members – for the practice of universal beneficence in the late eighteenth century.<sup>44</sup>

Unlike the Society of Universal Good-will, no humane society had a blueprint for founding organizations across the globe, although both humane societies and individuals distributed enormous amounts of materials in efforts to spread knowledge of resuscitation. Just as the reaction to John Howard had changed his conception of his mission, expansive goals had developed dynamically through the growth of the movement and through interactions in the movement’s network. It had not been clear to

---

<sup>43</sup> Robbins, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of . . . Massachusetts*, pp. 14, 10. See the reports of the RHS and MHS. The comment about the “most sublime eulogium” was printed in *Philadelphia Gazette and Universal Daily Advertiser*, September 23, 1794; *Philadelphia Gazette of the United States* September 24, 1794; *Baltimore Daily Intelligencer* September 26, 1794; *Boston Mercury*, September 30 to October 3, 1794; *Massachusetts Spy or Worcester Gazette* October 1, 1794; and *Portsmouth New Hampshire Gazette* October 7, 1794.

<sup>44</sup> On the idea that the RHS taught humanity by promoting lifesaving, see Davidson, “Raising Up Humanity,” pp. 251, 258. Henry Corbin to the RHS, November 31, 1789, *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 445; *RHS Reports 1795*, p. 22.

the early founders of humane societies what the extent of the need was or who would be helped. Activists had learnt about practicing impartial charity locally while also participating in a movement that placed great stress on international communication. Thanks to humane societies' impartial, incremental, and interconnected activities, philanthropists had built a structure that overcame obstacles to universal beneficence. In the eighteenth century, the lifesaving societies had perhaps uniquely resolved the pragmatic difficulties of succoring suffering strangers.

### *Global Action*

Perhaps humane society proponents overstated the movement's achievements. After all, as the data from the London, Massachusetts, and Philadelphia groups shows, they helped only small numbers of people. The movement's significance, however, went beyond its direct impact. Humane societies' intersecting mastery of impartial charity and international cooperation laid the groundwork for a new medical-charitable movement. In the early nineteenth century, vaccination supplanted the resuscitation movement and far surpassed its accomplishments. Working together, vaccination activists around the Atlantic world married local operations to the cosmopolitan practices that had become common in philanthropy, especially in the lifesaving cause, to realize a worldwide undertaking.

The vaccination movement rested on Edward Jenner's discovery of cowpox inoculation. Jenner (1749-1823), a Berkeley, Gloucestershire, doctor (and a medical assistant to the local humane society), had become interested in the immunity to smallpox known to be conferred by exposure to cowpox or swinepox, diseases which generally were more mild than smallpox. Exposure to cowpox was limited to places where cowpox

occurred and to times when there were outbreaks. To overcome that problem, Jenner experimented with person-to-person cowpox inoculation. The trial succeeded in providing immunity to smallpox, and in 1798, Jenner announced his discovery to the world. (The term “vaccination,” coined in 1803, comes from the Latin for “cow.” In the United States, cowpox was often called kine-pox, from the archaic word for cow.)<sup>45</sup>

Like knowledge of resuscitation, knowledge of vaccination procedures along with vaccine matter spread quickly through medical networks. Also similar to resuscitation, the new technique stirred controversy, although vaccination met far greater opposition as a result of a few early tragedies and anxiety about the efficacy and permanence of cowpox inoculation. Unlike resuscitation operations, which were always, as far as the evidence surveyed shows, charitable or civic undertakings, vaccination services could be bought (by those able to pay) or could be free (for the poor). In an effort to make access to cowpox inoculation universal, Americans and Europeans set up charitable and government-run vaccination programs or added such programs to existing institutions. These undertakings functioned in a cosmopolitan way by citing progress elsewhere in their publications and reproducing other organizations’ publicity materials in favor of the new technique.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Richard B. Fisher, *Edward Jenner 1749-1823* (London, 1991). *RHS Reports 1785-86*, p. 160. It is not clear what the virus early nineteenth-century vaccinators were using actually was. See Donald R. Hopkins, *The Greatest Killer: Smallpox in History with a New Introduction* (Chicago, 2002), pp. 7, 84.

<sup>46</sup> John Z. Bowers, “The Odyssey of Smallpox Vaccination,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 55 (1981): 17-33. On controversy over vaccination, see Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 80-104, 112, 157-165, 194-195. See also Blake, *Benjamin Waterhouse and the Introduction of Vaccination*. In the United States, Benjamin Waterhouse attempted to maintain a monopoly on vaccine distribution. Blake, *Benjamin Waterhouse and the Introduction of Vaccination*. On vaccination charities and government institutions, see, for instance, Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 101-102, 135-212; Bowers, “The Odyssey of Smallpox Vaccination”; Bell, “Dr. James Smith and the Public Encouragement for Vaccination for Smallpox”; *Longworth’s New York City Directory for 1802* (New York, 1802), p. 117. See also, Paul Hackett, “Averting Disaster: The Hudson’s Bay Company and Smallpox in Western Canada during the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78 (2004): 575-609.

While most vaccination charities focused on their immediate communities, they also participated in a worldwide effort in three ways. First, by vaccinating people locally, these organizations, the men and women who vaccinated poor neighbors on their own, and doctors who vaccinated for profit took part in a global eradication effort. “It must . . . be pleasing to every friend of humanity to learn,” New York doctor James Stringham asserted to an Edinburgh counterpart, “that the physicians here [in the United States] are not behind the rest of their medical brethren in other parts of the world, in endeavouring to alleviate the pressure of human misery.” As Stringham indicated, doctors appreciated that their local activities fit into a larger endeavor.<sup>47</sup>

Second, by relaying data on the numbers vaccinated in their communities to central institutions and to Edward Jenner himself, vaccinators helped track progress towards extermination just as humane societies reported their successes. Seven thousand people had been vaccinated in Swedish Pomerania between 1801 and 1804, two to three thousand in Bombay, and three thousand by one English cleric himself, various people informed Jenner and, through his publicity channels, a broader audience. In addition, devotees of the cause shared their innovations for charting the course of the cowpox in patients and for organizing other patient information. Dr. James Smith of Baltimore (one of the founders of the Dispensary there), for instance, sent Jenner a copy of “the following Record . . . to convey to [Jenner] a more accurate Idea of [Smith’s] data-tabulation method.

---

<sup>47</sup> On individuals (either medical men or lay people) vaccinating the poor for free, see, for instance, John Baron, *The Life of Dr. Jenner, M.D., Vol. 1* (London, 1838), pp. 433, 592-593; Benjamin Waterhouse, *A Prospect for Exterminating the Smallpox* (Cambridge, 1802), pp. 66-71; on female vaccinators, see Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, p. 89; Lady Brodhead to Edward Jenner, n.d., Jenner Papers, 5232/25, WL; Miss Story’s Vaccinations, 5244/74, Charles Murray (RJS Correspondence) WL. “Extract of a Letter Written by Dr James S Stringham of New York to Dr Duncan, concerning Vaccine Inoculation,” *Annals of Medicine for the Year 1801* (Edinburgh, 1802), p. 473.

1807 Benjamin Carr born 6<sup>th</sup> Decr. 1806  
 April 15 Vaccinated in the left arm  
     19 taken effect. . .  
     24 a characteristic vaccine pustule  
 May 2           took off a perfect scab  
                  Dismissed with Certificate No. 2701.<sup>48</sup>

Third, by experimenting with methods to send cowpox matter to faraway colleagues, doctors sought ways to bring vaccination to people everywhere. Medical men tried, among other techniques, preserving and transmitting the vaccine matter in quill pens, on glass, and in “many folds of Absorbent paper,” and communicated their successes and failures to one another. A universal program that drew on precedents from the humane society movement evolved organically from the labors of vaccination’s adherents.<sup>49</sup>

Besides this informal undertaking, governments and philanthropists in Europe and the United States set up centralized vaccination institutions. Starting in 1803, the Spanish Crown sponsored a three-year voyage under the direction of physician Francisco Xavier de Balmis (1753-1819) to disseminate cowpox matter and set up vaccination commissions throughout the Spanish Empire. (The venture rested on the coerced participation of orphaned boys who were vaccinated serially, to keep the cowpox alive, on the voyage from Spain to South America to the Philippines.) Various European governments set up institutions and starting with Bavaria in 1807, some made vaccination compulsory. In 1813, the United States government named a United States vaccine

---

<sup>48</sup> C. E. Wengel to Edward Jenner, July 15, 1807, Jenner Papers (MS 5232/13), WL; Helenus Scott to Edward Jenner, n.d., in John Baron, *The Life of Edward Jenner, M.D.*, vol. 1 (London, 1838), p. 412; *Third Festival of the Royal Jennerian Society* (from the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, June 1805), p. 524; James Smith to Edward Jenner, May 14, 1807, Jenner Papers, (MS 5232/12), WL.

<sup>49</sup> James Smith to Edward Jenner, May 14, 1807, Jenner Papers, (MS 5232/12), WL; Lord Elgin to Jean De Carro, December 23, 1800, in Baron, *The Life of Edward Jenner*, p. 415; John Rule to John Walker, August 14, 1815, (4809), Royal College of Physicians, London; Benjamin Waterhouse to John Coakley Lettsom, April 14, 1801, Benjamin Waterhouse Papers (MS 7801), WL. On various methods of non-human transmission, see also Bowers, “The Odyssey of Smallpox Vaccination,” pp. 21-22.

agent, the Baltimore doctor James Smith, to preserve cowpox matter and to provide it to any American citizen who requested it. (Like many cowpox inoculation leaders, and resuscitation leaders earlier, Smith's sense of his mission went beyond national boundaries; his vaccination evangelizing extended to the Caribbean and South America.) In 1808, the British government formed the National Vaccine Establishment out of the ashes of the self-destructed Royal Jennerian Society; the NVE performed vaccinations and disseminated matter. Before its demise, the RJS had had the grandest aim of all these groups, to wit, "the extermination of the Small Pox, from the Metropolis of the British Empire and the World."<sup>50</sup>

When the Royal Jennerian Society was formed in 1803, the spread of cowpox inoculation was well underway. The RJS, whose leaders included many men with experience in the humane society and other philanthropic movements, institutionalized the global diffusion of matter and information that had begun through personal channels. The Society put much effort into building the infrastructure for the promotion of vaccination around the United Kingdom. In London, where the Society was based, the RJS ran stations around the metropolis for the free immunization of poor patients (largely children). In addition to inoculating patients, the Society's Central House in Salisbury Square, off Fleet Street, disseminated vaccine matter and information. To facilitate the sending of matter and materials, the RJS arranged franking privileges for its mailings, although in 1806, those privileges were revoked during the conflict that destroyed the

---

<sup>50</sup> Bowers, "The Odyssey of Smallpox Vaccination," pp. 26-33. Balmis was disappointed to discover that cowpox had already been introduced in some places thus robbing him of some glory. Hopkins, *The Greatest Killer*, p. 86. Smith was also named as a vaccine agent by Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, and, based on his contracts, could charge fee for his services except to Maryland and Virginia citizens. Bell, "Dr. James Smith and the Public Encouragement for Smallpox Vaccination," pp. 504-506. Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, chap. 9. Minutes of the General Court of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox (RJS), June 5, 1805, (MS 4303), WL.



Society. A year after its founding, the Society had fourteen stations in operation, had vaccinated 5,987 people, had printed 4,500 copies of its pamphlets plus other materials, and had sent “6134 charges of matter to 2214 different persons, . . . [in] almost every part of the empire and of the world.” Its expenses that year, which included start-up costs, amounted to about £2,000. To advance its mission, the RJS asked recipients of vaccine matter to inoculate poor patients for free and send data on vaccinations to the Society. Furthermore, the Society carried on extensive campaigns to allay popular prejudice against cowpox inoculation; as part of that effort, it investigated and vigorously contested cases of alleged fatalities by vaccination.<sup>51</sup>

Much of the Society’s efforts focused on the United Kingdom, but the RJS also distributed cowpox matter and information throughout the British Empire and to foreign countries. “This gratuitous diffusion of Vaccine Virus,” the RJS congratulated itself in 1805, “has been a principal means of spreading the Vaccine Inoculation through the British Empire, and the world.” (Alas, the good feelings would not last much longer. Later that year, a nasty conflict began with a turf battle between the Secretary, Charles Murray, and the Resident Inoculator, Dr. John Walker, an imperious and self-satisfied,

---

<sup>51</sup> On the RJS, especially Jenner’s interactions with it, see Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 132-204. The number of RJS stations varied over time in large part because of lack of patients, though “great irregularities . . . in the attendance of the Inoculators” cannot have helped. On the stations, see, for instance, Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 146, 147; RJS General Court Minutes (MS 4303), March 7, 1804; March 26, 1806; quotation about irregularities, RJS Medical Council Minutes (MS 4304), October 3, 1805, WL. On children as the main patient population for vaccination, see John Epps, *The Life of John Walker* (London, 1831), p. 92; RJS General Court Minutes (MS 4303), February 23, 1803; RJS Board of Directors Minutes (MS 4302), March 17, 1803, WL. On distribution and franking privileges, see RJS Board of Directors Minutes (MS 4302), March 31, 1803; April 7, 1803, WL; Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, p. 145; RJS Medical Council Minutes (MS 4304), January 1, 1806; May 1, 1806; Minutes of the RJS Board of Directors 1805-1809 (MS 4305), April 3, 1806, WL. For the RJS 1804 annual report, see RJS General Court Minutes (MS 4303), March 7, 1804, WL. On the RJS request that recipients of cowpox matter vaccinate for free and send in reports, see RJS Medical Council Minutes (MS 4304), April 3, 1806, WL. On RJS investigations of problems with vaccination, see Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 158-159, 163-165. The RJS was not the first or only London vaccination charity; other communities in Britain also founded vaccination charities. See Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 96, 96, 135, 145.

radical cosmopolite of artisan stock who had been rejected for membership in the Society of Friends. By 1808, the strife had brought down the charity.)<sup>52</sup>

The global eradication of smallpox took until the late twentieth century, so the Royal Jennerian Society's goal of actually wiping out the virus may seem amazing now. But "[s]o completely [was] the extermination of this destructive disease within [their] controul," RJS leaders thought, "that could inoculation begin at the same time over every part of the kingdom, a single year, a single month, almost a single week, would annihilate a pestilence which twelve centuries have been establishing." Saying smallpox could be exterminated within a week was in part publicity hyperbole. But proponents of vaccination, with their limitless zeal, did indeed expect to conquer the world. The Parisian vaccination institution investigated cowpox inoculation and concluded that it held out "*the possibility of attaining to the entire extirpation of the Small Pox, and of banishing it from the Continent, and indeed from the World.*" In 1806 – eight years after Jenner's discovery was announced, three years after the founding of the RJS, and one hundred-and-seventy-four years before the Global Commission for the Certification of Smallpox Eradication completed its mission – the RJS rued obstacles to the "speedy Extirpation of that most destructive scourge of human nature, the Small Pox." That same year, Thomas Jefferson congratulated Jenner for "*hav[ing] erased from the calendar of human afflictions one of its greatest.*" (Italics added.) The ability to destroy smallpox, contemporaries thought, meant that the disease would be soon, or even, to Jefferson's mind, that it already was exterminated. By 1806, thousands upon thousands of people

---

<sup>52</sup> Minutes of the RJS General Court, March 6, 1805, (MS 4303), WL. On Charles Murray, see *Gentleman's Magazine*, New Series, vol. 27 (1847), pp. 554-556. On John Walker, see Epps, *The Life of John Walker*. On the collapse of the charity, see Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 172-204, esp. pp. 172-178, 204.

around the world – from Europe to the Americas to India to China – had been vaccinated. Vaccination supporters had good reason to think global goals were viable. Governments sponsored or supported much of the diffusion of cowpox matter, but the RJS leaders assumed that a charity could direct an international humanitarian undertaking. The London Vaccine Institution, a charity founded by one of the warring RJS factions, shared that view. Big philanthropy, with its expectation of a worldwide reach, had arrived.<sup>53</sup>

### *Conclusion*

Universal benevolence became a weak position in moral philosophy in the 1790s. In philanthropy, the opposite was true: Cosmopolitanism became stronger at the late eighteenth century and carried on into the nineteenth century, though it would wane some then. The realm of charity was a suitable place for cosmopolitanism, although a catholic outlook never precluded patriotic or localist competition in the empire of humanity. Enlightenment beliefs about unbounded philanthropy rested on the bedrock of Scriptural injunctions and so concern for strangers could not easily be jettisoned.<sup>54</sup>

In the 1780s, John Murray, the leading force behind the Society of Universal Good-will, had projected a centralized global charity with local branches to administer relief. His goal was impossible. To have an international impact, philanthropists had to work in the opposite way from what John Murray imagined. Rather than moving outwards from a center, activists built upwards from the local to the global. The Royal

---

<sup>53</sup> *Address of the Royal Jennerian Society* ([London], 1803), p. 24. *Report of the Central Committee at Paris, on the Subject of Vaccine or Cowpox; Made on the 24<sup>th</sup> November, 1802* (London, n.d.), p. 2. Minutes of the RJS General Court, March 26, 1806, (MS 4303), Wellcome Library. On the extermination of smallpox, see Hopkins, *The Greatest Killer*. Jefferson quotation, Hopkins, *The Greatest Killer*, p. 310. Fisher, *Edward Jenner*, pp. 178-178, 188. *London Vaccine Institution, for Inoculating and Supplying Matter Free of Expense* (London, 1813), esp. pp. vi, vii, xiv, xv, 6.

<sup>54</sup> On the weakening moral position of universal benevolence and the waning of cosmopolitanism, see Evan Radcliffe, "Burke, Radical Cosmopolitanism, and the Debates on Patriotism in the 1790s," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 28 (1999): 311-339; Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*, pp. 132-134.

Jennerian Society (whose secretary, Charles Murray, was John Murray's son) recognized that its goal of eradicating smallpox rested on a balance of local operations and cosmopolitan communication. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, men and women assumed that philanthropists could realize a worldwide scope. That confidence came from activists' participation in the empire of humanity and belief in the power of the written word. The humane society movement had been an arena in which activists brought the possibilities of networked activity to their fullest fruition in the eighteenth century: Their success laid the base for the vaccination movement with its far greater reach. By first setting up a charitable infrastructure that allowed people to aid strangers one-by-one, activists had mastered the methods to engage in a project with universal impact. Not individuals dispensing vast amounts of money, but citizens of the Atlantic world working together had realized a global scale to beneficence.

## Chapter Seven

### **The Business of Philanthropy, or Think Globally, Act Locally**

Before petering out after a few years of existence, the Philadelphia Humane Society named a French physician and a Connecticut man as corresponding members and solicited relationships with the Amsterdam and London resuscitation groups. In that same time, the PHS could claim to have saved all of one life. Even after its revival in 1787, the Society hobbled along for years. That the PHS did not disappear is a testament to members' perseverance, but in no way can the charity be deemed successful for its first two decades. Remarkably, however, the PHS pulled itself together around 1800 and became a reasonably well-functioning institution.

Although many philanthropists had cosmopolitan orientations and connections and strove to expand their reach through networked activity, charitable organizations functioned mainly and best in local arenas. The participants in transnational networks operated in distinct economic, political, religious, and social contexts of communities on each side of the Atlantic. Thus, George Whitefield's Halle-influenced orphanage in Georgia turned to the use of enslaved laborers and London Friends ignored American Friends' appeals to push abolitionism in the 1770s. The success of philanthropic enterprises, measured in terms of pursuit of their missions and institutional survival, depended on leaders who made international projects work locally.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Boyd Stanley Schlenther, "To Convert the Poor People in America,": The Bethesda Orphanage and the Thwarted Zeal of the Countess of Huntingdon," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 78 (1994): 225-256, pp. 243-244; Brown, *Moral Capital*, pp. 391-412. Many studies analyze the management of charitable

What did it take for the models of philanthropic enterprises conveyed and exchanged by cosmopolitan instigators and collaborators, so prone to fail, as were other voluntary organizations, to succeed? To effectively lead institutions, managers had to pay close attention to the local setting. First, managers needed to win and maintain financial support; most funds were raised and spent within charities' immediate communities. Second, they had to adapt programs to their communities' conditions, or at least assure supporters that they had done so. Third, they needed to heed the social and religious contexts in which they operated. Fourth, and finally, managers had to avoid letting the international arena distract them from their undertakings.<sup>2</sup>

Eighteenth-century philanthropists often tackled the unjust and harmful manifestations of global integration. The involuntary and voluntary movement of labor, fluctuations in the world economy, and the spread of disease underlay many charitable projects. Activists as a group, whatever their roles in the economy of philanthropy, knew they lived in an interconnected world, and they aimed to check some of its problems, for their own economic welfare and their own moral comfort as well as for less interested reasons. They thought globally, but the success of the institutions trafficked by intellectual trendsetters depended on capable managers acting locally.<sup>3</sup>

---

organizations in general. See Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, chap. 2; Borsay, *Medicine and Charity in Georgian Bath*; Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*; Mohl, *Poverty in New York*; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*. On the operation and management of voluntary associations in general, Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, chap. 7. For a generally helpful overview, but within an interpretation of the almost sinister nature of American charitable organization leadership, see Griffin, *Their Brothers' Keepers*, chap. 4.

<sup>2</sup> On the frequency of voluntary organizations failing, see Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 60, 243; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, p. 228.

<sup>3</sup> Besides the examples cited in this dissertation, Hamburg philanthropists, for example, analyzed poverty as connected to the international economy. Lindemann, "Urban Growth and Medical Charity, 1788-1815."

### *Philanthropic Funds*

Attracting income and managing money were among local leaders' key tasks. The expansion of associated philanthropy rested on growing middling wealth that directly or indirectly came about from the international economy built on the slave trade and slave-produced crops. In that sense, funding for eleemosynary institutions followed from global connections. Sometimes monies came from faraway friends, and in some cases managers ordered goods for their operations from overseas. But, by and large, in the period after the American Revolution, managers on both sides of the Atlantic raised and spent money locally.<sup>4</sup>

Some funds came from overseas. When the Thirteen Colonies were part of the British Empire, many Britons supported American endeavors financially. British Anglicans and Dissenters gave funds to various ecumenical efforts to promote Protestantism and to assimilate non-Britons into British American society. In addition, colonial Americans raised funds for various charitable ends from co-religionists in Europe or other colonies, and, for instance, the governors of New York Hospital solicited support for the nascent charity through mercantile and medical networks. After the war, Americans solicited occasional donations from British friends, but could no longer rely on British largesse for significant funding. London activists in the late eighteenth century, by contrast, did not look to foreign friends for financial support. John Coakley Lettsom, for one, never once asked Benjamin Rush to donate to any of his charitable ventures, in spite of the two men's intellectual cross-fertilization of their benevolent

---

<sup>4</sup> On charitable associations depending on growing middling wealth, see Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p. 483; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 207-208; Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, p. 8. But Joanna Innes cautions that, in the long view, "we are talking about quite small shifts in wealth, capacity and generosity." Innes, "State, Church, and Voluntarism," p. 43. On the inadequacy of philanthropy to deal with the problems of industrial-era poverty, see Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 6.

projects. Like their American counterparts, London charities received occasional donations from abroad. And wealth generated by Britons engaged in commerce outside Britain directly enriched some London charities, for instance, through the many philanthropically active Russia Company merchants. In the case of the Edinburgh Lunatic Asylum, money flowed in for the proposed asylum from Scots in the East Indies, with some donations also coming from the West Indies and North America. While there were exceptions such as the Edinburgh Lunatic Asylum, direct donations from outside organizations' immediate areas generally were insignificant financially for associated charities after American Independence. Charities called attention to those gifts to highlight their cosmopolitanism, but managers made few efforts to raise funds from abroad because they knew that donors wanted the ability to recommend beneficiaries and to keep abreast of how their money was spent. Gifts from faraway were a boon, not something to count on.<sup>5</sup>

The base of associated charities' incomes came from members. Membership in public subscription charities was open in theory to anyone. In practice, until the advent of women's organizations, most subscribers were local (white) men from the broad middling classes, but some organizations had meaningful female support: For instance, women made up close to fifteen percent (47 out of 356 subscribers) of the members of the Philadelphia Dispensary in 1787, a year after the institution had been founded. After the emergence of female-run charities, the number of women dropped drastically, to a

---

<sup>5</sup> The erratic nature of charities' financial data and the wildly varying size of institutions studied here makes meaningful, long-term comparisons of organizations' donations difficult. Marshall, "Who Cared about the Thirteen Colonies? Some Evidence from Philanthropy." James, *A People among Peoples*, chap. 5; Wilson, *Pious Traders in Medicine*. New York Hospital was chartered in 1771 but did not admit its first patients until 1791. Board of Governors' Meeting, November 7, 1771, NYH Minutes Vol. 1, NYH. For examples of letters from Lettsom to Rush, see the Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, LCP. Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 91-92. *Short Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Lunatic Asylum at Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1812), pp. 10, 25-51.



mere ten women out of 232 subscribers in 1808. Overall, men active in beneficence came from all religious and political backgrounds, although certain profiles might predominate in given charities, especially because leaders often pulled in subscribers through their familial, religious, and occupational networks. In addition to individuals, institutions subscribed to medical charities so that, besides asserting their presence and benevolence publicly, they could send their members or beneficiaries for medical treatment. So, for example, the Society of Universal Good-will of Norwich, England, subscribed to the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital and by the early nineteenth century several mutual-benefit, ethnic-aid, and religious societies subscribed to the Philadelphia Dispensary.<sup>6</sup>

Subscribers generally paid annual dues. Amounts varied, with one to five guineas typical in Britain and one dollar to five dollars common in the United States. Charities also offered life memberships in exchange for larger contributions. Collecting the monies created constant headaches for managers. Subscribers were often in arrears, and managers usually chose to hire collectors, generally for a cut of the take, to bring in

---

<sup>6</sup> Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 49; Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, p. 53. *Plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor* (Philadelphia, 1787), pp. 5-8; on the emergence of women's organizations in the United States, see Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*; *Plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor* (Philadelphia, 1808), pp. 3-7. Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, chap. 6, esp. pp. 197-198; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 207-227; on the breadth of support for voluntary associations, see also McCarthy, *American Creed*. Clarks notes the growth of large public subscription associations (of all types, not just charities) in Britain with substantial provincial memberships, but charities that gave supporters the power to recommend beneficiaries did not fit that pattern. See, for instance, *A General Report of the Workington and Harrington Dispensary for the Year 1796* (Workington, 1798), p. 3; *Plan of the Finsbury Dispensary, St. John's Square, Clerkenwell, for Administering Advices and Medicines to the Poor* ([London, 1794?]), pp. 17-36. Likewise, the Royal Humane Society's members mainly came from London and the environs; see, for instance, *RHS Reports 1791*, pp. i-xxv. On fundraising and membership recruitment through networks, see Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 83-84, 90-91; Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, pp. 47-51. I have excluded mutual-aid societies, which would have had less well-off members and in the United States included black mutual-aid societies. On English mutual aid societies, see J. R. Poynter, *Society and Pauperism: English Ideas on Poor Relief, 1795-1834* (London, 1969), pp. 35-39; on American mutual-aid societies, see Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 64-67; on African American organizations, see McCarthy, *American Creed*, pp. 99-105. *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, in Great Britain*, p. 27; *Plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor* (1808), pp. 3-7.

promised funds. In return for their subscriptions, supporters of many charities got two benefits: They had the right to vote in the organizations' elections (officers came from the ranks of subscribers). And they usually got patronage in the form of the power to recommend a certain number of beneficiaries to the organizations. (Humane societies differed in this regard.) Those perks did not ensure subscribers' unending support. As the Philadelphia Dispensary's drop in subscribers highlights, the membership size often fell once an organization ceased to be novel and as new alternatives for giving appeared.<sup>7</sup>

To attract and maintain support, managers marketed their ventures. Philanthropic leaders sold opportunities in increasingly crowded charitable marketplaces for benevolent self-images, access to patronage, and sociability. Like the sellers of other goods and services, the sellers of charity puffed their ventures through a number of media. Charitable organizations publicized meetings, results of elections for officers, and fundraising events in newspapers, and they touted their enterprises in city directories and periodicals. They had annual reports printed as pamphlets or inserted into newspapers (to fulfill expectations of accountability as well as to drum up support), and they printed membership certificates, recommendation forms, and meeting-reminder cards. In addition, they advertised through the organizations' buildings. Consumers did not browse shop windows. Rather they could scrutinize operations and the objects of aid.

---

<sup>7</sup> For succinct explanations of the funding of associated charities in London and New York, but applicable to other cities, see Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 49; Mohl, *Poverty in New York*, pp. 150-151. For typical dues including the option to become a life member, see, for example, *An Account of the General Dispensary for the Relief of the Poor*, p. 10; *The Institution of the Merrimack Humane Society, With the Rules for Regulating Said Society, and the Methods of Treatment to Be Used with Persons Apparently Dead* (Newburyport, 1803), p. 4; see also Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, p. 221; Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, p. 53. On collectors, see Humane Society committee meeting, May 2 and May 16, 1775, Minute Book, 1774-1784, RHS archives; Managers' Meeting, December 27, 1791, December 28, 1801, Philadelphia Dispensary Managers Minutes 1786-1806, PHA. On voting, see Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 49; Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, p. 53. On recommendations, see, for instance, Alexander, *Render Them Submissive*, pp. 22-24; Porter, "The Gift Relation," p. 166. On the common phenomenon of drop-offs in support, see Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, p. 177; James Stephen Taylor, *Jonas Hanway*, p. 71.

Managers, then, wielded many of the same tools that they used or knew as members of a “wide promotional culture.” As fundraisers, managers appreciated the importance of publicity. In 1809, John Coakley Lettsom peppered John Nichols, the printer of the Royal Humane Society annual reports (and an RHS leader) with instructions, questions, and ideas for that year’s report. “[E]ach Vice President and the President [should] have one [report] neatly bound and lettered with the name of each [person],” Lettsom told Nichols. “I think it would induce them to open their purses.” While managers embraced market methods, they appreciated that vending charity is not the same as hawking china. They turned to some of the decorative techniques used in advertisements for consumer goods, but they seem to have made choices to both be prudent with their printing costs and to appear so to the public. Thus, the forms they printed had borders and graphics and used different fonts to create visual interest, but those details look simple compared to other advertisements. Managers understood full well that charitable enterprise is an economic activity and they knew that subscribers expected sound financial practices. But they assumed beneficence was rooted in non-pecuniary motives. Thus in publicity materials, they touted the spiritual and emotional benefits of their charities.<sup>8</sup>

Other marketing methods included anniversary festivals and other similar events. Managers publicized those events both prospectively and retrospectively in newspapers and periodicals, thus milking them for maximum publicity. Event-goers bought tickets (with special friends getting them gratis) and, in return, got sermons, lectures, musical

---

<sup>8</sup> On fundraising methods, see Lloyd, “Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners”; Mohl, *Poverty in New York*, p. 148. Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure*, p. 271. *Sambrook Court*, pp. 156-169; quotation Lettsom to Nichols, April 14, 1809, in *Sambrook Court*, p. 164. On the decorative elements of charity’s materials versus other publicity materials, see, for instance, *RHS Reports 1799* or [Philadelphia Dispensary], *A Comparative View of the Natural Small-Pox, Inoculated Small-Pox, and Vaccination in their Effects on Individuals and Society* (Philadelphia, 1803) versus a London paper-hanger’s trade card in Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure*, p. 273.

performances, anthems or processions by beneficiaries, and meals. John Coakley Lettsom despaired “that as charitable institutions multiply, so do public dinners; and many amiable characters eat and drink themselves into disease, to prevent it in their fellow-creatures.” A charity feast might include turtle soup, “boiled salmon, or cod’s head, or turbot floating in thick lobster, shrimp, or oyster sauces,” then boiled ham, and roasted or boiled chicken “heightened in taste and flavour, by cayenne, black pepper, salt, soy, catchup, mustard, and horse radish,” washed down by porter, ale, and wine and sometimes brandy-and-water. Next would come geese, turkeys, ducks, and maybe roast beef and plum pudding, followed by cheese, and more libations. These types of events, especially the more theatrical and gluttonous versions, were more common in Britain than in the United States, but the Philadelphia Dispensary managers took advantage of Dr. Henry Moyes’s presence to raise money through benefit lectures and also held a charity concert. In addition, the marketing of philanthropy in London included the Foundling Hospital’s art gallery, an undertaking that aimed to draw visitors who could then see for themselves the worthiness of the charity tinged by accusations of encouraging immorality and of indulging the children. Londoners’ appreciation of marketing was keen enough that in 1792 one Londoner sent the Massachusetts Humane Society “two prints representing a remarkable instance of the resuscitation of a young man,” perhaps thinking that the gift would abet the charity’s publicity operations.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> On English charitable festivals and events, see Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 80-81; Lloyd, “Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners”; Williams, “The Luxury of Doing Good.” The Royal Humane Society, for instance, gave tickets to clergymen who preached charity sermons and also to its collector. Royal Humane Society committee meeting, March 19, 1778, Minute Book, 1774-1784, RHS archives. Lettsom, “Hints Respecting the Effects of Tavern Feasts” in *Hints Designed to Promote Benevolence, Temperance and Medical Science* (1797), pp. 205-206. For examples of American charitable events see, “. . . a CHARITY SERMON,” *New York Daily Advertiser*, November 13, 1790; “Humane Society,” *Columbian Centinel*, June 10, 1795. Managers’ Meeting, December 22, 1786, Philadelphia Dispensary Managers Minutes 1786-1806, PHA. Mohl refers to the use of charity sermons, but does not specify when

Besides subscriptions and fundraising events, charities had several other sources of income. Some organization sold items produced by the putative beneficiaries (this method generally failed in terms of serious fundraising), while hospitals brought in money by taking pay patients. Most charities did not get as large a share of their income from governments as, for instance, New York Hospital did, but government funding was an important source of support for American charities. British charities tapped the wealth of aristocrats and institutions such as livery companies or the East India Company. Bequests were another source of funds, and managers tried to encourage them by publicizing the correct legal wording for such gifts. A bequest that came from a complicated estate, however, not only could take a long time to secure, but also could demand a lot of time from managers. For people of modest means, collection boxes, placed outside institutions such as hospitals, offered ways to contribute.<sup>10</sup>

Finally, charities' income often included the returns on organizations' investments. Of course there were cases of financial mismanagement and of embezzlement, but managers tended to keep close eyes on money matters, with annual audits customary. Once their resources allowed, managers invested the monies their associations amassed. Organizations also received shares in business enterprises as gifts.

---

they became commonly used by ecumenical charities in the United States. Mohl, *Poverty in New York*, p. 148. (See below on this topic.) According to Wright, festivals became a cultural phenomenon in northeastern American charities in the 1820s and 1830s. Wright *The Transformation of Charity*, p. 182. Solkin, *Painting for Money*, pp. 159-174. *A Statement of the Premiums Awarded by the Humane Society of Massachusetts*, p. 48.

<sup>10</sup> Poynter, *Society and Pauperism*, p. 15. *The Annual Report of the Lunatic Asylum Erected at York; with a Short History of Its Rise and Progress* (York, England, 1785), p. 2; NYH Board of Governors' Meeting, June 2, 1794, NYH Minutes Vol. 1, NYH. Mohl, *Poverty in New York*, pp. 147-148; McCarthy, *American Creed*, p. 44; Porter, "The Gift Relation," pp. 158-161; *RHS Reports 1785-86*, p. vii. For samples of the proper legal wording for bequests, see *RHS Reports 1796*, p. 56; *An Account of the Philadelphia Dispensary, Instituted for the Medical Relief of the Poor* (Philadelphia, 1802), p. 19. The Philadelphia Dispensary managers spent years sorting out bequests; see the Minutes of the Philadelphia Dispensary, 1786-1806 & 1807-1839, PHA. Porter, "The Gift Relation," p. 158; NYH Board of Governors' Meeting, February 16, 1796, NYH Minutes Vol. 1, NYH.

The Philadelphia Dispensary held shares in the Bank of Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia and Lancaster Turnpike and the Delaware and Schuylkill Canal Company; owned bridge stock and real estate in Pennsylvania; and invested in government bonds. The Royal Humane Society put money in the 3% Consolidated Annuities (government securities), among other investments, and the Society of Universal Good-will made some money in navy stock, which it then put into the 3% Consols.<sup>11</sup>

Just as most income came from the local community, most spending went back into the local economy, or the regional or national economy in the case of investments. There were exceptions: New York Hospital bought medical equipment, drugs, books, and insurance from London and blankets “from Europe,” though the governors sought to cut costs by turning to suppliers closer to home where possible. For the most part, charitable institutions’ economic impact was within their cities. The scale of organizations’ budgets and the types of items they spent money on varied, not surprisingly, enormously. The Society of Universal Good-will relieved 226 people in 1784 and disbursed a total of £146.6.2. By contrast, the Matron of the London Foundling Hospital wrote in the reports of the Society for the Bettering the Condition of the Poor that using rice in place of flour in the 1790s *saved* the Foundling about £200 over a year. The Royal Humane Society laid out £2,000 in 1802, while the budget of the

---

<sup>11</sup> On audits, see, for examples, NYH Board of Governors’ Minutes, vols. 1-3, NYH; Royal Humane Society Minute Book, 1774-1784, RHS archives. Managers’ meetings, November 17, 1795, October 18, 1796, December 12, 1803, July 2, 1806, September 2, 1789, April 1, 1800, Philadelphia Dispensary Managers Minutes 1786-1806, PHA. *RHS Reports 1805* (London, [1805]), p. 87; *An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich from its Rise in 1775*, p. 78. On the various types of financial instruments, see Robert E. Wright, “The Financial Sector and the Reduction of Lending-Related Risks” in *The Wealth of Nations Rediscovered: Integration and Expansion in American Financial Markets, 1780-1850* (Cambridge, 2002). On the economic impact of charitable organizations’ investments, see Francis Godwin James, “Charity Endowments as Sources of Local Credit in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century England,” *Journal of Economic History* 8 (1948): 153-170; Boylan, *The Origins of Women’s Activism*, pp. 187-193; McCarthy, *American Creed*, chapter 4. Jessica Roney, a Ph.D. Candidate at the Johns Hopkins University, is currently studying the investments of Philadelphia clubs and societies.

Massachusetts Humane Society from June 1802 to June 1803 was \$1,335, over half of which went to buying stock (the society held United States, Massachusetts, Union Bank, and bridge stock.) The MHS's program spending that year was a little over \$300. When income fell short of expenses, more often a problem early on than later, an organization's treasurer often covered the expenses.<sup>12</sup>

One key difference in budgets and in economic impact was between institutions with buildings and those without buildings. Organizations that housed people had the most, and most varied, expenses. The marvelously-detailed account for the Infirmary, Dispensary, Lunatic Hospital, and Asylum in Manchester, England, shows spending on, among other items, drugs; bottles, vials, and pots; lemons and oranges; carriage and freight; church pews; fire insurance; meat, fish and fowl; potatoes, greens and roots; tin ware, spoons &c.; gardener's wages, seeds and dung; thread; mops; furniture; coals; painting and white-washing; shaving the patients; and a subscription to the Stranger's Friend Society. For the 1800 fiscal year (January 31, 1800 to January 31, 1801), New York Hospital had a budget of almost \$18,000. Building repairs made up the biggest category of expenses (\$6,602), followed by household expenses (\$4,449) for the staff and the roughly 600 patients that year. Household expenses included items such as "food and beverages except liquor, soap, candles, stationery, chimney sweeping, blankets, linen, newspaper, garden seeds, hay and straw, cows, trees, horseshoeing, bed pan, etc."

Excluding the line item for the balance due the treasurer, wages (\$1,726) were the third biggest category; the hospital employed a steward, a matron, nurses, and orderlies, and

---

<sup>12</sup> *An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of the Year 1784. To the End of the Year 1787*, p. 4. "Extract from an Account of the Benefit of the Use of Rice. By the Matron of the Foundling," *SBCP Reports*, vol. 1, p. 189. *RHS Reports 1803* (London, [1803]), p. 98. Gardiner, *A Sermon Delivered Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1803*, pp. 36-37.

gave room and board to the apothecary and house surgeon (young men who provided cheap labor in return for launching their professional lives.) Fuel came next (\$928), then medicines and medical equipment (\$667), followed by stationery, printing and books for the medical library (\$490), and wine and spirits (\$412, but the governors always stressed that the Hospital recouped much of the cost of liquor from pay patients). Funeral expenses for deceased patients (\$253) and discounts paid the bank (\$171) completed the expenditures. Excluding the money owed the treasurer (typical for many voluntary associations, the hospital loaned out money) and line items relating to the steward's accounts, funds came in from New York State (\$9,375); the Collector of the Port of New York to cover care for American seamen (\$4,246; the monies were raised from a tax on sailors' wages); pay patients (\$1,337); admission tickets for medical students (\$45); rent from the lots owned by the Hospital in New York City (\$40); and the sale of a calf and hogs (\$33).<sup>13</sup>

Organizations that did not house beneficiaries did not have as great a variety of expenditures, but they too were steady spenders in local economies. Rent, the apothecary's salary, stationery, printing, medical equipment, and medicines made up most of the Philadelphia Dispensary's usual costs in its first decade: Other American and British dispensaries' major costs fell generally into those same categories. Medicines were the Philadelphia Dispensary's most frequent purchases. Perhaps to get good prices, but also probably to placate druggists who might otherwise have sold to the poor or to doctors who cared for the poor, the Dispensary managers patronized many of the city's

---

<sup>13</sup> *A Report of the Infirmary, Dispensary, Lunatic Hospital, and Asylum in Manchester. From the 25<sup>th</sup> of June, 1793, to the 24<sup>th</sup> of June, 1794.* ([Manchester, 1794]), first page. Board of Governors' Meeting, February 3, 1801, NYH Minutes vol. 1, NYH. For the quotation giving examples of household items, see Board of Governors' Meeting, February 16, 1795, NYH Minutes vol. 1, NYH.



drug merchants. Dispensaries, like other charities with buildings, also routinely employed carpenters and other people to maintain properties. Printing costs were another of the most common expenses for charities, as they were for all voluntary associations. In addition, organizations provided employment by using the services of messengers and clerks to deliver notices about meetings and to perform other similar tasks. Finally, certain types of charities, such as the London Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress, disbursed funds, for instance as weekly pensions, directly to poor folks.<sup>14</sup>

Charitable enterprise burgeoned with the international economy. Cities expanded, the middle classes prospered and consumed, and communications improved during the Consumer Revolution. One result of those developments was the boom in voluntary associations, including philanthropic organizations. In that way, the growth in humanitarian activity rested on the globalizing economy. Most of charitable institutions' direct getting and spending, however, took place within local economies.

### *Local Adaptations*

When activists in a given community proposed the founding of novel types of charitable institutions, they often referred to developments elsewhere. The founders of the New York Dispensary had informed the public that the value of dispensaries had been proved in most of the large cities of Europe and in New York's neighbor, Philadelphia.

---

<sup>14</sup> See, for examples, Managers' Meeting, December 18, 1787, December 15, 1790, December 9, 1789, December 15, 1795, March 21, 1797, Philadelphia Dispensary Managers Minutes 1786-1806, PHA. *Rules of the City Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor. Instituted at New York. February 1, 1791* (New York, 1791), p. 15. *A General Report of the Workington and Harrington Dispensary for the Year 1796* (1796), p. 4. Margaret Morris Haviland, "Beyond Women's Sphere: Young Quaker Women and the Veil of Charity in Philadelphia, 1790-1810," *William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994): 419-446, p. 431. On the mutually beneficial relationship between printing and voluntary associations see Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 165-166; Taylor, *Jonas Hanway*, p. 186. On messengers, see, for instance, Royal Humane Society committee meeting, April 5, 1776, Minute Book, 1774-1784, RHS archives; Boston Dispensary Minute Book, November 9, 1798, Box 1, Records of the Boston Dispensary, Countway Library of Medicine; *Account of the Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress*, p. 8.

And in 1813 the Philadelphia Association of Friends for the Instruction of Poor Children explained that the Association relied on educational systems from London and Madras. Philanthropists cited foreign examples to stoke concern about keeping up with other communities as part of fundraising efforts. But, in addition, hearing that unfamiliar institutions worked in other communities reassured potential supporters that their money would be going to a viable project. Furthermore, an international frame of reference catered to genteel subscribers' intellectual curiosity and senses of liberality. Whether for the sake of competition, reassurance, or intellectual and social gratification, by explicitly setting a given charitable enterprise within a cosmopolitan context, leaders highlighted that they and their supporters belonged to a larger community engaged in similar activities. Nevertheless, managers knew that supporters and beneficiaries expected international models to be adapted to local conditions and they responded, sometimes disingenuously, to that dual demand.<sup>15</sup>

Philanthropists on both sides of the Atlantic avowed that they had adapted models of charitable institutions borrowed from elsewhere to local and national conditions. The Massachusetts Humane Society explained that the resuscitation methods it recommended essentially hewed to those of foreign societies, but added that the Society had made “a few necessary alterations, to render them more conformable to the particular circumstances of the country.” Likewise, the English Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor opined that in general the “same modes” of poor relief were “not adapted to

---

<sup>15</sup> *New York Daily Advertiser*, October 20, 1790. John Paxton, *The Philadelphia Directory for 1813* (Philadelphia, 1813), p. cii. Wright explores this process of adaptation, but he argues that the extent of change was greater than I judge it to have been. Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 101-106. Several historians argue for the fundamental similarities in the forms of dispensing relief in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe. See Hugh Cunningham, Introduction to *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform from the 1690s to 1850*, p. 5; Mary Lindemann, “Urban Charity and the Relief of the Sick Poor in Northern Germany, 1750-1850” in *Health Care and Poor Relief in Northern Europe*, eds. Grell, Cunningham and Jutte, pp. 148-149. I think that the same pattern of basic similarity prevailed on both sides of the Atlantic.

all states and situations,” although the same principles should rule. Therefore, to make their endeavors relevant to local supporters and putative beneficiaries, managers of medical charities, for example, adapted models of charitable institutions to their communities’ situations.<sup>16</sup>

City size and medical customs influenced the decisions managers made. London dispensaries generally excluded surgical, lunatic, obstetrical, and smallpox cases in part because the city’s highly elaborated charitable infrastructure provided treatment for those conditions at other institutions. Dispensaries in smaller communities had fewer or no restrictions on the type of conditions treated. Other adaptations were more specific to local needs. The Charleston Dispensary, founded in 1801, offered the unusual service of advising “strangers and others, for the best method of avoiding the diseases incidental to the climate.” Medical charities’ therapies varied too. The resuscitation methods recommended by humane societies around the Atlantic followed the same basic principles. A victim’s body heat, respiration and circulation of the blood should be restored. Common methods included placing the body in a warm place, rubbing the body, blowing air into the lungs (preferably through a bellows), and administering medicaments. The suggested medicaments, however, differed from place to place. Tobacco enemas were widely, but not universally, recommended, while other treatments varied with food or beverages consumed locally. Thus, the resuscitation methods promulgated in Hamburg advised placing “rye bread toasted, and steeped in brandy,” on

---

<sup>16</sup> *The Institution of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1786), p. 8; *Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor*, vol. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (1805), p. 292.

the drowned person's heart and stomach and the Massachusetts Humane Society directed that resuscitators should "Bathe the breast [of the drowned person] in hot rum."<sup>17</sup>

Managers also made bigger changes to Atlantic-wide undertakings in response to communities' perceived needs. Besides variations in resuscitation methods, different humane societies added programs to the basic mission based on assessments of local life-threatening problems. The Royal Humane Society emphasized its efforts to minister to people rescued from suicide attempts. (See Chapter Five.) The Philadelphia Humane Society worried about sudden death from drinking cold water and pasted signs on water pumps throughout Philadelphia cautioning people on how to correctly drink cold water on hot days. That initiative responded to a long-standing problem of people dying "by drinking cold Water too greedily while they were hot." To prevent such calamities, the PHS counseled "1<sup>st</sup>, AVOID drinking while you are warm, or, 2<sup>nd</sup>, DRINK only a small quantity at once, and let it remain a short time in your mouth before you swallow it. . . ." Humane societies near coasts expanded their programs in various ways to aid mariners. The Massachusetts Humane Society built huts along the coast to shelter shipwrecked mariners: The huts were located in "exposed places" and furnished with "a tinder-box, hatchet, dry fuel, a few candles, and dry sea weed" so that people cast ashore could stave off death. The Merrimack Humane Society "procured Signal Colors and Lights" to notify in-bound vessels what courses they should take when sea conditions did not allow pilots to reach the vessels. And the Humane Society of Sunderland, England, authorized

---

<sup>17</sup> *An Account of the General Dispensary for the Relief of the Poor*, p. 9; *Barbados Mercury*, July 27, 1787; *Rules of the City Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor. Instituted at New York*, p. 4; *A General Report of the Workington and Harrington Dispensary for the Year 1796*, p. 1; *Rules and By-Laws of the Baltimore General Dispensary*, pp. 4-5; "Public Information," *Charleston City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, May 3, 1802. Cogan, trans., *Memoirs of the Society Instituted at Amsterdam in Favour of Drowned Persons*, p. 16; *The Institution of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1788), p. 3.

rewards to “such seamen or others as shall remarkably exert themselves in saving the lives of mariners” shipwrecked near Sunderland’s harbor.<sup>18</sup>

Social and economic factors led managers to alter programs too. In the mid-1790s, with Europeans and West Indians fleeing revolutionary turmoil pouring into the United States, men in Boston, Charleston, New York, and Philadelphia formed immigrant-aid societies. The Boston society, which was founded in 1793 and claimed to be the model for the other three, averred that “[n]ot with a design to *encourage* immigration, was our society formed.” Lest the favorable portrayal of New England society that the Boston group’s broadside gave should induce foreigners to want to migrate to the area, the flier ended on a discouraging note by stressing New England’s homogeneity. The societies in Charleston, New York, and Philadelphia, by contrast, all published materials that offered advice or aid to immigrants, and all three couched their efforts to manage the influx of foreigners in positive terms based on the view that immigrants benefited their new country.<sup>19</sup>

Supervision of potentially unruly people was an aim of the immigrant-aid groups as it was with many beneficent projects. But managers knew they could not simply

---

<sup>18</sup> *RHS Reports 1800*, p. 16; *RHS Reports 1810* (London, [1810]), p. 45. For a report of a death caused by drinking water, see *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 9, 1747. Perhaps the explanation for such deaths is hyponatremia, or water intoxication. Gina Kolata, “Marathoners Warned about Too Much Water,” *New York Times*, October 20, 2005. My thanks to Matthew Osborn for alerting me to this issue. Philadelphia Humane Society, *Directions for Recovering Persons, Who Are Supposed to Be Dead, from Drowning*, p. 9; Managers’ meetings, June 12, 1799, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 138-139; Brooks, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 9<sup>th</sup> June 1795*, p. 20. *The Institution of the Merrimack Humane Society* (Newburyport, 1809), pp. 24, 25; *Reports of the Sunderland Humane Society, From It’s [sic] Institution in September 1791, to the Commencement of the Year 1793* (Sunderland, 1793), p. 11.

<sup>19</sup> *Information for Emigrants to the New England States* (Boston, 1795). *Information to Those Who Are Disposed to Migrate to South-Carolina* (Charleston, 1795); *New-York Society for the Information and Assistance of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries* (New York, 1794); *The Act of Incorporation, Constitution and By-laws of the Philadelphia Society for the Information of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries* (Philadelphia, 1797). On these societies, see Erna Risch, “Immigrant Aid Societies before 1820,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 60 (1936): 15-34.

impose their wills on the poor. Indeed, their impotence could be striking, although charities' printed records – publicity materials – elide that situation. Philadelphia Dispensary managers bemoaned that, “The expences of this Institution have been considerably increased by the negligence of the Patients in not returning their Vials,” although the rules required patients to return the containers used to dispense medicines. Worse yet, “many instances have occurred of [patients] selling [the vials].” The governors of New York Hospital had to take measures to “prevent the patients going improperly out,” and the Society of Universal Good-will and other philanthropists had no luck in setting Ismael, aka James, Bashar on the profitable course they wanted him on.<sup>20</sup>

As managers knew then, the lower sorts had a modicum of power too in philanthropy. If they avoided institutions, they checked the aims of philanthropists. Just as managers needed to adapt projects to local conditions to attract better off supporters, they also had to make charitable endeavors attractive enough that the poor would incorporate them into their survival strategies. Activists who wrote for the reports of the Society for the Bettering the Condition of the Poor conceded that point, in condescending terms: To alleviate hunger, people of “wealth, science and benevolence” would have to educate the poor about new ingredients and “judicious and economical cookery.” But philanthropists could not overlook the desires of the lower sorts. “The poor . . . want[ed] clear and explicit directions how their food may be prepared to the best advantage,” “cheaper fuel, . . . and an improved kitchen apparatus.” Moreover, activists had to appeal to the culinary preferences of the lower classes. When, in the winter of 1796-97, a soup-

---

<sup>20</sup> Jonathan Barry points out that the records of associations that exercised power are most likely to survive. Barry, “Urban Association and the Middling Sort,” p. 92. Managers’ Meeting, April 9, 1804, Philadelphia Dispensary Managers Minutes, vol. 1, PHA; Board of Governors’ Meeting, February 2, 1802, NYH Minutes, vol. 2, NYH; *An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775*, pp. 37, 73.

establishment in Birmingham sold soup (at a penny a quart) based on “Count Rumford’s principles, varied . . . to an English taste,” demand for the cheap fare was low. The following winter the recipe “was improved,” and three times the amount of soup sold. Poor folks’ choices, the SBCP contributor implied, dictated the success of the venture. Likewise, SBCP reports repeatedly featured dishes made with rice because, as one SBCP activist reported, “Rice is much in respect” among the poor.<sup>21</sup>

Managers adapted projects to appeal to middling supporters and to induce the lower sorts to use institutions, but the adjustments were often slight – much too slight, in the minds of critics of the Massachusetts Humane Society. For years, the MHS came under criticism for failing to make more thoroughgoing changes and for years, the financially strong MHS withstood those challenges. The complaints against the MHS matter, however, because they highlight that local conditions might play little role in determining how charitable resources were used, regardless of managers’ assurances about having fitted international models to “the circumstances of the country” and that once a group’s finances allowed, it could overlook supporters’ expectations.<sup>22</sup>

To its critics, the Massachusetts Humane Society, in its adherence to the common mission of the international rescue and resuscitation movement, failed to meet actual needs in Massachusetts. As early as June 1788, only about two and a half years after the

---

<sup>21</sup> *SBCP Reports*, vol. 3, pp. 162, 164. The improved soup recipe called for beef, ox’s cheeks, white pease, onions, ground rice, salt, black pepper, ground ginger, cayenne pepper, mint, celery, carrots and leeks. *SBCP Reports*, vol. 1, pp. 226-233, quotations p. 228. The Earl of Winchilsea to Arthur Young, January 6, 1800, Correspondence of Arthur Young, vol. 3, 1798-1802 (Add. 35128), f. 172, BL.

<sup>22</sup> Conrad Edick Wright discusses the programs, such as the huts, that the Massachusetts Humane Society added as an example of “a charitable institution in search of its objectives.” I disagree with that characterization. The Society remained true to its objective of lifesaving, and, like other humane societies, made small adaptations to better meet that goal in light of local conditions. The Society’s unwillingness to pursue the suggestions of its critics to take on fundamentally different types of programs supports, I would argue, my view that the Society made relatively minor alterations to the common program of the international movement. Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 138-139; on imitation, not need, prompting other charitable ventures, see p. 101.

founding of the MHS, Rev. Jeremy Belknap of Boston penned a proposal for an “Improvement” to the program of the Massachusetts Humane Society. Since “[t]he avowed design” of the Humane Society was to “preserve Life,” Belknap thought that it would not be improper to suggest additional ways the Society might save lives. Before getting to his suggestion, Belknap recounted the beginnings of the humane society movement in Amsterdam where “people [were] continually falling” into the city’s many canals. Belknap noted that while other places did not have the same extent of drowning accidents as Amsterdam did, they faced many other threats to human life, and “Humanity calls us to attend to every practicable method of rescuing or preserving . . . human beings from misery & destruction.” The Humane Society of Massachusetts had already made one change to meet area conditions – the huts to shelter shipwrecked mariners – and Belknap thought the Society should add another program in response to a local problem. “Scarcely a year passes but we hear of infants exposed or murdered . . . either to conceal the shame of . . . illegitimacy or perhaps in some cases from mere poverty,” so “to prevent accidents of this kind,” Belknap suggested that the Humane Society establish a dispensary and foundling hospital. Belknap gave some background on the London Foundling Hospital, provided a detailed plan of his proposed institution, and included a chart that he had drawn up, based on information from a London guidebook, comparing London’s various lying-in and foundling hospitals. Belknap’s advocacy on behalf of endangered infants did not stop with his MHS colleagues. Philadelphians too might found a lying-in charity, Belknap suggested to Benjamin Rush.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> “Papers Relative to a Sick & Lying-in Patients by the Humane Society,” Belknap Papers, Reel 161.A. (Reel 4), Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston. Belknap’s statement about infants being exposed or murdered to conceal illegitimacy brings to mind the famous case of Elizabeth Whitman, the unmarried woman from a respectable background who gave birth to stillborn baby in a Massachusetts tavern in late



In making his proposal, Belknap was rejecting neither the emulation of foreign charitable enterprises nor the participation in philanthropic networks. Rather, he advocated lying-in institutions based on his analysis that such an institution would meet a serious social need. The Massachusetts Humane Society, he thought, would better fulfill its lifesaving mission by focusing on foundlings rather than on drowning victims since drowning presented a less common problem in Massachusetts than it did in Amsterdam. Belknap would be disappointed, however, with the reactions to his advocacy. The very idea that such institutions – which might take pregnant unmarried women as patients – might be needed in the United States affronted Rush. The Massachusetts Humane Society, though it appointed a committee to confer with the overseers of the poor about his proposal, failed to act on Belknap’s suggestion.<sup>24</sup>

In the years after Belknap’s proposal, the Massachusetts Humane Society came under periodic criticism by speakers at its anniversary festivals for neglecting to succor people in distress from various causes. The Rev. John Clarke in 1793 lamented that the Society’s funds would not allow it to aid “a numerous class of sufferers” – the poor – in Boston. “The habitation provided for these sufferers,” he thought, was “wholly inadequate to the purpose. . . . The benevolent [English prison reformer John] Howard would say, it is rather a dungeon than an hospital.” The MHS had an obligation to concern itself with the condition of that asylum, Clarke hinted, since the MHS built

---

June 1788. The first published account of that case was on July 29, 1788, and Belknap’s proposal is dated June 1788, so it seems unlikely that the Whitman case was an impetus for Belknap’s proposal. Cathy N. Davidson, Introduction to *The Coquette* by Hannah W. Foster, ed. and with an intro. by Cathy N. Davidson (Oxford, 1986), p. 1.

<sup>24</sup> In the 1790s, however, lying-in institutions would be established in Philadelphia and New York, and Rush would recommend that one of his students use a position as a physician to a lying-in dispensary to launch his practice. Benjamin Rush to Jeremy Belknap, July 15, 1788, in Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, p. 478; *A Statement of the Premiums Awarded by the Trustees of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, from July 1817 to April 1829*, p. 45.

shelters for another group, shipwrecked mariners. Three years later, in 1796, Rev. Chandler Robbins alluded to public dissatisfaction with the Humane Society when he said that with increased funds the Society would be able “to gratify their own, and the wishes of the public, by extending their benevolence to other objects.” In his discourse to the group, in 1801, Rev. Jedidiah Morse offered several ways the Society could expand on its mission, proclaimed by the Society’s motto, to ““alleviate the miseries of human life.”” First, he suggested that, if there were people rescued from attempted suicide, the MHS could imitate the Royal Humane Society in ministering to the unhappy souls. Next, he urged the Society to consider means to improve the physical, religious, and moral conditions of prisoners. The Humane Society, he thought, could introduce “the valuable improvements of the ingenious and philanthropic HOWARD and RUMFORD” to Massachusetts. Finally, he called the Society’s attention to the idea of building a hospital for lunatics. None existed, he pointed out, in New England, and the sufferings of lunatics, their family and friends were “inconceivable.”<sup>25</sup>

In their entreaties to the MHS to turn its attention to other types of suffering, Clarke, Robbins and Morse criticized in mild terms. Dr. John Clark Howard, in 1804, by contrast, lambasted the Society for congratulating itself for restoring people to life but then “look[ing] no further—you wish to know no more, for the ostensible purpose [sic] of your institution is completed. But who,” Howard asked, “is the distressed object that is thus snatched from a peaceful grave? May it not be some houseless wanderer, long since

---

<sup>25</sup> Clarke, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, Eleventh of June 179*, p. 25; Robbins, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1796*, p. 20. Morse used the word “country,” not Massachusetts, when he called for Howard’s and Rumford’s improvements to be introduced. I assume country referred to Massachusetts. Morse, *A Sermon Preached Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semi-annual Meeting, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1801*, pp. 19-21.

a burthen to himself and society, or perhaps some wretched maniac, to whose disordered sense existence has no charm. And,” he drove the point home, “to what are they restored? to the same poverty and wretchedness from which their kinder fate was about to release them.” Unless his listeners addressed themselves to meliorating “living wretchedness” – and Howard felt that fallen women, in particular, should command his listeners’ charitable attention – they would not “in reality be the benefactors of society.”<sup>26</sup>

The Massachusetts Humane Society did not act on any of those suggestions until 1810. The Society had, in 1794, petitioned the General Court on behalf of Americans held captive in Algiers, but otherwise it stuck to the agenda of the international lifesaving movement, with the small modification of the huts for mariners, for over twenty years. Although some of its supporters felt that the MHS could be more useful, the Society could afford to ignore calls for new programs: The Society’s finances were strong enough that between 1798 and 1804, it could suspend taking up collections at the annual meeting. Then, starting in 1810, MHS members spearheaded the creation of a lunatic hospital, later known as the McLean Asylum. The lunatic hospital was a separate entity from the MHS, but the MHS and its members (and the Merrimack Humane Society) provided substantial financial support for the hospital. The new project arose from several forces. First, people in the community thought Boston needed a lunatic asylum, as the advocacy of such an institution by Jedidiah Morse and the 1808 MHS anniversary speaker John Danforth, among others, reveal. Second, the international humane society movement was waning by the early nineteenth century. While humane societies continued operating for years, the cause no longer provoked the excitement that captured

---

<sup>26</sup> Howard, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, pp. 19-21.

public interest and fostered international communication. Third, the treatment of lunatics was one of the causes that had supplanted resuscitation in the attention of medical philanthropists around the Atlantic. For a long time, MHS critics had not been able to prod the Society to make significant changes in response to perceived local needs. But eventually, the Society's leaders and members acted on the discontent by moving on to a new cause.<sup>27</sup>

Many historians explain the founding of new charitable institutions by first analyzing changing economic conditions that led to new social needs and supposedly prompted activists to respond. But a given community's problems might only be one factor in the formation of a new charitable venture. "Another thing on the wind," the Rev. John Eliot wrote to Jeremy Belknap in January 1786 after having heard of the new rescue and resuscitation charity, "& of a very windy nature from what I know of it. The humane society." But, the future treasurer of the Massachusetts Humane Society added, "The Subscription only 6/8 [six shillings, eight pence] & therefore I put down my name. Some vain thing to make some young Physicians important." As Eliot implied, an

---

<sup>27</sup> *A Statement of the Premiums Awarded by the Trustees of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, from July 1817 to April 1829*, pp 51, 49. Howard, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, p. 29. Richard Bell has made a compelling case about the connection between the Massachusetts and Merrimack humane societies and the founding of the McLean Asylum. I diverge from his view, however, that the Massachusetts men founded the McLean Asylum primarily out of frustration with the humane societies' insufficiencies in dealing with suicide. On both sides of the Atlantic, care of the insane garnered increasing attention in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The type of men who would support a medical charity such as the humane societies would have been likely to move on to the next medical charitable cause, and I suspect that that Atlantic-wide evolution of interests spurred interest in building McLean, with the humane societies providing excellent structures for fundraising among likely supporters of the new cause. Bell, "Do Not Despair," pp. 169-175. On transatlantic trends in the care of lunatics, see Gerald N. Grob, *The Mad Among Us: A History of the Care of America's Mentally Ill* (New York, 1994), pp. 25-39; Peter McCandless, "'A House of Cure': The Antebellum South Carolina Lunatic Asylum," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 64 (1990): 220-242. Wright explains that new institutions often emerged from existing ones because organizations' fiduciary duty prevented institutions from expanding into areas not specified by their charters. He explains the criticisms of the MHS as acceptance of the limits of what any one organization could do. Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 139-142, 136-137.

assessment of local problems had not driven the founding of the MHS (and yet even with his jaundiced view, Eliot subscribed to Boston's new charity). Rather, the lifesaving program had come to the attention of the founders through the efforts of Henry Moyes and Benjamin Waterhouse and the Royal Humane Society. Cosmopolitan ties and outlooks were key in communities' adoption of eleemosynary enterprises. But though staying current in international philanthropic movements played a major role in the formation of new charities, successful managers knew that charities' consumers and users expected institutions to suit their communities. Managers could ignore that demand if they had the financial wherewithal. But even then, they tweaked programs to fit the "particular circumstances" of a given place, and, savvy publicists that they were, managers always assured the public of having done so.<sup>28</sup>

### *Hierarchy and Religion*

Besides making charitable programs relevant to local settings, managers had to contend with thorny issues of social hierarchy and religion. Differences in how managers treated those two matters split on two separate axes. Provisions relating to social issues broke along a transatlantic line, while the place of religion in ecumenical charities varied based on the extent of religious diversity in communities. While the widespread embrace of basic models of projects highlights unity in the Atlantic world, the way managers of ecumenical charities handled social issues and religion remind us that urban Atlantic charities functioned in distinct contexts.

---

<sup>28</sup> For example, John Alexander, Richard Bell, Barbara Bellows, and Raymond Mohl all begin their studies with analyses of rising levels of need, or in the case of Bell's study of suicide of rising perceptions of need. Alexander, *Render Them Submissive*; Bell, "Do Not Despair"; Bellows, *Benevolence Among the Slaveholders*; Mohl, *Poverty in New York*. Similarly, in the second chapter of her book, Donna Andrew explains English concern about population strength as an impetus for new charitable foundations. Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 54-57. John Eliot to Jeremy Belknap, January 24, 1786, Belknap Papers, Reel 161.D, pp. 50-69, MHS.

Although the ways philanthropists around the Atlantic dispensed relief diverged little, the ways American and British managers used beneficence to reinforce social hierarchy points up an important difference between the two societies. Historians of early American philanthropy have rightly emphasized that activists tried to use beneficence to shore up the existing social structure. American charitable organizations, like their British counterparts, commonly relied on personal recommendations from individual subscribers for access by poor folks to aid. (Charities often printed fill-in-the-blanks forms for subscribers to use to make recommendations.) That practice gave charities' supporters influence over poorer neighbors and thus was a means to bolster hierarchy. American philanthropists' efforts to inculcate deference, however, were attenuated compared to their British peers. British philanthropists wrote constitutions for charities that routinely required beneficiaries to give thanks in parish churches or to recommenders, and there were echoes of those practices in the United States. New York Hospital required beneficiaries to sign certificates about their cases and the benefits received from the hospital on their release to be published or otherwise used as the governors saw fit. The New York Dispensary required beneficiaries to inform their recommenders when they had been discharged (a subscriber could then recommend another patient). By and large, however, American philanthropic organizations did not stage elaborate, formal thanking rituals by adult recipients of charity. Managers of American charities may have rued the democratic expectations of the lower sort, but they recognized that ceremonies of homage to hierarchy did not suit a society where the social scale was truncated compared to European countries.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Alexander, *Render Them Submissive*, esp. pp. 127-141; Foster, *An Errand of Mercy*. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*. Grell and Cunningham, "Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century

The United States' relatively less hierarchical society led to another difference related to sociopolitical issues. Unlike their American counterparts, the managers of British organizations, from the upper-middling echelon of society, operated in a society where aristocrats wielded much economic, social, and political power in spite of gains by the middling sorts. British managers knew the advantages of having aristocrats involved in charities: Peers gave big donations, and their names on lists of subscribers and their presence at anniversary festivals attracted other donors. But associated philanthropy, like other types of voluntary association, gave middling men a voice in governance of communities. Middling men prized their independence, like their hard-won gentility, and worried about the influence aristocratic subscribers could have on elections for charities' officers. Thus, unlike their American counterparts, some, although not all, British charities required peers and also members of Parliament to vote by proxies. (On both sides of the Atlantic, women subscribers to male-run charities had to vote by proxy.)<sup>30</sup>

A second broad difference among philanthropic organizations in various communities was the place of religion in ecumenical charitable institutions or, put another way, the extent of religious pluralism, especially the strength of Quakers, in different cities. In short, managers of ecumenical charitable organizations in New York and Philadelphia, diverse cities where Friends made up significant proportions of the

---

Northern Europe," p. 5; Governors' meeting, August 27, 1793, New York Hospital Governors' Minutes, vol. 1, NYH; *Rules of the City Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor. Instituted at New York. February 1, 1791*, p. 8. Lloyd, "Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners," pp. 26, 32, 36. According to Wright, the New England practice of displaying the inmates of orphan asylums before benefactors began in 1801. New York charity schools did likewise, see, for instance, "On Sunday next. . .," *New York Daily Advertiser*, November 3, 1794; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 153-154. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, chap. 13.

<sup>30</sup> Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 464, 482-483; John Brewer, "Commercialization and Politics" in *Birth of a Consumer Society*, eds. Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, (Bloomington, 1982). *Plan of the Westminster General Dispensary. Instituted 1774* (London, 1776), p. 15; *Address of the Royal Jennerian Society, for the Extermination of Small-Pox, with the Plan, Regulations, and Instructions for Vaccine Inoculation* (London, 1803), p. 28; *Account of the Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress*, p. 20.

cities' populations and yet larger percentages of the cities' activists, generally avoided the use of charity sermons to raise funds. A survey of advertisements for charity sermons in New York City newspapers from 1785 to 1801 reveals that with occasional exceptions, charity sermons were the preserve of denominational charities, namely, the various churches' charity schools and their poor relief efforts.<sup>31</sup> By contrast, ecumenical charitable organizations in Boston, London, and many other cities commonly raised funds through charity sermons. Religious diversity may have made charity sermons a fraught issue in New York and Philadelphia in general, but, in particular, Quakers opposed tithes as a violation of liberty, and charity sermons too closely resembled the coercive nature of tithes for Friends' comfort. Thus, ecumenical charitable organizations in Philadelphia and New York did not turn to that fundraising technique.<sup>32</sup>

The strength of Friends' feeling on the issue, and the unpleasant possibility of sectarian division over it, is revealed in a situation faced by the governors of New York Hospital in 1795. At the January 1795 governors' meeting, the board was informed that the Treasurer was holding some money "received in consequence of a Sermon" preached on New Year's Day by an unnamed clergyman who, the implication was, had acted on his own accord to raise funds for the hospital. "[A]n uneasiness," however, arose among the governors "on the propriety of the reception of Money collected in that way" and

---

<sup>31</sup> Besides research in the records of various New York and Philadelphia ecumenical charitable societies in, this statement is based on a search of all the New York City newspapers by "charity sermon" for 1785 through 1801 in the database of Early American Newspapers. I also searched the newspapers for certain years by the names of certain ecumenical charities, such as the Society for the Relief of Distressed Debtors and the Dispensary, and I sampled certain years by the words "discourse" and "oration." Searching those ways did not change my conclusions. The Debtors' Society held charity sermons in 1788 and 1789, and in 1789 also encouraged clergymen to hold charity sermons to raise funds in their congregations. The New York Society for the Information and Assistance of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries held a sermon in 1794. Thomas Dunn, *Discourse, Delivered in the New Dutch Church, Nassau-Street, on Tuesday, the 21<sup>st</sup> October, 1794, Before the New York Society for the Information and Assistance of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries* (New York, [1794]).

<sup>32</sup> Laura Brace, *The Idea of Property in Seventeenth-Century England: Tithes and the Individual* (New York, 1998), pp. 34-40.



“further discussion of this Subject [was] postponed to the next Month.” In fact, the governors waited a few months before considering the issue. (The minutes for February and March do not mention the issue at all, although it could have been informally discussed and not recorded in the minutes.) Finally, in April the governors voted on sectarian lines – non-Friends in favor and in the majority – to accept the funds. The governors then logged the opposition view in the minutes: “Because, as we cannot for Conscience sake agreeably to the well known established principles of our religious Society contribute in that way whither for the use of the preacher or others,” the Quaker governors felt, “so neither can we receive money so obtained to our own use and of course not in trust to the use of others.” For that reason, charity sermons generally did not figure among the fundraising tactics of ecumenical organizations in New York and Philadelphia. As the New York Hospital governors’ reluctance to make a decision about the clergyman’s proffered gift shows, managers knew that religious diversity created perils for charitable organizations. In London, a worldly Quaker philanthropist such as John Coakley Lettsom went along with the majority culture in which charity sermons were a norm. But in communities where Friends made up a significant proportion of the charitably active, managers took pains to avoid sectarian divisions.<sup>33</sup>

The way managers dealt with social and religious factors among otherwise very similar beneficent institutions varied in ways that highlight how different the communities that made up the Atlantic world were. Philanthropists often changed little, particularly at the outset, about the programs of institutions they adopted from colleagues

---

<sup>33</sup> Governors’ meetings, January 6, and April 7, 1795, New York Hospital Governors’ Minutes, vol. 1, NYH. Theatre benefits could a problem too. In circa 1759, financial difficulties put the Quaker managers of the Pennsylvania Hospital in the awkward position of having to overcome their scruples and accept money raised by a performance of *Hamlet*. James, *A People among Peoples*, p. 210.

elsewhere. But when it came to social and religious matters, managers put local norms first.

### *Local Focus*

Would that the managers of the Philadelphia Humane Society in the 1780s put local considerations first in general. Instead, they split their attention between the local and international arenas and tottered on the edge of extinction for a decade. Failure is a central theme in the history of charity. Even for adequately funded institutions, organizations' continued existence or success was never assured. Among the many pitfalls that might hinder managers' effectiveness was the distraction posed by the international realm. As the Philadelphia Humane Society managers eventually realized, a local focus had to take priority if charities were to succeed.

The Philadelphia Humane Society had been founded in 1780 and had soon positioned itself as part of the international resuscitation movement. The group took the name "humane society," presumably in emulation of the Royal Humane Society, and in its first published statement, the Society explained that it had been inspired by the examples of resuscitation organizations in London, Amsterdam, and Paris. Inspiration, however, was not enough. The infant society obviously knew enough about those foreign societies to want to pursue the same agenda, but did not have the information needed to actually engage in its mission. Eventually in February 1781, thanks to the help of the Chevalier de la Luzerne, the French minister then in America, the PHS received a "Memoir upon ye different Kinds of Asphyxia," written by the first physician to French army in America. After receiving the French physician's memoir, the PHS drew up directions for the recovery of the drowned and then began to engage in its mission by

publicizing the methods for restoring apparently-drowned persons to life and by providing rescue equipment along the river.<sup>34</sup>

Distributing lifesaving directions and equipment was one thing; saving lives was another. Not until April 1782, did the Philadelphia Humane Society have a case of the recovery of a drowned person, that of a six-year old boy, to present to the public. Even as it was just beginning to pursue its mission in Philadelphia, the PHS sought to enmesh itself in a larger community. In 1781, the PHS made the French army physician a corresponding member in thanks for the critical information he had provided the fledgling society. The following year, the PHS named a second corresponding member, Gosvinus Erkelens of Middle Haddam, Connecticut. Erkelens had initiated the connection when he wrote to the PHS to express his approval for the organization and to ask for information on the PHS's lifesaving methods so he could promote lifesaving in his area. The PHS managers resolved not only to send the information to Erkelens (whose origins in Amsterdam may explain his interest in the new resuscitation charity), but also made him a corresponding member. Erkelens had approached the PHS – thus giving the managers a reason to think that they already had made a mark on the world – and his request for information was the first and last about him in the PHS minutes. But the PHS managers' interest in having Erkelens as a corresponding member highlights their focus on faraway ties in their early years. Besides naming the French physician and Erkelens corresponding members, the PHS had written to the Amsterdam resuscitation group and the Royal Humane Society in 1782 and 1783, respectively, in efforts to forge ties. The PHS was taking a series of steps to establish itself in the international arena.

---

<sup>34</sup> *Pennsylvania Packet*, September 2, 1780. PHS meetings, September 7, 1780, September 11, 1780, December 4, 1780, January 1, 1780, February 5, 1781, April 2, 1781, June 6, 1781, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA.

Other than for the child saved in 1782, however, the PHS could claim to have saved no lives in its first few years of existence. It had not meaningfully established itself in Philadelphia, and in 1784 the group ceased meeting.<sup>35</sup>

After the formation of the Massachusetts Humane Society in 1786 and the visit to the United States of humane society advocate Henry Moyes, Philadelphia Humane Society members revived the dormant society in March 1787. Five months later, at the August meeting, the PHS president, Dr. John Jones, was asked to write to the Royal Humane Society to inform it of the PHS's revival and to begin an exchange of materials. The following month, the PHS decided to distribute its materials to all the delegates to the "federal convention" then meeting in Philadelphia, presumably in an effort to extend knowledge of resuscitation and the humane society model to citizens of other states. Writing to the Royal Humane Society and dispatching materials to the Constitutional Convention delegates had its merits: It gave the PHS something to do. In its first half-year after its revival, printing and distributing pamphlets and broadsides made up the bulk of the Society's activity. Of course, disseminating information about the Society and about resuscitation methods had to be the group's first task, but disseminating information was more or less the group's only task. The Society was having no appreciable impact locally.<sup>36</sup>

For most of the 1790s, the Philadelphia Humane Society fared little better, although different problems undermined the group during that decade. True, in 1793 the

---

<sup>35</sup> PHS meetings April 3, 1782, February 5, 1781, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. *Connecticut Courant*, March 31, 1778; PHS meetings December 2, 1782, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA; Erkelens's obituary is in the *Federal Gazette, and Philadelphia Evening Post*, January 28, 1792. PHS meetings, October 4, 1781; December 2, 1782; May 5, 1783, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA.

<sup>36</sup> PHS meetings, August 22, 1787, September 12, 1787, October 10, 1787, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. N.B. The letter from Jones to the RHS is printed in the RHS report for 1787-89 and is dated September 12, 1788, but that dating may be a mistake because Jones reported at the October 10, 1787, PHS meeting that he had written the letter to the RHS. *RHS Reports 1787-1789*, p. 212.

Society received a charter of incorporation (which the managers were spurred to seek in light of a bequest to the PHS). The Society paid better attention to the condition of the lifesaving apparatus distributed along the waterfront, and the lives of a handful of people were saved. In addition, the PHS showed intermittent interest in corresponding with the London and Massachusetts humane societies. But offsetting the signs of growing stability was the managers' sorry attendance record at monthly meetings. Meeting after meeting had no quorum, although in fairness the yellow fever epidemics that assaulted Philadelphia throughout the 1790s emptied the city repeatedly and therefore disrupted associational activities. The attendance situation got so bad, however, that apothecary Charles Marshall, the longtime secretary, whose job was to keep the minutes and who faithfully showed up month after month only to record that there had been no quorum, routinely hosted the PHS gatherings at his store from 1795 on.<sup>37</sup>

For the Philadelphia Humane Society's first two decades, its leaders had had little success in building a functioning organization. Remarkably, the situation changed in the late 1790s, a few years after a new president, Dr. Benjamin Say, took over from Benjamin Rush, who had been president from March 1792 to March 1795 and, unhelpful for the fortunes of a medical charity, had been at war with his local medical brethren over Rush's treatment of the sick during the 1793 yellow fever epidemic. Benjamin Say

---

<sup>37</sup> This evaluation is based on evaluation of the PHS minutes for the 1790s in general. On the charter, see PHS meetings, September 12, 1792, December 12, 1792, December 19, 1792, March 4, 1793, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. On the apparatus and the people saved, see PHS meetings, June 8, 1791, July 11, 1791, May 9, 1792, September 12, 1792, March 4, 1793, March 21, 1793, April 10, 1793, July 10, 1793, January 8, 1794, February 12, 1794, March 12, 1794, May 16, 1798, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. On the PHS's actual or proposed correspondence with the MHS and RHS, see PHS meetings, December 10, 1789, February 10, 1790, December 12, 1792, March 4, 1793, April 10, 1793, March 9, 1796, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. There was no quorum for most of 1790, much of 1791, about half of 1792, the fall of 1793, half of 1794, several months in each 1795 and '96, and most of 1797; even once the PHS became more effective, the attendance record remained shaky. Meetings began to be held at the Marshalls' store in January, 1795, PHS meeting, January 14, 1795, PHS minutes, vol. 1, PHA. James Hardie, *The Philadelphia Directory and Register for 1794* (Philadelphia, 1794), p. 96. Low attendance was a common problem for voluntary associations. Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, p. 237.

became president in 1795 and held that office for a decade. Around 1798, the PHS began taking a series of steps to anchor itself locally and abroad. Among those steps, Say gave the first address in the Society's history to better publicize the PHS's purpose and, not least, to raise funds. The same year, 1799, the Society moved to strengthen ties with faraway colleagues by electing seven honorary members, two of whom were affiliated with the MHS and four of whom were leading RHS members. (In its typical dilatory fashion, the PHS did not send certificates of memberships to its honorees until April 1801. Once the Society finally did send off those certificates, all but one of the honorees – the deceased MHS president Thomas Russell – dispatched letters or publications to the Society.) In addition, in 1800 the PHS had printed membership certificates, and working, at its usual glacial pace, had sorted out the by-then faulty membership list by 1802; by 1803, members were receiving their certificates. Over the next decades the number of rewards given for lives saved increased to several per year and, although the PHS would never be anyone's idea of an exemplary voluntary organization, the Society had become reasonably well functioning.<sup>38</sup>

The Philadelphia Humane Society had had three founding moments – first, when the Society was initially founded; second, in 1787 when it was revived; and third, in the late 1790s when the Society sought to put itself on sure footing. At each of those moments it established itself on both the local and transnational levels. The third and finally successful time, managers focused on taking the local steps necessary to firm up

---

<sup>38</sup> Managers' meetings, May 9, 1792, March 21, 1793, March 12, 1794, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA. On Rush and the yellow fever epidemic, see Powell, *Bring Out Your Dead*. Managers' meetings, March 11, 1795, PHS Minutes, vol. 1; Managers' meeting, March 12, 1805, PHS Minutes, vol. 2, PHA. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of Humane Society of Philadelphia, March 6, 1799, PHA; Say, *An Annual Oration Pronounced Before the Humane Society of Philadelphia, . . . ; the 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 1799*. Managers' meetings, March 29, 1799, June 12, 1799, September 12, 1800, March 10, 1802, May 18, 1802, March 9, 1803, PHS Minutes, vol. 1, PHA.

its institutional presence. The international arena remained important: Moyes's visit had stimulated the revival of the PHS, and the knowledge that their peers in other cities had active lifesaving programs may have prevented the Philadelphia men from abandoning their foundering venture in the 1790s. Unlike in the 1780s, however, ties to faraway friends now came second.

Like the Philadelphia Humane Society, the Humane Society of the State of New York reached out to distant peers soon after its founding. New Yorkers set up the group in mid-1794. During the next twelve months, Dr. Amasa Dingley, a member of the medical committee whose charge included communicating with fellow humane societies, wrote to the Massachusetts and London societies informing them of the founding of the New York organization and forwarding its constitution to them. But the Humane Society of New York acted too soon in announcing its birth to the world. The Society had been eager to belong to the larger resuscitation movement, but members did not show up to meetings and the group soon faded. Extant records of the New York Humane Society are scanty, but the group may have let its attention to colleagues elsewhere interfere with the often-frustrating work of rooting a group in its local community.<sup>39</sup>

By contrast, other medical charities did not allow international ties to become a distraction. The governors of New York Hospital looked abroad for models while they were in the planning stages and in the 1810s, the Hospital sent its *Brief Account* of the Hospital to far-flung doctors. But, more often, the New York Hospital governors' ties to the international medical-philanthropic community ran through the Hospital's doctors

---

<sup>39</sup> On the short-lived Humane Society of the State of New York, see *The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York* and Thomson, "The Role of Physicians," pp. 48-49. *A Statement of Premiums Awarded by the Trustees of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, from July 1817 to April 1829*, p. 49; *RHS Reports 1795*, pp. 35-36.

rather than being direct ties pursued by a corresponding secretary or committee of correspondence. Likewise, dispensaries had access through local doctors to innovations adopted elsewhere. For its part, the Royal Humane Society, while disseminating information about the cause of resuscitation far and wide, effectively built its local structure by naming dozens of medical men as medical assistants and enlisting the help of clergy to promote the group across London through charity sermons. Similarly, the Massachusetts Humane held an annual oration, given by either a cleric or doctor; those events created opportunities for participation for members of a charity that did not give subscribers' the power to recommend beneficiaries to the group.<sup>40</sup>

Hospitals, dispensaries, and humane societies all had direct or indirect ties to the international fraternity of medical philanthropists. Through those ties, organizations learnt about novel practices and extended the associated philanthropy on a transnational scale. Moreover, a widespread, if weak, cosmopolitan orientation spurred people in cities around the Atlantic to want to keep up with peers in beneficence. The international arena had a vital impact on communities' charitable infrastructures. But the far-flung empire of humanity could also be a distraction. To succeed, in terms of lasting and pursuing their agendas, managers had to stay focused on local matters.

### *Conclusion*

The growth of humanitarian activity in individual cities built on large-scale transnational trends. It is also the history of countless groups of people coming together in charitable associations and trying to make those organizations work. Activists' impact on their putative beneficiaries could be good, bad, or negligible, and because of the self-

---

<sup>40</sup> For a list of the RHS medical assistants and the clergy who preached for the Society in one year, see for example, *RHS Reports 1785-86*, pp. 218, 247-250. For a list of the speakers at the MHS annual discourse, see *History of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, p. 32.



serving aspects and unintended yet harmful effects of beneficence, the accomplishments of philanthropists should not be cast in heroic terms. But getting an organization off the ground was not easy, as the evidence of many failed charities underscores. To succeed, managers of ecumenical organizations had to raise and spend funds, make international models relevant to the supporters and users of given charities, deal with religious diversity and with the social expectations of beneficiaries and supporters, and stay focused on the task of running a local project.

By tackling the various challenges of running organizations, managers anchored ideas in institutions and developed them further. Through the efforts of instigators and collaborators, philanthropists around the Atlantic learnt about the variations, small or large innovations, and new projects developed by managers in particular cities. With many failures, frustrations, and flaws, managers made ventures work. Thanks to the dynamic interaction between local and international arenas, local activists built the institutional infrastructure of humanitarianism in the Atlantic world.

## **Chapter Eight**

### **Change and Continuity**

By the end of the eighteenth century, activists on both sides of the Atlantic congratulated themselves and their supporters for practicing beneficence with no “improper prejudices.” With the vaccination movement in the early nineteenth century, citizens of the Atlantic world undertook the first secular philanthropic project on a global scale. But just around the time that the vaccination movement began, universalism in philanthropy came under attack from various clergymen, managers, and supporters of charities. A decade of revolutionary chaos in the Atlantic world was finally taking its toll.

What effect did the upheaval of the French Revolution and subsequent wars have on philanthropy? In some ways, cosmopolitan practices and liberal aspirations waned over the first decade and a half of the nineteenth century. Important new trends in beneficence came to the fore. Religious philanthropy surged and supplanted the leading place of medical charity. Women began organizing female-run charities. But much stayed the same and those continuities left a lasting legacy. The circulation of information had become routine, not episodic. New types of charitable undertakings continued to proliferate. Traveling to examine eleemosynary institutions became more and more common. In short, the field of philanthropy remained interdependent across the Atlantic and that trait contributed to ongoing growth and change.

### *Questioning Cosmopolitanism*

By 1800, many people celebrated charities' universalism, but not everyone applauded the direction philanthropy had moved in over the previous several decades. The American Revolution had fostered cosmopolitanism in organized beneficence at the local and transnational levels in both Britain and the United States. But the turmoil in the Atlantic world spawned by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars had the opposite effect. During the 1790s and 1800s, Americans and Britons challenged the ideal of catholic benevolence, although philanthropists, by and large, did not reject it outright.

The most famous attack came from Edmund Burke, the self-same man who had lauded John Howard for his labors on behalf "of all men in all countries." In his 1790 *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Burke denied that universal benevolence existed. Burke's *Reflections* came in response to Richard Price's 1789 speech, *A Discourse on the Love of Our Country*, which endorsed the French Revolution and argued that patriotism should be restrained by goodwill to humankind. Burke, opposed to the French Revolution and fearful of radicalism that the Revolution might unleash at home, assailed the idea of love of humankind as an existential threat to the familial and local ties that, in his view, were the bedrock of civilization. Earlier in the century, universal benevolence had been a morally strong position as a counterweight to selfish and potentially socially harmful attachments, such as patriotism in militaristic form. But during the reactionary 1790s, Burke and his followers redefined the concept as the self-serving false idol of the opponents of family, society, and tradition.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Radcliffe, "Revolutionary Writing, Moral Philosophy, and Universal Benevolence in the Eighteenth Century"; Radcliffe, "Burke, Radical Cosmopolitanism, and the Debates on Patriotism in the 1790s."

Across the water, Americans had generally welcomed the French Revolution. But as it became increasingly violent and as Americans clashed over their nation's foreign policy in light of British-French war, responses to the Revolution shaped emerging party divisions. Federalists turned against the Revolution, while Democratic Republicans remained rhetorically committed to revolutionary ideals, although opposed to revolutionary action by the enslaved people of Saint Domingue.<sup>2</sup> Those tensions would affect ideas about moral responsibility and the practice of beneficence.

In the charged political atmosphere on both sides of the Atlantic, some activists echoed Burke in criticizing universal benevolence and in endorsing partial loyalties. The doctor in Chester, England, John Haygarth urged readers in 1793 to embrace his national smallpox inoculation plan by arguing that Britons' sympathy "need not solely be excited by the inhabitants of the remote regions of the earth," that is, by enslaved Africans. Slaves – "objects of disgust" – and criminals – "the most guilty" – got too much attention in Haygarth's mind. British "acts of beneficence" should also be directed to "our neighbours and fellow-citizens."<sup>3</sup> Even more hostilely, John Sylvester John Gardiner condemned "the specious veil of universal philanthropy" at the Massachusetts Humane Society anniversary festival in 1803. The idea of universal philanthropy, he charged in Burkean tones, "conceal[ed] . . . indifference to the whole human species." "[I]f we did not love those best with whom we are most nearly connected, who belong to the same community, dwell in the same town, worship at the same temple," he argued, "but were

---

<sup>2</sup> Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes*, pp. 112-140; Joanne Freeman, *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic* (New Haven, 2001), pp. 91-98; Simon P. Newman, "American Political Culture and the French and Haitian Revolutions: Nathaniel Cutting and the Jeffersonian Republicans" in *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, ed. David P. Geggus (Columbia, 2001).

<sup>3</sup> John Haygarth, *A Sketch of a Plan to Exterminate the Casual Small-Pox from Great Britain; and to Introduce General Inoculation* (London, 1793), pp. 24-25.

compelled by stern inflexible justice, to reserve our affections for the supposed superiority of merit in strangers, with whom we are but slightly acquainted, perhaps never saw, our situation would be truly deplorable, and,” he warned, “men, of all creatures, would be most miserable.” The search for ways to aid suffering strangers had lost its force.<sup>4</sup>

Besides pressing for the primacy of national or local ties in charity, some British reformers espoused a special Anglo-American Protestant civilizing mission, in contrast to the French menace. Well-off British and Federalist American philanthropists regularly denounced “those fierce and cruel passions” of the French, which “threaten desolation, destruction, and misery far and wide,” as Boston cleric John Lathrop put it in 1799. And they also praised the goodness shared by Britons and Americans. Some went farther. The bigoted Patrick Colquhoun hoped “that England and America will form a permanent union, as the best means of preserving the peace of the world, and promoting the best interests of the human species.” Likewise, the broad-minded John Coakley Lettsom confided to Jedidiah Morse that he thought that the American purchase of Louisiana was “advantageous . . . to the human species” because it would “extend the English language, laws and religion.” In the 1780s, Americans and Britons had used the language of cosmopolitanism to rekindle and redefine transatlantic ties. By the early nineteenth century, bonds between Britons and some Americans hearkened back to the common British Protestant identity of the mid-eighteenth century and looked forward to the idea that flourished at the turn of the twentieth century of a special Anglo-Saxon mission for

---

<sup>4</sup> Gardiner, *A Sermon Delivered Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts . . . June 14, 1803*, pp. 11-12.

the world. Not everyone spoke in those terms. But that Lettsom, a man who had been so taken with himself as a citizen of the world, did, underscored the changed climate.<sup>5</sup>

Lettsom's view that the American purchase of Louisiana was good for the human species implied, of course, a catholic outlook. Universalist goals could be imagined within illiberal frameworks. But advocacy of partial or national loyalties in philanthropy also undermined ideals of aiding strangers without bias, as Haygarth's and Gardiner's comments suggest. The goal of impartial benevolence, however, rested on the firm base of the parable of the Good Samaritan and had been widely considered morally desirable for decades. In the 1790s and 1800s, philanthropists challenged that goal but, unlike writers such as Burke, they did not dispense with it completely.

Instead, philanthropists and clerics who addressed charities' anniversary festivals hewed to the idea (contested by some) that love of mankind could grow from narrower bonds. John Sylvester John Gardiner, for instance, followed up his attack on the "specious veil of universal philanthropy" by advising his listeners that "Our charity, indeed, must begin at home, though it ought not to end there." Likewise, the London cleric George Isaac Huntingford explained that people owed a greater moral duty to those close to them, but, he added, "every human Being, in every existing region, is considered by Christian Charity as entitled to that degree of assistance, which circumstances of prudence, and superior obligation, will fairly allow." The Royal Humane Society met

---

<sup>5</sup> John Lathrop to William Hawes, July 24, 1798, in *RHS Reports 1799* (London, [1799]), p. 28. Isaac Hurd, *A Discourse Delivered in the Church in Brattle Street, in Boston, Tuesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 1799, Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1799), p. 11. William Hawes in *RHS Reports 1795*, p. 37. John Coakley Lettsom to Jedidiah Morse, February 22, 1804, Gratz Collection, Case 12, Box 21 (European Physicians and Scientists), HSP. Patrick Colquhoun to Thomas Eddy, September 12, 1808, in Knapp, *The Life of Thomas Eddy*, p. 226. On late nineteenth-century Anglo-Saxonism, see Stuart Anderson, *Race and Rapprochement: Anglo-Saxonism and Anglo-American Relations, 1895-1904* (Rutherford, NJ, 1981); see also Reginald Horsmann, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981). See also Charles Crowe, "Bishop James Madison and the Republic of Virtue," *The Journal of Southern History* 30 (1964): 58-70, p. 69.

that responsibility by dispatching information to faraway places, he assured his audience. Gardiner and Huntingford were clear: Nearer relations came first, but Christians had a weak moral responsibility to all humanity. Cosmopolitan values had ebbed, but not disappeared.<sup>6</sup>

### *Changes*

The critique of universal benevolence had not wholly dispatched that ideal but by the 1800s, the changed attitude was having an impact on charitable organizations' public faces. In the first decade of the nineteenth century, charitable organizations downgraded the importance of their international ties. Instead, they put new stress on national and imperial bonds and concerns.

The shift came earlier and with greater force among Britons. The British Empire and especially the British East Indies loomed larger in humanitarian imaginations.<sup>7</sup> A Major Carroll, for instance, urged the Royal Humane Society in 1795 to extend its reach to India. Not only would lives be saved, but more importantly, "IDOLATRY would be done away [and] hordes of Indians [would be] taught to worship the true GOD" as a result of successful resuscitations. Moreover, Indian trust in Britons and British-Indian commerce would both grow. The London-based Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox (RJS) also revealed the rise in imperial thinking among British philanthropists. One of the first speakers at the first RJS anniversary festival, in 1803, rejoiced that "From the Severn" – the river in Jenner's home county of

---

<sup>6</sup> Gardiner, *A Sermon Delivered Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, p. 12. George Isaac Huntingford, *A Sermon Preached at the Anniversary of the Royal Humane Society, in St. James's Church, Westminster, on Sunday, April 24, 1803* (London, 1803), p. 25.

<sup>7</sup> This shift coincided with greater British acceptance and waning critiques of its imperial role in India. See P. J. Marshall, "The Moral Swing to the East: British Humanitarianism, India and the West Indies" in P. J. Marshall, *A Free though Conquering People* (1986; reprint Aldershot, Hampshire, 2003).

Gloucestershire – “to the Ganges, the mild virtues of the Cow-pock have been seen, felt, and acknowledged—along the shores of Asia, in the cot of the Hindoo, and in the temple of the Bramin.” And in its address publicizing the new charity, the RJS asked Britons to “unite in the great undertaking of extending it over every part of the British empire.” The RJS espoused universal goals too (see Chapter Six), but those were increasingly inflected by imperialism.<sup>8</sup>

The situation on the American side was different. Americans held as an article of faith that their country’s plenty meant that social ills were less severe in the United States than in Europe. New Yorker Thomas Eddy assured Londoner Patrick Colquhoun in 1803 that “many of the evils which afflict and deform the more populous societies of Europe, either do not exist among us, or appear only in a small degree.” But thanks to input from their peers abroad, some Americans sensed that American social problems were but fainter versions of Europe’s woes. Eddy conceded to Colquhoun that alcohol corrupted morals on both sides of the Atlantic. DeWitt Clinton saw greater similarities. ““In London,”” Clinton quoted for his audience at the New York Free School Society from Patrick Colquhoun’s treatise on the police of London, ““above twenty thousand individuals rise every morning, without knowing how, or by what means they are to be supported through the passing day, and in many instances even where they are to lodge

---

<sup>8</sup> Major Carroll to William Hawes, August 27, 1795, *RHS Reports 1796* (London, 1796?), p. 44. *An Account of the First Anniversary Festival of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of the Small-pox, on Thursday, May 17, 1803, Extracted from the Gentleman’s Magazine* (London, n.d.), p. 2. *Address of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Small-pox, with the Plans, Regulations, and Instructions for Vaccine Inoculation*, p. 23.



on the ensuing night.” And, he informed his audience, “hundreds are in the same situation in this city.”<sup>9</sup>

Clinton saw convergence between New York and London, but he stressed differences too between the United States and Britain. In his speech, Clinton cited common urban problems and the common use by American and British philanthropists of the Lancastrian educational system (in which older pupils taught younger children) in response to those problems. He highlighted his concern for schooling all the world’s “poor and distressed.” He noted that personal contacts had played an important role in the spread of the Lancastrian method from England to New York. Clinton remained morally and intellectually a citizen of the world, but he did not return to his hopes of a decade earlier for an international university, where partial loyalties among the world’s peoples would fade. Instead, he emphasized political distinctions between the United States and Britain. “Here, no privileged orders—no factitious distinctions in society—no hereditary nobility—no established religion—no royal prerogatives exist.” Rather, in the United States, “[a]ll men being considered as enjoying an equality of rights, the propriety and necessity of dispensing, without distinction, the blessings of education followed of course.” The American national character, Clinton explained, made America “more fertile soil” for Lancaster’s “beneficial discover[y]” than Britain where Lancaster had faced censure for upsetting the social order.<sup>10</sup>

The comments by Clinton and this handful of philanthropists suggest that imperial and national perspectives weighed heavier than cosmopolitan ones did by the early

---

<sup>9</sup> Drew R. McCoy, *The Elusive Republic: Political Economy in Jeffersonian America* (New York, 1982), esp. 107-110. Eddy to Colquhoun, July 15, 1803, in Knapp, *The Life of Thomas Eddy*, pp. 201, 206. Clinton, *An Address to the Benefactors and Friends of the Free School Society*, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Clinton, *An Address to the Benefactors and Friends of the Free School Society*, pp. 7, 10, 12, 11, 10, 5, 16, 15.

nineteenth century. Evidence from humane societies' relationships with one another bears out that contention. The first sign of change came when the Royal Humane Society publicly downgraded its interest in foreign societies. Starting with the 1787-1789 report, the Royal Humane Society printed a list of the humane societies that, the RHS boasted, had been established thanks to its help. For over a decade, an overseas society *always* came first. Societies fell off or were added to the list and the order varied, but, with minor exceptions, the RHS listed most of the overseas, Scottish, and Irish societies before the societies in England. That custom changed in 1801. English societies came first, then Scottish societies followed by the Dublin, North Wales, and Jamaica groups. Next came societies in Central Europe and St. Petersburg. Societies in the United States came dead last. The list remained more or less the same for several years. Then in 1809, the RHS signaled more explicitly that imperial ties and an imperial conception of Britain's place in the world were taking root. That year, the RHS broke the list of societies out into three parts: "I. *BRITISH UNITED EMPIRE*" – societies in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. "II. *BRITISH FOREIGN SETTLEMENTS*" – societies in the East Indies, Nova Scotia, and Jamaica. And "III. *FOREIGN*" – societies in Central Europe, Russia, and the United States.<sup>11</sup>

British philanthropists further confirmed their waning interest in foreign, non-imperial ties in the choices they made of charities' honorary members. In a move that would have been unthinkable ten or so years earlier, in 1805 the Royal Jennerian Society vetoed almost all the prominent foreign medical men and statesmen who had been nominated to be honorary (non-medical) or corresponding (medical) members. John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and the Rev. Dr. James Madison of Virginia were rejected.

---

<sup>11</sup> *RHS Reports, 1787-1800; RHS Reports 1801*, p. 8; *RHS Reports 1809* (London, [1809]), p. 13.

Even more surprising, so were Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Waterhouse and three other American doctors. A few Frenchmen and other Europeans were voted in, but most honorary or corresponding members were Britons either at home or in the empire. (Some British nominees were also turned down, including Marquis Wellesley and numerous British doctors.) Interest in foreign ties had not disappeared: Doctors communicated about vaccination extensively across national borders, and the RJS Board of Directors and Medical Council had nominated a long list of foreigners as honorary or corresponding members. But the mood of the General Court (the quarterly meetings of subscribers) in September 1805, as Britain faced the possibility of French invasion, was insular, even as activists pursued a worldwide program.<sup>12</sup>

Likewise, the Royal Humane Society's choices of honorary members in the early nineteenth century underscored the chauvinistic mood. Between 1793 and 1802, foreigners had made up from one-third to over one-half of the people named as honorary members. From 1803, however, foreigners accounted for one-quarter or less of the honorary members. Not a big change, perhaps, given the small numbers of honorary members overall, but between 1799 and 1804, no new foreign honoree was named. In 1805, John Coakley Lettsom's correspondent, the Episcopalian bishop of Virginia, James Madison, was chosen as an honorary member. Then for the next five years, the RHS again made no new foreign honorary members. In 1811, the RHS expanded its honorary list from twenty names the year before to thirty-three. The new honorees included the

---

<sup>12</sup> RJS Board of Directors Minutes, May 9, 1805, (MS 4302), WL; RJS General Court Minutes, September 4, 1805, (MS 4303), WL. In 1807, the RJS Medical Council nominated three other foreign honorary members. RJS Medical Council Minutes, September 4, 1805, (MS 4304), WL. Wilifrid Prest, *Albion Ascendant: English History 1660-1815* (Oxford, 1998), chap. 18; Richard Glover, *Britain at Bay: Defence Against Bonaparte, 1803-14* (London, 1973), pp. 14-15. On fears of invasion, see also Colley, *Britons*, pp. 305-306.

presidents of the Philadelphia and New York humane societies and longtime Massachusetts Humane Society officer and officer of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Rev. John Lathrop. That year was an anomaly, though. By 1820, the RHS had not named a foreign honorary member since 1811.<sup>13</sup>

The Massachusetts Humane Society changed its public face, too. In 1793, the MHS had broadcast that it actively cooperated with other humane societies in a common cause by printing in its annual report extracts from a letter from the Royal Humane Society. Every year from 1795 with the exception of 1799, the MHS's annual report had included the annual letter it received from the RHS. But in 1805, the MHS printed no letter from the RHS. Instead, it included a letter from the new Merrimack Humane Society, based in Newburyport, Massachusetts.<sup>14</sup> The MHS and RHS had not broken off ties: The MHS corresponding secretary sent the Society's annual discourse to the RHS in July 1805, and he wrote to the RHS in 1807 with news that the MHS was emulating the

---

<sup>13</sup> *RHS Reports, 1793-1820*. The RHS incorrectly listed Lathrop as president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. On Bishop Madison, see Crowe "Bishop James Madison and the Republic of Virtue."

<sup>14</sup> In 1799, the corresponding secretary was new to the job. Perhaps that situation explains the omission of the RHS letter that year. In 1802, the letter was not reprinted in the MHS report, but the report referred to the letter and other materials sent by the RHS. Clarke, *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, . . . Eleventh of June, 1793*, p. 31; Brooks, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1795*, p. 15; Robbins, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts . . . June 14, 1796*, p. 25; John Fleet, *A Discourse Relative to Animation, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting June 13<sup>th</sup>, 1797* (Boston, 1797), p. 17; William Walter, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the Semiannual Meeting Twelfth of June, 1798* (Boston, 1798), p. 33; Hurd, *A Discourse Delivered in the Church in Brattle Street, in Boston, Tuesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 1799, Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*; Thacher, *A Discourse Delivered at Boston, Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1800*, pp. 19-20; Morse, *A Sermon Preached Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semi-annual Meeting, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1801*, pp. 31-32; Eliphalet Porter, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 8, 1802* (Boston, 1802), p. 23; Gardiner, *A Sermon Delivered Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1803*, p. 21; Howard, *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 12, 1804*, pp. 30-32; Thomas Gray, *The Value of Life and Charitable Institutions* (Boston, 1805), pp. 25-26.

RHS by building a lifeboat on the model of the lifeboat invented by an Englishman.<sup>15</sup>

After printing the Merrimack Humane Society letter, the MHS quit inserting letters from other humane societies in its reports. It did pay tribute to RHS founder William Hawes when he died by including an obituary of Hawes in the MHS report. But the time when members of the humane society movement prized belonging to an international community was past.<sup>16</sup>

The emphasis on foreign ties among philanthropists flagged as twenty years of conflict stoked nationalism among citizens of the Atlantic world. French Revolutionary violence, the Haitian Revolution, the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, the Quasi-War with France, the Embargo, and the War of 1812 weakened cosmopolitanism. But, in addition, the generation of philanthropists born in the 1740s had mostly died off by the end the 1810s. Jeremy Belknap, Thomas Cogan, John Crawford, Alexander Johnson, John Coakley Lettsom, Henry Moyes, the Murray cousins, Thomas Percival, and Benjamin Rush were all dead by 1820, most of them by 1815. “I once enjoyed a pretty wide range of professional correspondence, American as well as transatlantic,” one of the survivors, Benjamin Waterhouse, wrote in 1813, “but alas! almost all my epistolary friends have gone down to the grave!”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> If the MHS wrote to the RHS after 1807, changes in the sources stymie the historian’s ability to know. The evidence of MHS correspondence with the RHS comes from RHS reports. But the format of the RHS reports changed in 1808, with the death of William Hawes. The reports became shorter and also more cut-and-dried compared to the exuberance of the reports edited by Hawes, and the RHS reports no longer included letters from other societies.

<sup>16</sup> William Spooner to William Hawes, July 23, 1805, *RHS Reports 1806* (London, 1806), p. 60; William Spooner to William Hawes, February 3, 1807, *RHS Reports 1808*, p. 13. *Appendix* ([Boston?], [1810]), pp. 23-32. N.B. The MHS did not print a full report in 1810, but only printed the materials that usually went in the appendix.

<sup>17</sup> Benjamin Waterhouse to Dr. Tilton, December 30, 1813, Gratz Collection, American Literary Miscellaneous (Case 6, Box 24), HSP.

With the passing of that generation, there were no longer Americans or Britons alive who had come to young adulthood before the imperial crisis began. Moreover, the next generation had less or different experience as citizens of the world than their predecessors did. The men who dominated mid-eighteenth century London charities (a generation older than the philanthropists born in the 1740s) had spent more time abroad, historian Donna Andrew comments, than the evangelical cohort of London philanthropists, which emerged in the 1780s and 1790s. Young American doctors continued to go abroad for medical training in the 1780s, '90s and early nineteenth century. But now that there were American medical schools to attend, the protégés of Samuel Bard, Benjamin Rush, and their peers first attended medical school in the United States and then went abroad for additional training after receiving their medical degrees. The younger generation not only compared the schools abroad unfavorably to those at home, but also felt some coolness from Britons. Medical students abroad after American Independence, according to one medical historian, found it harder to join English society than their mentors had in the colonial period.<sup>18</sup>

The generational shift affected philanthropy in various ways. For one, intimacy among American and British philanthropists faded. MHS letters to the RHS in the 1800s, for instance, lost their buoyant tone and became more businesslike.<sup>19</sup> The willingness or ability to participate in different communities, characteristic of early modern citizens of the Atlantic world, waned too in ways that affected local charitable operations beyond international philanthropic communication. John Coakley Lettsom had hailed

---

<sup>18</sup> Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 167; Bell, "Philadelphia Medical Students in Europe, 1750-1800," p. 27

<sup>19</sup> Compare, for instance, the letters of 1792 and 1805, *RHS Reports 1793*, pp. 29, 31; *RHS Reports 1806*, p. 60.

ecumenical cooperation in fundraising – “[a]t the anniversary of the Society for the Deaf and Dumb 3000*l.* were subscribed, of which 700*l.* were brought by Abraham Goldsmid the Jew. At the Jews’ Hospital 2500*l.* of which about 1000*l.* by the Christians,” he told a friend in 1810. Two decades later, the Jewish secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals lost his position as religious orthodoxy trumped ecumenicalism. That shift had begun earlier. The Sunday school movement had been rent by religious conflict in the 1790s, and, as the nineteenth century unfolded, denominational purity among English charities replaced the pluralism that Lettsom had celebrated.<sup>20</sup>

In the more diverse United States, the situation differed. Americans continued to expand and elaborate the philanthropic sector by maintaining and founding both pluralistic and particularistic groups. Denominational variety grew in the early nineteenth century, but did not preclude ecumenical charities. The American Bible Society, founded in 1816, for instance, emphasized its ecumenical nature. The area where the changed mood did have an impact, and an especially ugly one, in the United States was with the founding in 1817 of the American Colonization Society, a group devoted to deporting African Americans from their natal land.<sup>21</sup>

The biggest differences, however, in the direction of charity in the next few decades compared to that of the mid-to-late eighteenth century period were new attitudes towards the poor, the revival of religious philanthropy, and the formation of female-run

---

<sup>20</sup> John Coakley Lettsom to Rev. James Plumtre, May 15, 1810, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, p. 153. Roberts, *Making English Morals*, pp. 115, 68-69, 72. On splits in the charity school movement, see Jones, *The Charity School Movement*, pp. 333-339. Although religious and political pluralism was common in English charities over the eighteenth century, there was factionalism too. On this topic, see Wilson, “The Politics of Medical Improvement in Early Hanoverian England”; Porter, “The Gift Relation”; Croxson, “The Public and Private Faces of Eighteenth-Century London Dispensary Charity.”

<sup>21</sup> On Protestant cooperation in post-1815 beneficence, see Foster, *An Errand of Mercy*; Roberts, *Making English Morals*, p. 97. Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (Yale, 1989), pp. 64-66, 144; Foster, *An Errand of Mercy*, pp. 115, 122-123; on the ACS including African American opposition to it, see Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*, pp. 96-104, 116-118.

charitable organizations. Here again change came first in Britain, especially in terms of changed attitudes towards the poor. The loss of the Thirteen Colonies began this shift in attitude. The imperial breakup left Britain without many of the colonies to which it exported settlers, drawn from the lower sorts, and with a high national debt and demobilized sailors and soldiers. As a result, concern about the well-being of the poor declined and worries about the economy and crime rose. Then during the 1790s, anxiety in Britain about challenges to the social order and the crises of dearth, resulting in both widespread food riots and onerous poor rates, led elites to mull over both the causes of and responses to poverty.<sup>22</sup>

That rethinking took various forms. Typical of his penchant for far-reaching reforms, Jeremy Bentham sketched a thoroughgoing overhaul of the poor relief system based on the goal of providing labor to prevent destitution. Bentham's scheme imagined removing the relief recipients from their parishes to Industry Houses where they would live and work; the plan would have consolidated the poor relief apparatus administered locally in England and Wales's 15,000 parishes to two hundred Industry Houses. In a massive survey of poverty and poor relief, Frederick Morton Eden critiqued the poor law as antithetical to the liberal economics that he, following Adam Smith, believed nurtured freedom and progress. Eden's support for self-help among the poor signaled the direction elite thinking and practice were generally moving, but he did not call for abolition of the poor law. By contrast, Thomas Malthus attacked the poor law in his *Essay on the Principle of Population*, published first in 1797. His belief that, if not held in check,

---

<sup>22</sup> Susan Thorne, "'The Conversion of Englishmen and the Conversion of the World Inseparable': Missionary Imperialism and the Language of Class in Early Industrial Britain" in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, eds. Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler (Berkeley, 1997), p. 242; Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, p. 164, Prest, *Albion Ascendant*, pp. 294-297; Fideler, *Social Welfare in Pre-Industrial England*, pp. 178, 180.



population growth would outpace food production led him to oppose public poor relief and to urge the poor to delay procreation. Malthus had his critics among reviewers and other writers on the poor law. (John Coakley Lettsom condemned Malthus as “unfeeling” in a letter to a friend. Malthus’s book should be “publicly burnt” for opposing the “first command of God, ‘be fruitful and multiply,’” Lettsom added.) But Malthus’s views found favor in the early nineteenth century with moderate evangelicals. Men and women of that cast of mind believed in free will and individual self-help based on their view that God did not intervene in human or natural affairs. Thus, they worried about the corrupting effects of compulsory poor rates on donors – compulsion stripped charity of its spiritual value – and they believed that by ministering to the moral, not material, state of needy folks, they encouraged the self-reliance of the poor.<sup>23</sup>

These ideas found practical expression in charitable organizations founded in the period. The Society for the Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor (SBCP) advocated measures such as teaching the poor to prepare reasonably-priced, unfamiliar foods or selling soup to the poor at a small cost. Philanthropists turned also to charity schools, Bible societies, and missionary activity. Besides aiming to promote morality among the poor, activists hoped to restore lost bonds between elites and the lower sorts.<sup>24</sup>

In the first decade of the nineteenth century, Americans picked up some of the food-philanthropy ideas that their British counterparts were experimenting with in the

---

<sup>23</sup> This paragraph draws on Fideler, *Social Welfare in Pre-Industrial England*, pp. 178-186; Poynter, *Society and Pauperism*, chap. 4; Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865* (Oxford, 1988), esp. pp. 16-17, 32, 70, 82-102; Lettsom quotation, John Coakley Lettsom to Rev. James Plumtre, December 1, 1804, in Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*, vol. 2, p. 109.

<sup>24</sup> Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police*, pp. 174-176, 169-174; Roberts, *Making English Morals*, chaps. 1 & 2; Foster, *An Errand of Mercy*, part one.

1790s. Ways to improve fuel efficiency and nutrition in the preparation of foods in carceral institutions gained adherents, and New Yorkers set up a soup kitchen in 1802 modeled on European soup kitchens. Although Americans adopted some of the British programs associated with Britons' new severity towards the poor, loss of sympathy towards the poor among northern American philanthropists came somewhat later, around the 1820s. In the face of economic distress, urban growth, and increased heterogeneity, well-off white Protestants blamed the habits of the poor for their poverty: Reformers focused their energies on improving the supposedly flawed spiritual and moral condition of the poor.<sup>25</sup>

As historian Bruce Dorsey points out, that change coincided with the rise in evangelical religion. The same held true in Britain. The upsurge in evangelical religion began in the 1780s and gathered over force over the next few decades. By the early nineteenth century, Sunday schools, missionary groups, and Bible Societies typified Anglo-American humanitarian activities, as medical philanthropy had in the eighteenth century. Evangelical religious fervor fueled too the rise of antislavery to a mass movement in Britain; in the United States, it remained mainly an elite cause until the antebellum era.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Thomas Eddy, *An Account of the State Prison or Penitentiary House, in the City of New-York* (New York, 1801), pp. 46, 40-45. *Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the Humane Society of the City of New York* (New York, 1814), p. 6. Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, pp. 56-63; Michael B. Katz, *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America* (New York, 1986), pp. 16-19; Mohl, *Poverty in New York*, pp. 259-263; see also Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum*. By contrast, paternalism remained a trait of poor relief in Charleston until the 1850s. Bellows, *Benevolence Among Slaveholders*. Roman Catholic and African American women rejected the new ethos. Boylan, *The Origins of Women's Activism*, pp. 197-199.

<sup>26</sup> Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women*, p. 52. Foster, *An Errand of Mercy*. Turley, *The Culture of English Antislavery*; Prest, *Albion Ascendant*, pp. 312-313. On the PAS as an elite institutions, see Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*, chap. 1.

Perhaps the greatest change was the emergence of female-led charitable organizations. Some women had played a role in the first wave of associated philanthropy by subscribing to male-run societies. They faced restrictions, however, on their participation in those groups: Women could not hold offices and, unlike men, they had to vote by proxy. As women on both sides of the Atlantic increasingly formed charities in their own rights, they launched a new wave in associated philanthropy: The opposition women organizers had met at first turned into the assumption by the 1830s that, ““It is to female influence and exertion that many of our best schemes of charity are due.””<sup>27</sup>

### *Continuity*

In spite of those changes, much stayed the same. Philanthropists continued to elaborate charitable infrastructures thanks to innovations and novel ideas they picked up as members of translocal and transnational communities. They continued to cooperate with colleagues elsewhere. They continued to embrace global goals. In short, philanthropists continued to engage in organized beneficence in cosmopolitan ways.

Central to the expansion of philanthropy had long been the intertwined forces of access to innovations and awareness that peers elsewhere were pursuing new types of charitable programs. That dynamic encouraged, and legitimated, the growth of women’s charitable activism, as Timothy Alden revealed in 1804: He cited in the printed edition of a charity sermon to the Portsmouth (New Hampshire) Female Asylum the female

---

<sup>27</sup> John Coakley Lettson, “Hints Designed to Promote the Establishment of a Dispensary” in *Hints Designed To Promote Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science* (1797), p. 19. Boylan, *The Origins of Women’s Activism*; McCarthy, *American Creed*, chap. 2; Midgley, *Women Against Slavery*; Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England*; Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence*, quotation p.1.

charitable societies formed or then forming in various cities in Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island.<sup>28</sup>

In male-run philanthropy, the same forces furthered growth. Philanthropists pursued greater specialization in medical charity, for instance, with the establishment of fever houses (known often as houses of recovery) or fever wards of hospitals at the turn of the century. Fever institutions, where patients suffering from the broad group of contagious diseases categorized as fever could be segregated and treated, were not a new idea in the 1790s. John Haygarth had established a fever ward at the Chester (England) Infirmary in 1783 and had agitated for the spread of the model for years. In addition, European and American port cities had a long familiarity with quarantine regulations to prevent the spread of infectious diseases. But in the mid-1790s – when humane societies and dispensaries were old news for the trendsetters and vaccination was still around the corner – houses of recovery and other modes of combating fever began to capture the imagination of the international community of philanthropists. Mancunians established a fever house in 1796. Londoners followed the example of Manchester and other provincial English and Irish cities in 1802. (Dr. John Murray’s youngest son, Thomas Archibald Murray, died in the commission of his duties as a fever hospital physician not long after the London fever hospital opened.) The SBCP promoted fever institutions in its reports, as did Lettsom and other doctors in various publications. At New York Hospital, the doctors and surgeons urged the governors in 1805 to keep up with European

---

<sup>28</sup> Timothy Alden, *A Discourse, Delivered before the Members of the Portsmouth Female Asylum* (Portsmouth, NH, 1804), p. 9.

hospitals by replacing wooden bedsteads with iron bedsteads (“not apt to retain infection, or harbour vermine like wood”) for the hospital’s already-existing fever wards.<sup>29</sup>

As had been so often the case in humanitarian activism in previous decades, new types of institutions were set up in given cities when local or personal factors interacted with national or international trends. In London, for example, two bad years of fever outbreaks disposed London philanthropists to emulate their provincial colleagues in the founding of a fever hospital. Personal factors could be another proximate cause for a particular community to join a broader movement. The founding of the first school for the deaf and dumb in the United States is one example. The school opened in Connecticut in 1817 after Thomas Gallaudet returned from a trip to Europe to study deaf education. Men with familial interests in the deaf had supported his trip: Gallaudet had traveled with funds raised by a Hartford doctor, Mason Cogswell, who had a deaf daughter, and a letter of introduction from New York philanthropist Thomas Eddy, who

---

<sup>29</sup> On fevers, see John Duffy, *Epidemics in Colonial America* (Baton Rouge, 1953), pp. 202, 229; Bynum, “Hospital, Disease and Community,” p. 99. On Haygarth’s program, see John Coakley Lettsom, “Hints Respecting the Prevention of Infectious Fevers, and the Establishment of Houses of Recovery” in *Hints Designed To Promote Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science*, vol. 1 (1801), pp. 272-276; see also, Lobo, “Haygarth, Smallpox, and Dissent.” On quarantines in American port cities, see Duffy, *Epidemics in Colonial America*, pp. 101-103; John Duffy, “History of Public Health and Sanitation in the West since 1700” in *The Cambridge World History of Human Disease*, ed. Kenneth Kiple (Cambridge, 1993), p. 201. On quarantines in England, see Arnold Zuckerman, “Plague and Contagionism in Eighteenth-Century England: The Role of Richard Mead,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78 (2004): 273-308; Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England*, pp. 143-144. On the spread of the fever institution model, see Lettsom, “Hints Respecting the Prevention of Infectious Fevers,” pp. 284-288; Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 122-123; Bynum, “Hospital, Disease and Community,” p. 102; Cassell, *Medical Charities, Medical Politics*, pp. 10-11. On Thomas Archibald Murray, see *Gentleman’s Magazine*, vol. 82 (1802), p. 286; *Gentleman’s Magazine*, New Series, vol. 27 (1847), p. 554. See also Porter, “Cleaning up the Great Wen,” pp. 69, 73. On the SBCP promoting fever houses, see Bynum, “Hospitals, Disease and Community,” p. 104; *Reports of the Society for the Bettering the Condition of the Poor*, vol. 3 (London, 1802), pp. 271-288; Lettsom, “Hints Respecting the Prevention of Infectious Fevers, and the Establishment of Houses of Recovery.” NYH Governors’ Minutes vol. 2, April 2, 1805, NYH.

had a deaf son, to London reformer Patrick Colquhoun. (It was his efforts teaching Cogswell's daughter that got Gallaudet interested in deaf education.)<sup>30</sup>

Philanthropists did not merely found new institutions in emulation of peers elsewhere but continued to act on an international stage in various ways. In 1805, for instance, the Philadelphia Humane Society launched a prize medal competition “to excite public attention towards the further improvement” of the science of resuscitation and called for essays on improved methods of reviving drowning victims. (The Royal Humane Society had held such competitions in the past.) The PHS imagined an international pool of competitors – essays could be in English, French, or Latin – and announced the competition in newspapers, to doctors (including Lettsom and Hawes) and medical students, and to fellow humane societies. (The competition was a bust. Essays were due by 1808, and by then only three had been received. The judges were the medical professors of the University of Pennsylvania. They deemed none of essays worthy of the award because none “appear[ed] to contain any original observations.” But, the judges said maybe to assuage any disappointment on the part of the PHS managers, that “that the Dissertations, especially one of them, are by no means destitute of merit, in regard to arrangement & style.”) The Royal Humane Society too stayed intellectually engaged with the larger world. In the early nineteenth century, the RHS highlighted Chinese, Arabian and South American types of life-preservers.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Bynum, “Hospital, Disease and Community,” p. 101. Thomas Eddy to Patrick Colquhoun, May 19, 1815, in Knapp, *The Life of Thomas Eddy*, pp. 230-231; on Eddy's deaf son, see p. 326; Wright, *The Transformation of Charity*, pp. 110-111.

<sup>31</sup> PHS Meeting Minutes, vol. 2, December 11, 1805. On RHS competitions, see, for instance, *RHS Reports 1787-89*, p. 254; *RHS Reports 1800*, p. 7. PHS Meeting Minutes, vol. 2, February 26, 1806; January 13, 1808; June 8, 1808, PHA. *RHS Reports 1813* (London, 1813), pp. 57-58.

Humane societies were not unique in their attention to the international arena. The governors of New York Hospital, for instance, offered their expertise with charitable hospital management to the international medical community in 1813 when they sent copies of *An Account of the New-York Hospital* to “Medical practitioners” around the United States and Europe. The *Account*, like pamphlets of many other charitable institutions, had multiple audiences. The governors targeted New York State legislators (the lion’s share of the Hospital’s funds came from the State) with avowals and evidence of the Hospital’s “great public utility.” They addressed would-be founders of similar institutions with information such as the layout and rules of the Hospital.<sup>32</sup>

Similarly, the managers of the Edinburgh Lunatic Asylum pursued building the Asylum as a cosmopolitan project. Before it opened in 1813, the managers publicized an account of the Asylum (which took two decades to get off the ground) “both at home and abroad.” (Abroad could mean outside Edinburgh or Scotland, not in foreign lands, but since a couple donations for the Asylum came from America and many came the East Indies, “abroad” may indicate here that the plan reached areas outside of Britain.) The managers gave two reasons for the wide circulation of the account. First, “all who could be benefited by the plans might have a ready opportunity of being possessed of them.” That is, like the managers of the New York Hospital, the Asylum managers thought they could contribute know-how to people engaging in similar programs elsewhere; the account, published in 1807, included fold-out pages with the elevation, floor plan, and ground plan of the projected asylum along with other information. Second, “still farther improvements of the plan might be received from intelligent judges.” In other words, the managers were soliciting advice too. Establishing an asylum in Edinburgh, as the

---

<sup>32</sup> NYH Governors’ Minutes vol. 3, February 2, 1813, NYH. *An Account of the New-York Hospital* (1811).

managers understood it, was a transnational, cooperative venture. In non-medical philanthropy and reform, the same held true. The New York Quaker philanthropist John Griscom's correspondence in the early 1820s included letters from American and European colleagues about prisons, schools, deaf and dumb institutions, and other causes replete with an international array of ideas, systems, plans, examples, and reforms.<sup>33</sup>

Besides corresponding with colleagues, philanthropists traveled to inspect examples of enterprises they planned to establish. Visiting charitable institutions was nothing new in the early nineteenth century, but it became a customary step for people setting up new undertakings. Philadelphians, for instance, toured New York City's charity and free schools circa 1807-1809. Likewise, Robert Reid, the architect of Edinburgh Lunatic Asylum, "visit[ed] the most celebrated Lunatic Asylums in England" so that he would be able "to avoid imperfections, and to introduce important improvements" in his plans. And the Baltimore hospital sent its architect to Philadelphia in 1811 to examine the Pennsylvania Hospital's lunatic cells before the Baltimore men began an addition for the care of the insane to the Baltimore hospital. The greater density of eleemosynary enterprises on both sides of the Atlantic by the early nineteenth century and faster transportation made it easier for people to see institutions in person before proceeding with projected ventures. It also meant that activists could see models fairly close to home. Alongside the "philanthropic tourism" of reformers like John Howard or Dorothea Dix who made vocations of journeying to inspect institutions, then, went a less

---

<sup>33</sup> *Short Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Lunatic Asylum at Edinburgh*, pp. 7, 10, 25-51, 10-11. *Address to the Public, Respecting the Establishment of a Lunatic Asylum at Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1807). W. C. Woodbridge to John Griscom, October 30, 1820; J. Bigelow to John Griscom, October 29, 1822; Baron Witinghoff to John Griscom, September 9, 1822; Joseph Dudley to John Griscom, April 22, 1820, John Griscom Correspondence, New York Public Library Manuscript and Archive Division.



outstanding, but more typical, phenomenon of regional due diligence trips. “All [could not] be HOWARDS,” but local leaders engaged in philanthropy in the same way, though on a smaller scale, that the great figures did.<sup>34</sup>

This travel set the stage for further growth in the size of humanitarian undertakings. By 1840, Americans and Britons organized the World’s Antislavery Convention in London to gather together antislavery advocates (from the United States and Britain, so much for the name). The kind of international philanthropic conference that John Murray, president of the Society of Universal Good-will of Norwich, England, had imagined back in the 1780s had now become viable as crossing the Atlantic became faster and traveling for beneficent ends became commonplace.<sup>35</sup>

### *Conclusion*

In the wake of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, the emphasis on international bonds had waned, but many aspects of philanthropic practice stayed the same. Activists continued corresponding, visiting, and cooperating with distant colleagues, especially when they were evaluating innovations and new institutions. As a result, eleemosynary infrastructures kept expanding and diversifying. Those continuities masked key changes. New trends, such as a focus on the spiritual rather than moral condition of the poor, emerged as a new generation of philanthropists came of age.

---

<sup>34</sup> Clinton, *An Address to the Benefactors and Friends of the Free School Society*, p. 15. *Short Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Lunatic Asylum at Edinburgh*, p. 9. James Smyth to Benjamin Rush, March 30, 1811, Rush Manuscripts, vol. 16, f. 28, LCP. (Likewise, growing urbanization in eighteenth-century England meant migrants often moved shorter distances than English migrants in early centuries had. P. J. Corfield, *The Impact of English Towns 1700-1800* (Oxford, 1982), p. 105.) George Rogers Taylor, *The Transportation Revolution* (New York, 1951). Dekker, “Transforming the Nation and the Child,” pp. 137-139; Brown, *Dorothea Dix: New England Reform*, pp. 100, 119, 123. White, *An Address to the Members of the Merrimack Humane Society, at their Anniversary Meeting, in Newburyport, Sept. 3, 1805*, p. 17.

<sup>35</sup> On the World Antislavery Convention, see McDaniel, ““Our Country is the World,”” chap. 2.

More significantly, because Britons and Americans no longer shared the sense of community that the men and women born in the 1740s or earlier had, the starting point for their collaboration was as strangers rather than as fellow nationals. Future generations of transatlantic coadjutors would not have to struggle with how civil war changed perceptions of community and moral responsibility. That context had been critical to the unfolding of new understandings of charitable obligation, and a lasting legacy of the breakup of the British Atlantic community was a worldwide scope to charitable endeavors. Most important, however, was transatlantic divergence in the direction of social welfare policies. After imperial disunion, Britons and Americans came to expect different things from government. The British state took over more of the functions that had been the province of philanthropists in the eighteenth century, while similar developments in the United States would await the aftermath of Americans' second civil war.

## Conclusion

Americans and Britons congratulated themselves for providing “the means of relief . . . for the afflicted of every description.” What philanthropists and their supporters did not perceive was that harm could sometimes come from beneficence. The activists of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox and their coadjutors did not realize, for instance, that vaccination could, in certain circumstances, undermine the prevention of smallpox: In India, British vaccination programs disrupted traditional religious smallpox inoculation rituals, and, by provoking suspicion and resistance, actually hindered the cause. The unintended consequence of vaccination efforts in India is sobering. The many critics of humanitarian endeavors – from Eric Williams to Michel Foucault and his countless followers to William Easterly – would not be surprised. They have drawn attention to self-interest and the drive to control the poor and disorderly as aspects of philanthropic endeavors, and rightly so.<sup>1</sup>

Yet the study of the economic motives and social control effects of humanitarianism – the “why” questions – has run its course. We have internalized the insights of the vast literature on philanthropy as social control: Historians do not talk about charitable institutions without drawing on those understandings, but the awareness that philanthropy was (and is) self-serving and that it has unintended, malign

---

<sup>1</sup> Hardie, *The Philadelphia Directory and Register* (1793), p. i; *Account of the Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress*, p. 3. David Arnold, *Colonizing the Body: State Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth-Century India*, chap. 3 (Berkeley, 1993). Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; William Easterly, *The White Man’s Burden: Why the West’s Efforts to Help the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good* (New York, 2006).

consequences should not prevent us from exploring new lines of analysis. Neither should it stop us from appreciating the moral complexity of beneficence. Philanthropic institutions meet immediate needs, carve out new areas for government action, and act as bulwarks against government power by allowing individuals and groups to help set communal agendas that tyrannous majorities might not support with public funds.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the exercise of power through charitable organizations is often closer to the ground than it is through the market or government and, therefore, weaker members of society may have more opportunity to assert their views.

In the place of the “why” questions, students of humanitarianism should now focus on the issues of “how.” Two recent histories of antislavery have explored how people figured out what actions to take or what tactics to use at certain points.<sup>3</sup> The question I have asked is related: How did people transform the practice of philanthropy so that, for instance, the Royal Jennerian Society’s pursuit of a worldwide goal seemed feasible? To answer that question, I have tried to cut eighteenth-century philanthropists down to size by focusing on the nitty-gritty details that fascinated them. Neither saints nor ogres, they were flawed, and very often vain, human beings. They did not recognize the baleful effects of their beneficence but did engage intellectually and, especially, practically with an array of human suffering and societal derangement.

Over the long eighteenth century, Americans and Britons built an ever-more complex infrastructure to reduce distress and promote order. Through evolutionary change, they transformed philanthropy. In the first half of the eighteenth century, universal benevolence had generally been praised as a morally desirable attitude, but

---

<sup>2</sup> This statement draws on the work of various scholars, esp. McCarthy, *American Creed*.

<sup>3</sup> Brown, *Moral Capital*; Newman, *The Transformation of American Antislavery*.

considered as a practical impossibility. At the end of the century, helping strangers locally, never mind faraway, continued to raise dilemmas as prefatory comments to the section on ethnic mutual aid societies, such as the St. Andrew's Society and the French Benevolent Society, in a city directory reveal. "When people fall into misfortunes in any part of the world, remote from the place of their nativity, it is natural for them to make their distress first known to those who were originally from the same country," the commentator opined in 1793. "The presumption in this case is, that the love of the native soil, which is inseparable from every human breast, will make their countrymen more ready than others to administer to their relief; and," – here the commentator revealed why aiding strangers could present problems – "some may be found among them, with whom they are connected by blood, who may have known some of their relatives, or, at least who may have better opportunities of being assured from local circumstances that they are not impostors."<sup>4</sup> Ethnic or religious organizations continued to play important roles in welfare provision. As those comments in the 1793 *Philadelphia Directory* reveal, there were compelling reasons for partiality in charity. Yet contemporaries had also found, and celebrated having found, ways to avoid "improper prejudices" in beneficence. That change in activists' local practices, with the concomitant increase in their international reach, was intertwined with the enlarging and diversifying of charitable infrastructures.

How did growth in both scale and scope come about? Through practical, targeted, and gradual innovations, contemporaries expanded the variety of charitable institutions, identified more and more discrete groups as objects worthy of aid, and reached for a worldwide scope to philanthropic endeavor. Those developments – the rise

---

<sup>4</sup> Hardie, *The Philadelphia Directory and Register* (1793), p. 205.

of humanitarianism – rested on the widespread and varied cosmopolitanism of citizens of the Atlantic world, the Consumer Revolution, and the making and unmaking of the British Empire.

With a latitudinarian appreciation of increasing global integration, this dissertation has probed the types of cosmopolitanism – which always coexisted with patriotic themes and civic boosterism – in philanthropy. By traveling, reading, and corresponding, activists ranged across space and gathered new ideas that reshaped local charitable infrastructures. By using translocal and international frames of reference when pitching new projects, managers situated their and their supporters' endeavors as part of the activities of a broader community. By calling on liberal language in their correspondence and publicity materials, philanthropists trumpeted universal benevolence as a goal. By finding ways to aid local or faraway strangers, contemporaries realized their catholic aims. Contemporaries' behaviors as citizens of the world were foundational to the elaboration of organized beneficence in the eighteenth century.

Cosmopolitan practices and ideas underlay the collection and adoption of new models of institutions and the building of charitable undertakings that dispensed aid on impartial grounds or that strove for worldwide reaches. The Consumer Revolution was another critical context in the accelerating evolution of beneficence in the eighteenth century. Contemporaries enjoyed and expected novelty and variety in goods and activities. Leaders and supporters, motivated by faith in gradual but steady improvement and by inevitable disappointments with charitable institutions, gravitated towards new models. Moreover, leaders recognized that one way to call forth middling folks' wealth was to offer supporters innovative programs, although consumers did not part ways with

their money unthinkingly. They had to be persuaded their funds would be well spent. Thus, effective managers and opinion-makers had to be savvy publicists.

In addition to pragmatic cosmopolitanism and consumer mindsets, imperial disunion shaped developments in philanthropy. Americans and Britons struggled with the nature of charitable obligation as they struggled with the civil war in the Anglophone community. After the war, communication in the empire of humanity provided a way to rebuild ties. The loss of a shared identity based on Britishness and Protestantism (sacrificed by the British efforts to mollify Quebec Catholics and the American alliance with France) meant that activists on both sides of the Atlantic turned to catholic language to express their aims. That trend dovetailed with epistolary cooperation and the peregrinations of individuals to expand the range of Anglo-American philanthropy.

Developments in beneficence in any given community and in the Atlantic world as a whole were intertwined. Border-crossing individuals gathered and introduced new institutions and ideas to the public at large and to individual communities and, in doing so, they played a vital role in the expansion and acceleration of philanthropic activity. Because founding associated-philanthropy ventures were local undertakings, instigators propelled the formation of charitable organizations. People who crossed borders not only set agendas. With their own needs to establish themselves in new communities, they played important roles in influencing when and where charitable institutions came to new cities.

With the celebrity of English prison and hospital reformer John Howard, local and international circumstances were again intertwined. To fund and advance philanthropic projects, charitable leaders courted consumers' attention. Even Howard, who held

mainstream society at bay, fashioned his image in recognition of the public's expectations. But to his chagrin, philanthropic trendsetters on both sides of the Atlantic lionized him as "the Patriot of the World": Exploiting Howard as a cosmopolite helped leaders pursue local and national agendas. In doing so, contemporaries embraced the impact of consumer culture on philanthropy and furthered the impersonal direction in which beneficence had been moving since the sixteenth century.

Britons and Americans made John Howard a star in the wake of the American Revolution. Similarly, imperial disunion led members of the Anglophone community to think anew about the nature of charitable responsibility. As fellow nationals became foreigners, some activists sought new ways to aid suffering strangers. Their over-reaching as they aimed to build transnational charitable enterprises played a fruitful role in the process of learning how to succeed – or what to succeed at. Moreover, their floating of plans for projects, even if they went nowhere, sowed ideas and ideals. Yet organizations could not operate on a transnational scale in their own right in the 1780s, as failed projects to help migrants on an international scale and to cooperate on a transatlantic basis to relieve distressed mariners reveal.

Over time, philanthropists found ways to aid suffering strangers far away; those methods grew from contemporaries' experience helping strangers locally. Philanthropists in many cities founded public-subscription charities that gave relief, based on subscribers' recommendations, to people of diverse religious and ethnic backgrounds. Other charities sought specifically to help strangers including foreigners, and white antislavery advocates, pushed by the resistance and activism of people of African descent, created organizations that made often-distant, different folks the object of their



moral concern. Because the humane society movement aided drowning victims without regard to race, religion, ethnicity, nationality, gender, or status (logically, though not necessarily obviously to contemporaries), it provided an unparalleled example of the practice of impartial charity. And because the movement emphasized communication with faraway colleagues and the dissemination of information far and wide, humane society supporters found that they had institutionalized a method for aiding suffering strangers on an ongoing way. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the smallpox vaccination movement, forged by individuals, charities, and government institutions, built on the structures of the resuscitation movement to pursue a worldwide philanthropic undertaking. Even so, for charitable organizations to run very well, their managers had to focus on the local. Charities raised most funds locally, and, while the international arena was rich with ideas, it could distract managers from the task of building institutions that local people used and supported.

Although growth and change continued to come from transnational ties, at the turn of the nineteenth century, leaders sensed their supporters were turning inward. They therefore downplayed international bonds in recognition of the rise of nationalism in the Atlantic world after decades of revolution and war. In spite of that shift in attitude, little changed in other ways. Britons and Americans had long borrowed models for institutions from other peoples. In the middle of the eighteenth century and then with greater urgency after the American Revolution, they made practices such as adopting foreign models and disseminating foreign ideas customary in philanthropy. They also found ways to help suffering strangers locally. They had expanded the scale and scope of charitable activity to the point that global undertakings seemed and, indeed, were

feasible. According to a recent historian, “. . . the early history of American philanthropy was written in collective terms.”<sup>5</sup> So too was it, and the history of British beneficence, written in transnational terms, to such an extent that to talk of American or British philanthropy makes little sense.

Local, religious, ethnic, regional, and national communities affected how activists went about their charitable endeavors as they affected so many other aspects of people’s lives. But people in the eighteenth century also commonly crossed those borders physically and mentally, though not necessarily willingly. Although distinct, the ways that enslaved people, the lower sorts, and the middling-elite sorts grappled with participating in various and pluralist communities made cosmopolitanism a defining trait of the era. Different from universalism, the applied cosmopolitanism of early-modern men and women made the Atlantic world work, to the benefit of some and at great cost to others. *Philosophes* idealized being citizens of the world, but for many more people the practicalities of living in heterogeneous communities in a globalizing world mattered much more. As people like John Crawford or Count Rumford or the black Moravian preacher Rebecca Protten show, eighteenth-century people lived their lives flexibly, with much less regard for boundaries than historians have often had. Moreover, even as Americans and Britons defined their nations in opposition to others, they also looked abroad.<sup>6</sup>

Like so many other developments in the long eighteenth century, changes in humanitarian activity depended on contemporaries’ attention to foreign ideas and institutions. Working together, activists around America, Britain, and Europe had set up

---

<sup>5</sup> McCarthy, *American Creed*, p. 202.

<sup>6</sup> On Rebecca Protten, see Sensbach, *Rebecca’s Revival*.

charitable infrastructures that could fight death and disease internationally.

Organizations today, such as Doctors Without Borders and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, build on their legacy.

Smallpox vaccination efforts could hamper more effective inoculation practices and the Gates Foundation has been criticized for favoring flashy new research over efficacious, but dull, methods of combating disease such as malaria. Philanthropists' short-sightedness and craving for attention and acclaim can be issues of life and death. Motives and impact matter. In the past, surely as today, motives could be profound, petty, or self-interested, and impact included all economic activity surrounding fundraising and spending, social benefits to activists and supporters, the relief of immediate distress, and, for the long-term, the creation of new agendas, such as lifesaving. We need a new, more complex framework for thinking about beneficence that recognizes that developments in charitable infrastructures in a given community could have more to do with activists' ties to other cities than with local conditions. Americans' and Britons' pragmatic, sometimes competitive cosmopolitanism, their embrace of the Consumer Revolution, and their grappling with imperial disunion created the context in which humanitarian rose. Less new than a great acceleration of changes begun centuries earlier, philanthropy in the Anglophone world in the long eighteenth century grew thanks to the interactions among citizens of the Atlantic world.

## Appendix One

Genealogy of Founded and Attempted Humane Societies in the Anglophone World plus Miscellaneous Other Resuscitation Institutions (Excluded are some reported societies for which information is very limited and/or where there was no confirmation from anyone in the locale of a society's existence, such as Algiers. Also excluded are individuals' efforts to publicize knowledge of resuscitation in places, such as North Wales, where no independent societies evidently were founded. Many of those institutions probably lasted a short time or declined and then were revived. I have only included information on length of existence when I had a reasonable degree of certainty about it. The RHS reports suggest that many of these institutions had longer or more continuous existences than may in fact be the case. Much of the information comes from the RHS reports; the RHS exaggerated its impact, but the RHS's reports include many letters from founders of new societies thanking the RHS for sending materials to found the societies and I assume that information, even if there were other inputs, is correct.)

<b>Organization/Place</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Instigator/connections/misc.</b>	<b>Length of existence</b>
Amsterdam Society for the Recovery of the Drowned	1767	First such society	Still in existence; information from Dr. Willem Frijhoff of the Free University, Amsterdam on its continued existence
Paris resuscitation institution	1771	Founded by city magistrates	
Royal (London) Humane Society	1774	William Hawes (inspired by reading Cogan's translation of the Dutch group), Thos. Cogan, and friends	Still in existence; see <a href="http://www.royalhumane.org">www.royalhumane.org</a>
Norwich, England	c. 1775	Mayor and corporation established a program, in emulation of RHS, per RHS	
Cork (Ireland) HS	1775; 1786	Dr. Richard Townshend had received material from the RHS in 1775 and subsequently a society was formed in Cork. In 1786, a joint dispensary and humane society was formed.	
Devon and Cornwall (England) HS	c. 1776	Thomas Reynolds, a coroner, asked the RHS for information needed to found a society.	
Hull (England) HS	c. 1776	Charles Scott asked the RHS, on behalf of the city government, for information needed to found a society.	Seems to have faded and been re-founded c. 1786
Liverpool	1775	City government set up program at suggestion of a surgeon; a doctor, Thomas Houlston (d. c. 1785), had been inspired by the translations of the Amsterdam society and publicized resuscitation information in Liverpool from 1773, per RHS. The first dedicated Receiving House (where apparently dead people could be treated) was set up in Liverpool.	Faded; re-founded

<b>Organization/Place</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Instigator/connections/misc.</b>	<b>Length of existence</b>
Chester (England) infirmary	1776	Infirmary set up a resuscitation program in imitation of RHS.	
Dublin HS	c. 1776; 1785		Evidently founded twice, the second time as part of a dispensary established in 1785
Humane Society of Philadelphia	1780/1787	Robert Parrish first proposed society. Information from French army doctor in America proved vital in 1780 to the PHS's pursuit of its program. Revival may have been spurred by Dr. Moyes, who was promoting humane societies at the behest of A. Johnson.	To the 1830s; a successor organization, the Philadelphia Humane Society and Skating Club, is in existence.
Whitehaven (England) Dispensary and HS	c. 1784	Set up as part of the Dispensary; instigated by Dr. Joshua Dixon and another man. In 1768, Dixon had attended lectures in London on resuscitation given by Dr. Hunter and Mr. Hewson, prompted by news from a Dutch publication of the resuscitation of a boy. At the time, Hewson's experiments with resuscitating animals had mixed results. Received materials from RHS to found society.	
Bristol (England) HS		William Dyer was instigator.	Society had declined and was revived in a union with the Severn Humane Society with John Hurford playing a leading role in that development.
Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts	1785	Dr. Moyes served as catalyst.	Still in existence; see <a href="http://www.masslifesavingawards.com">www.masslifesavingawards.com</a>
Severn Valley (England) Humane Society	1786	John Hurford, former RHS member, instigated society when he moved to the Severn Valley. Received materials from RHS to found society.	
Barbados General Dispensary and Humane Society	1787	John Crawford seems to have instigated the humane society after a visit to England where his brother was involved in the RHS. Received materials from RHS to found society.	To 1788

<b>Organization/Place</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Instigator/connections/misc.</b>	<b>Length of existence</b>
Portugal	c. 1788	Charles Murray, HM consul at Madeira and an RHS member, promoted resuscitation knowledge in Portugal. Received materials from RHS to found society. Within a few years, the Royal Academy of Sciences in Lisbon resolved to offer rewards for lifesaving.	
Rochester (England) HS	c. 1788	RHS supporter, Richard Thompson, of Rochester was involved in founding humane society in that area.	
Leith (Scotland) HS	c. 1788	Received materials from RHS to found society.	
Northamptonshire (England) Preservative Society	1789	John English Dolben instigated society.	
Lancashire (England) Humane Society	c. 1789	Lifesaving directions were written up by Dr. Thomas Percival, per Percival in a letter to B. Rush.	
Newcastle (England)	c. 1789	Founded as offshoot of Medical Society.	
Jamaica HS	1789	Mr. Chamberlain, an RHS medical assistant and former Jamaica resident, instigated formation of JHS from London. He urged his former medical colleagues to form a society and sent necessary materials from the RHS.	Per Jamaica directory, the Jamaica Medical Society was formed out of the Humane Society.
Glasgow HS	c. 1791		
Sunderland (England) HS	1791	Received materials from RHS to found society.	
Prague	1792	Dr. Adalbert Zarda, a university professor, asked the RHS to become a member and for materials to form a society in Prague.	
Montrose (Scotland) HS	1792	Proposed by Adam Glegg, formed under auspices of Montrose hospital. Received materials from RHS to found society.	
Limerick (Ireland) HS	1792	Asked for and received materials from RHS to found society.	

<b>Organization/Place</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Instigator/connections/misc.</b>	<b>Length of existence</b>
Londonderry (Ireland) HS	1792	Asked for and received materials from RHS to found society. Mr. Chamberlain, RHS member (and Jamaica HS instigator), was a correspondent of one of the Londonderry HS founders; that man told the RHS that Chamberlain could vouch for the Londonderry men.	
South Carolina Humane Society	1793	Dr. Elisha Poinsett was instigator. He had lived in London in the 1780s; imported RHS apparatus and spurred founding of a humane society by the Medical Society and City Council.	Evidently never really took off
Humane Society of the State of New York	1794	NY Dispensary had imported lifesaving equipment and advertised its availability in 1792, but did not set up a humane-society program. That same year, Dr. David Hosack urged the formation of a humane society on his return from medical study in Britain, as did Dr. Amasa Dingley in a 1794 speech to the Medical Society.	Faded in 1795.
Belfast (Ireland)	c. 1794	Asked for and received materials from RHS to found society. Formed as part of another charity.	
Halifax (Nova Scotia) Marine Humane Society	1795	Rev. Andrew Brown seems to have been the instigator; he was a link between the Mass. Humane Society and the Halifax Marine Humane Society.	
Leicester (England) HS	c. 1796	Received materials from RHS to found society. Joseph Boultree was institutor.	May have become the Rivers Wreak and Eye HS; re-founded in 1805 (but Rivers Wreak and Eye HS then continued to exist)
St. Petersburg, Russia	1797	Stephen Shairp, HM consul, and other members of the British Factory there tried to set up receiving houses and had asked for and received materials from RHS to do so.	

Organization/Place	Established	Instigator/connections/misc.	Length of existence
Melton Mowbray (England) HS	c. 1798	Joseph Boultree, who had instituted the Leicester HS, moved from another Leicestershire town to MM in 1798. Presumably Boultree was an instigator.	
Wisbech (England) HS	1799	Founded with help from the RHS.	
Copenhagen	1800	Information in RHS publications played key role in inspiring founding of society.	
Kingston-on-Hull (England) HS	1800		
York (England) HS	1800	Asked RHS for information; received apparatus from Savigny.	
Merrimack (Mass.) Humane Society	1801		Until at least 1813
Baltimore Humane Society	1804	Founded as part of the Dispensary; Dr. John Crawford requested information from Benjamin Rush about the PHS.	
Bath (England) Humane Society	1805	Founded by Thomas Cogan and friends after Cogan's move to Bath.	
Burlington (U.S.) Humane Society		Referred to in the PHS minutes in 1806.	
Brunswick (U.S.) Humane Society		Referred to in the PHS minutes in 1809.	
Teignmouth (England) HS	1807	Established with aid from RHS.	
Suffolk HS and Woodbridge HS (England)	c. 1806/07	Shared the same president	
Canterbury (England) HS	c. 1807		
Paisley (Scotland) HS	c. 1807		
Falmouth (England)	1807	Established with aid from the RHS as part of the Dispensary there.	
Bedford (England) HS	1807	Received aid from RHS; prompted by drowning of a child.	
Ipswich (England) HS	1807	A clergyman who gave lectures on resuscitation in Ipswich as part of the founding of the society had attended Hawes's lectures in London years earlier.	



Organization/Place	Established	Instigator/connections/misc.	Length of existence
Swansea (Wales) HS	1808		
Wilmington (Del.) Humane Society	1813	A group of Wilmington residents asked the PHS for information needed for forming a humane society. On Jan. 14, 1815, the Wilmington <i>American Watchman</i> printed details of the Wilmington Humane Society, but no other references to it have been found.	
Plymouth (England)	c. 1815		
Isle of Wight HS	c. 1815		
Portsmouth and Portsea (England) HS	c. 1815		
Preston (England) HS	c. 1815		
Newry (England)	c. 1815		
Southampton (England) HS	c. 1815		
St. Petersburg, Russia	1818	The Literary Board of St. Petersburg asked the PHS for information needed for forming a humane society.	
Cincinnati	1818	A Cincinnati man asked the PHS for information needed for forming a humane society.	

Sources: *RHS Reports 1774-1815*; MHS annual discourses; Philadelphia Humane Society minutes vols. 1 & 2; *The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York*; *Account of the Dublin General Dispensary and Humane Society*; Benjamin Rush Manuscripts, vol. 3, f. 138 & vol. 28, f. 59; Waring, A *History of Medicine in South Carolina*; (Halifax) *Royal Gazette and Nova Scotia Advertiser*, December 16, 1794; *The Institution of the Merrimack Humane Society*; *Bath Humane Society, Instituted in the Year 1805; Supported by Voluntary Contributions*; (Wilmington, Del.) *American Watchman*, January 1, 1815. See also Chapter One.

## Appendix Two Honorary Memberships

### HUMANE SOCIETIES' HONORARY MEMBERS

#### Cork Dispensary and Humane Society

John Coakley Lettsom, honorary member and corresponding physician (1786)

Source: *RHS Reports* 1785-86

#### Halifax (Nova Scotia) Marine Humane Society

President of the RHS (1794)

Vice-Presidents of the RHS (1794)

Register of the RHS (1794)

Source: *RHS Reports* 1795

#### Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Between 1811 and 1817, the society did not print lists of honorary members. There were no new names on the 1817 list.

Rt. Hon Earl of Stamford, President of the RHS, London (1792)

William Hawes, M.D., Register of RHS (1792)

John C. Lettsom, M.D. F.R.S and A.A.S, treasurer of RHS (1792)

Timothy Pickering, Esq., Post-master general of the U.S. (1793) [On at least one occasion, he conveyed a letter between the Philadelphia and Massachusetts Humane Societies.]

Dr. John Osborne, of Middletown, CT (1793)

Nathaniel Adams, of Portsmouth, NH (1793)

Rev. Dr. Erskine of Edinburgh (1793) [Prominent Church of Scotland cleric; he was a director of the Scottish Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SSPCK) in the 1760s and 1770s. John Lathrop, long an MHS officer, was a correspondent of the SSPCK.]

Hon. John Pickering, of Portsmouth, NH (1793) [Chief Justice of New Hampshire from 1790 to 1795. Incidentally, according to the ANB, he had a disabling fear of crossing bodies of water.]

Dr. Ammi Rummah Cutter, Portsmouth, NH (1793) [He was a prominent New Hampshire doctor who, inter alia, had served in the Continental Army's medical establishment and been a delegate to the New Hampshire constitutional convention.]

Hon. John Langdon, of Portsmouth, NH (1793) [Wealthy New Hampshire merchant, delegate to the Constitutional Convention, President of New Hampshire, U.S. Senator]

Capt. John Calef, of the island of St. Kitts (1793) [In 1788, he had donated £1.16.0 to the Society.]

Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia (1793)

Rev. Andrew Brown, Halifax, later of Edinburgh (1793; first on list in 1794) [He had been made a member after a visit to Boston in 1791.]

Rev. John Kemp, Edinburgh (1794) [A director of the SSPCK in 1780s-1800s. John Lathrop was a correspondent of the SSPCK.]

Hon. James Sheafe, Esq., Portsmouth (1794)

John Bulkeley, Esq., Lisbon (1795; name first appears 1796) [Lisbon wine merchant]

Mr. Thomas Bulkeley, Lisbon (probably named 1795; name first appears 1796) [Lisbon wine merchant]

Anthony Fothergill, M.D., Bath, G.B. (elected 1795; name first appears 1796)

Mr. Edward [sic; should be Edmund] Goodwin [or Goodwyn], Bath, G.B. (elected 1795;

name first appears 1796)  
 William Russell, Philadelphia, later Middletown, CT (1796)  
 Hon. Oliver Ellsworth, Chief Justice of the United States (1797)  
 Hon. James Sheafe, Portsmouth (1797) [Merchant and New Hampshire politician (see  
 Appleton's)]  
 Hon. Samuel Tenny, Exeter (1797)  
 Dr. Oliver Baron, Calcutta (1802)  
 Hon. Jedidiah Huntington, New-London (1802) [Revolutionary War general]  
 Hon. Thomas Fraser, Esq., London (1805)  
 Rev. Timothy Alden, Portsmouth, NH (1805) [Congregational minister and educator; per  
 ANB, he was an active Mason]  
 Hon. David Ramsay, Esq., Charleston, S.C. (1808) [Prominent Charleston doctor,  
 historian and politician]  
 Hon. Nicholas Gilman, Exeter (1808) [New Hampshire politician]  
 David Hull of Fairfield, CT (1809)

Sources: MHS annual discourses; *RHS Reports 1796*; SSPCK reports; *ANB*; *Appleton's Cyclopaedia*

### **Northamptonshire Preservative Society**

Honorary Directors:  
 Thomas Cogan, M.D.  
 Wm. Hawes, M.D.  
 Rev. Wm. Agutter, A.M.  
 Rev. James Chelsum, D.D.  
 Rev. Septimus Hodson, M.B.  
 Rev. Robert Nares, A.M.  
 Rev. Richard Nicoll, D.D.  
 Rev. E. Hay Drummond, D.D.  
 Alexander Johnson, M.D.; Anthony Fothergill, M.D.  
 Rev. Gerrard Andrews, A.M.

Source: *RHS Reports 1796*  
 Years of admission are not given.

### **Humane Society of Philadelphia**

#### Corresponding Members

Dr. Coste, First Physician to the French Army in American (1781)  
 Gosvinus Erkelens (1782) [He was a Connecticut man, from Amsterdam, who wrote to  
 the PHS to ask for materials so he could promote the cause in his area.]

#### Honorary Members

Thomas Russell, President of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of  
 Massachusetts (1799) [Russell was dead by the time he was named.]  
 Benjamin Waterhouse M.D. (1799)  
 John Coakley Lettsom, M.D., F R S of London (1799) [Per Pettigrew, Lettsom was  
 elected an honorary member in 1781. There is no evidence to support that contention in  
 the PHS records.]  
 Anthony Fothergill, M.D., F R S of Bath in England (1799)  
 William Hawes M D, Treasurer of the Royal Humane Society of London (1799)  
 William Heberden, M.D., F R S Pall Mall [London] (1799)  
 Edward [sic; should be Edmund] Goodwin [or Goodwyn] M.D. of Woodbridge, Great  
 Britain (1799) [He was the 1788 gold medal winner of the RHS essay competition on  
 suspended animation].

Sources: PHS Minutes vol. 1

### **Royal Humane Society Honorary Members**

Rt. Rev. Richard Watson, Lord Bishop of Landaff (1791; first listed under Honorary Governors in 1795)

His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York (1792; listed first in 1810)

Hon. Thomas Russell, President of the Massachusetts Humane Society (1792)

Dr. Adalbert Zarda, M.L.I.C. & M.D. Profess. Reg. Pub. Extra., Prague (1793) [In a June 1792 letter to the RHS, Zarda explained he was developing a professorship on suspended animation and resuscitation, requested RHS materials for he could pursue a resuscitation program in Prague, and asked to be made an RHS member.]

Julia, Duchess of Giovanni, and the Baroness of Mudersbach (1793)

Hon. J. Ignacius de Pina Manique, General of Her Majesty's Household, Intendant-General of Police (1793) [Per a letter from a Portuguese doctor to the RHS, he had ordered the placement of lifesaving equipment around Lisbon.]

Dr. Benjamin Rush, M.D. and Professor of Medicine, Philadelphia (1794) [proposed by Lettsom]

Rev. John Charlsworth, D.D. (1794)

Dr. Anthony Fothergill, M.D. and F.R.S. (1795) [of Bath at the time of his admission]

Rt. Rev. Samuel Horsley, Lord Bishop of Rochester (1795)

Mrs. Henrietta Fordyce (1797)

Count Leopold de Berchtold, Knight of the Holy Order of St. Stephen, Tuscany (per footnote in the 1801 report, he was named in 1797; his name is first listed in 1799)

[Berchtold, per a note in the *RHS Reports 1811*, founded the Moravian Humane Society. He and Zarda evidently knew each other.]

John Gretton, Esq. (1798) [He wrote odes and the like for RHS festivals.]

Dr. Christian August Struve, Gorlitz, Saxony (1798) [Struve was a correspondent of Lettsom and of the RHS. He promoted the cause of resuscitation in Germany.]

Count Rumford (1798) [He was dropped from the list after 1805.]

HRH The Duke of Cumberland (1802) [As Prince Ernest, he was given an honorary medallion in 1798, for his role in restoring an attempted suicide to life.]

Isaac Hawkins Browne, Esq. V.P.—M.P. (1803)

Dr. John Coakley Lettsom, V.P. F.R.S. (1803)

Rev. Dr. Richard Valpy, F.A.S (1803)

Rev. Thomas Gisbourne, M.A. (1803)

Dr. Edward Jenner (1803) [A footnote to his name says “Royal Jennerian Society.”]

Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of Gloucester (1803)

Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of St. David's (1804)

Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of St. Asaph (1804)

Thomas Thoresby, Esq. (1804) [He lived in Holywell, North Wales, and promoted the humane society movement there, including having materials on lifesaving translated into Welsh.]

Hon. and Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of Bristol (later Bishop of Exeter) (1805)

Rt. Rev. Dr. Madison, Bishop of Virginia (1805) [Madison was a correspondent of Lettsom's and was president of the Virginia state hospital for insane people. He advocated – and used at the hospital – a technique involving the resuscitative process to restore patients having fits to their senses. First, a patient was plunged into water only enough to temporarily stop respiration. Then, the resuscitative process was used.]

His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of Russia (1809)

Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of Chichester (1800; listed first in 1810)

Rt. Hon. Earl Poulett, President of the Bath Humane Society (1811)

Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of Cloyne (1811)

Thomas Cogan, M.D., Surviving Institutor of the Royal Humane Society (1811)

Benj. Say, M.D., President of the Humane Society of Philadelphia (1811)

Rt. Hon. Lord Henniker, M.P. (1811)

Rev. Gerard Andrews, D.D., Dean of Canterbury (1811)

Robert Humphrey Marten, Esq. (1811)

Rev. John Owen, A.M. (1811)

Rev. John Lathrop, D.D. President of the Academy of Arts, Cambridge, Mass. (1811)  
 Matthew Clarkson, Esq., President of the Humane Society, New York (1811)  
 Geo. Wm. Manby, Captain, Barrack Master, Yarmouth (1811) [He developed lifesaving techniques and equipment methods and, also, prompted the Edinburgh Skating Club to add lifeguard activities to their functions.]  
 Ronald M'Donald, Esq. of Staff, Isle of Skie, North Britain (1811)  
 HRH The Duke of Kent (1813)  
 Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of Chester (1813)  
 Edward Richard Adams, Esq. (1814)  
 Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of Ely (1814)  
 HRH The Duke of Sussex (1815)

Sources: *RHS Reports* 1793-1815; Certificate of membership for Rush in RHS, Rush Manuscripts, LCP

#### MEMBERS OF LEARNED BODIES

##### Men Mentioned in this Study who Were Fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences

Jeremy Belknap (1786)  
 James Bowdoin (1780)  
 DeWitt Clinton (1816)  
 Aaron Dexter, M.D., Boston (1784)  
 Dr. John Haygarth, Chester, England (1789)  
 John Howard (1790)  
 Rev. John Lathrop, Boston (1790)  
 John Coakley Lettsom, MD, Fellow of the Royal, Antiquarian and Medical Societies of London (1788)  
 Samuel L. Mitchill, New York (1797)  
 Rev. Jedidiah Morse, Charlestown, Massachusetts (1796)  
 Dr. Henry Moyes (1785)  
 Thomas Percival, Manchester (1789)  
 Benjamin Rush, MD (1788)  
 Count Rumford (1796) [He had donated funds to the AAAS to endow a prize medal.]  
 Thomas Russell, Boston (1788)  
 Dr. John Warren, Boston (1781)  
 Benjamin Waterhouse (with conditions) (1795)

Sources: New York Daily Advertiser, September 11, 1788; American Academy of Arts and Sciences Papers II, Boston Athenaeum; AAAS Book of Members; Warren, *A Eulogy on the Honorable Thomas Russell*

##### Men Mentioned in this Study Who Were Members of the American Philosophical Society

Rev. Jeremy Belknap (1784)  
 Hon. James Bowdoin, Governor of Massachusetts (1787)  
 Anthony Fothergill, M.D. of Bath, England (1792)  
 Dr. John Fothergill, London (1763)  
 Dr. William Hawes (1805)  
 Dr. David Hosack (1811)  
 Dr. Thomas Percival, Manchester (1786)  
 Dr. John Coakley Lettsom, London (1787) [Proposed by Thomas Parke]  
 Dr. Samuel L. Mitchill (1791)  
 John R. B. Rodgers (1787)  
 Benjamin Rush (1768)

Sources: *New York Daily Advertiser*, July 28, 1786, February 3, 1787, July 28, 1787, February 4, 1792; *Gentleman's Magazine*; Lettsom to Parke, Society Misc. Collection, HSP

**Men Mentioned in this Study Who Were Corresponding  
Members of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society**

James Currie (1781)  
John Haygarth  
John Coakley Lettsom  
Benjamin Rush (1784)

Thomas Percival was one of the founders.

Sources: *Memoir of the Life, Writings, and Correspondence of James Currie*; *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Percival M.D.*

**Men Mentioned in this Study Who Were Fellows of the Royal Society**

James Bowdoin, Boston  
James Currie, Liverpool  
David Hosack, New York  
Anthony Fothergill, Bath, England  
John Fothergill, London  
John Howard, Cardington, Bedfordshire, England  
Edward Jenner, Berkeley, Gloucestershire, England  
John Coakley Lettsom, London  
Thomas Percival, Manchester, England  
Count Rumford, London, Munich, Paris

Sources: *ANB Online*; *Memoir of the Life, Writings, and Correspondence of James Currie*; *David Hosack: Citizen of New York*; *'Take Time by the Forelock'*; *Chain of Friendship*; *Memoirs of the Public and Private of John Howard*; *Edward Jenner*; *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*; *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Percival M.D.*; *Knight of the White Sparrow*

**Men Mentioned in this Study Who Were Corresponding Members of the London Medical Society**

James Currie, Liverpool (1792)  
Amasa Dingley, New York (1796)  
Joshua Dixon, Whitehaven, England  
David Hosack, New York  
John Howard (honorary; 1 of 3, per Lettsom in 1789)  
Thomas Parke, Philadelphia [Proposed by Lettsom]  
Benjamin Rush, Philadelphia (1784)  
C. A. Struve, Gorlitz, Saxony  
John Warren, Boston  
Benjamin Waterhouse, Boston  
Amos Windship, Boston [Proposed by Lettsom]

Sources: *New York Daily Advertiser*, June 17, 1790; Bartlett, *An Oration Occasioned by the Death of John Warren, M.D. Past Grand Master*; Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, f. 6, vol. 4, f. 65, LCP; Lettsom to Parke, Gratz Collection, HSP; Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*; Lettsom Papers, Wellcome Library; (New York) *Argus. Greenleaf's New Daily Advertiser*, August 31, 1796

**Medical Society of Edinburgh**

Samuel Bard (1763)  
James Currie (1778)  
Edmund Goodwyn (1780) [Annual president one year]  
Joshua Dixon (1767)  
Anthony Fothergill (1761)  
John Haygarth (1763)  
John Coakley Lettsom (Honorary; 1788)  
Samuel Latham Mitchill (1785)

Thomas Percival (1763)  
John R. B. Rodgers (1784)  
Benjamin Rush (1767; honorary, 1785) John Howard (Honorary, 1787)

Source: *List of the Members of the Medical Society of Edinburgh, Instituted 1737—Incorporated by Royal Charter 1778* (Edinburgh, 1796)

#### MEMBERSHIPS OF SELECT INDIVIDUALS

##### **Thomas Percival of Manchester**

American Academy of Arts and Sciences  
American Philosophical Society  
Fellow of the Royal Society  
Fellow of the Royal Society of Paris  
London Medical Society  
Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society founder  
Royal Society of Edinburgh

Sources: *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Percival M.D*  
Rush Manuscripts, vol. 28, f. 60, LCP

##### **Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia**

American Academy of Arts and Sciences  
American Philosophical Society (1768)  
Edinburgh Medical Society  
Physical Society of Edinburgh  
(Lexington, Kentucky) Society for the Promotion of Medical and Philosophical  
Knowledge (1799)  
(London) Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (1773)  
London Medical Society (1784) [Proposed by Lettsom]  
Royal Humane Society  
Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Massachusetts Medical Society (1787)  
Preston (England) Lit. and Phil. (1812) [Proposed by Lettsom]  
New York Medical Society (1808)  
New York Historical Society (1810)  
Imperial Academy of Medicine, St. Petersburg (c. 1812)

Sources: Butterfield, *Letters of Benjamin Rush*; Rush Manuscripts, LCP

##### **John Coakley Lettsom of London**

American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1788)  
American Philosophical Society (1787)  
Agricultural Society of Amsterdam (1789)  
Bath Agricultural Society (1789)  
Bath Philosophical Society  
Bristol Medical Society (corresponding) (1791)  
University of Cambridge, Mass. (honorary member) (1790)  
Colchester Medical Society (honorary) (1786)  
Cork Humane Society and Dispensary (1786)  
Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh (1791)  
Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh (1788)  
Royal Physical Society of Edinburgh (honorary) (1791)  
Horticultural Society of Edinburgh (1813)  
Fellow of the Royal Society  
Royal Humane Society [honorary, as well as an officer of the organization] (1803)

Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society (1781)  
 Humane Society of Massachusetts (honorary) (1792)  
 Massachusetts Historical Society (c. 1796)  
 Massachusetts Society for Promoting Agriculture (1793)  
 Massachusetts Medical Society (1792)  
 Academy of Arts and Sciences of Montpelier (1790)  
 Medical Society of Montpelier (honorary) (1790)  
 Royal Academy of Sciences, Montpelier (1792) [Per Pettigrew, thanks to M.  
 Broussonet.]  
 Medical Society of Aberdeen (honorary) (1796)  
 Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle (honorary) (1793)  
 Linnean Society of New England (honorary) (1815)  
 Medical Society of New Haven (honorary) (1789)  
 Medical Society of New York (honorary) (1789)  
 Medical Society of the State of New York (1800; proposed by Hosack)  
 New-York Historical Society (honorary) (1813)  
 New York Hospital (1798)  
 Pennsylvania Abolition Society (1792)  
 College of Physicians of Philadelphia (1782; associate 1802)  
 Humane Society of Philadelphia (1799) [Per Pettigrew, Lettsom was made an honorary  
 member in 1781. There is no evidence in the PHS records in support of that claim, but  
 other dates that Pettigrew gives generally are accurate so perhaps there is something  
 behind Pettigrew's information.]  
 Medical Lyceum of Philadelphia (1808)  
 Philadelphia Medical Society (1803)  
 Preston Literary and Philosophical Society

Sources: Pettigrew, *Memoirs of . . . Lettsom*; PHS Minutes vol. 1; MHS annual discourses; *RHS Reports*

**Benjamin Waterhouse**

Academy of Sciences, Letters, Arts, Agriculture and Commerce of Marseilles (1806)  
 Royal Humane Society  
 London Medical Society (1790)  
 Humane Society of Philadelphia (1799)  
 New Hampshire Medical Society (1808)

Sources: Waterhouse Papers, Countway Library



## Bibliography

### PRIMARY SOURCES

#### Manuscript Collections

##### **Bodleian Library, Oxford**

Letters to John Howard, MS English Misc. c. 332

##### **British Library, London**

Hardwicke Papers

Papers Relative to a Monument to John Howard

Correspondence of Arthur Young

##### **Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, Boston**

Benjamin Waterhouse Papers

Records of the Boston Dispensary

##### **Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia**

Clifford Correspondence

Howard Edwards Collection

Etting Collection

Gratz Collection

Old Swedes Church Gloria Dei Burial Records

##### **Library Company of Philadelphia**

Benjamin Rush Manuscripts

##### **Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore**

“A Letter Addressed to Lieutenant General Mathew on the means of preventing the method of treating and origins of the Diseases most prevalent and which prove most destr[uctive] to the Natives of Cold Climates visiting or residing in Warm Countries by John Crawford, M.D.,” Box 130, Manuscript Collections of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland

Correspondence of John Crawford

##### **Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston**

Jeremy Belknap Papers

Massachusetts Humane Society Papers

James Murray Papers

James Murray Robbins Papers

##### **New York Academy of Medicine**

Bard Collection

D[avid] Hosack: Copies of Letters and Documents

##### **New-York Historical Society**

Murray Family Papers

**New York-Presbyterian Hospital-New York Weill Cornell Medical Center Archives**  
New York Hospital Board of Governors Minutes, Vols. 1-3

**New York Public Library**  
John Griscom Correspondence

**Pennsylvania Hospital Archives, Philadelphia**  
Philadelphia Dispensary Minute Books, 1786-1806 & 1807-1839  
Philadelphia Humane Society Annual Meeting Minutes 1793-1839  
Philadelphia Humane Society Managers' Minutes Vols. 1 & 2

**Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence,**  
Gilbert Deblois Letterbooks

**Royal College of Physicians, London**  
John Rule to John Walker, August 14, 1815

**Royal Humane Society Archives, London**  
First Minute Book, 1774-1784

**Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London**  
Letter from John Crawford to unknown recipient, January 28, 1789, Naval Hospital Barbados 1789  
"Memorial of Doctor [John] Crawford (the Chief Surgeon of the Colony of Demerary) to the Lord of the Treasury." (n.d.)  
Jenner Papers  
John Coakley Lettsom Papers  
Royal Jennerian Society Correspondence  
Minutes of the Board of Directors Minutes of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox, [1802-1805]  
Minutes of the Board of Directors of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox, 1805-1809  
Minutes of the General Court of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox, [1803-1806]  
Minutes of the General Court of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox, 1807-1808  
Minutes of the Medical Council of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of Smallpox, [1803-1807]  
Benjamin Waterhouse Papers

**Published Collections of Correspondence**

Baron, John. *The Life of Dr. Jenner, M.D.* 2 vols. London, 1838.  
Butterfield, Lyman H., ed. *Adams Family Correspondence*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963.  
----- . *Letters of Benjamin Rush*. 2 vols. Princeton: Published for the American

- Philosophical Society for Princeton University Press, 1951.
- Corner, Betsy C. and Christopher C. Booth, eds. *Chain of Friendship: Selected Letters of Dr. John Fothergill of London, 1735-1780*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Currie, William Wallace. *Memoir of the Life, Writings, and Correspondence of James Currie, M.D. F.R.S. of Liverpool, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh, London Medical Society, &c. &c.* London, 1831.
- Field, John. *Correspondence of John Howard, Not Before Published*. London, 1855.
- Lawrence, Christopher and Fiona A. Macdonald, eds. *Sambrook Court: The Letters of J. C. Lettsom at the Medical Society of London*. London: The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at the University College London, 2003.
- Lawrence, Christopher, Paul Lucier and Christopher C. Booth, eds. *'Take Time by the Forelock': The Letters of Anthony Fothergill to James Woodforde*. London: Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1997.
- Percival, Edward, ed. *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Percival M.D.* London, 1807.
- Pettigrew, Thomas Joseph. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Late John Coakley Lettsom, M.D.; LL.D; F.R.S; F.A.S.; F.L.S.; &c. &c. &c. With a Selection from his Correspondence*. 3 vols. London, 1817.
- Sprigge, Timothy. *The Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham*. Vol. 3. London: Athlone Press, 1968.
- Woods, John A., ed. "The Correspondence of Benjamin Rush and Granville Sharp, 1773-1809." *Journal of American Studies* 1 (1967): 1-38.

### **Books and Pamphlets**

- An Abstract of the Proceedings of the Scots Society in Norwich, November 30, 1780*. Norwich, n.d.
- Account of the Dublin General Dispensary and Humane Society. Established at the Dispensary Court, No. 28, Temple-Bar, for the Purpose of Administering Medical and Surgical Assistance to the Sick Poor of the City, and of Recovering Persons Apparently Dead from Drowning, Suffocating, or Other Accidents*. Dublin, 1793.
- An Account of the First Anniversary Festival of the Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of the Small-pox, on Thursday, May 17, 1803, Extracted from the Gentleman's Magazine*. London, n.d.
- An Account of the General Dispensary for the Relief of the Poor*. London, 1772.
- Account of the New York Hospital*. New York, 1811.
- An Account of the Philadelphia Dispensary, Instituted for the Medical Relief of the Poor*. Philadelphia, 1802.
- An Account of the Proceedings of the Society of Universal Good-will, from the Beginning of 1784. To the End of the Year 1787*. Norwich, 1787.
- An Account of the Scots Society, in Norwich, from Its Rise in 1775, Until It Received the Additional Name of the Society of Universal Good-will, in 1784. To Which Are Added the Articles, President's Address, &c. &c.* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Norwich, n.d.
- An Account of the Scots Society in Norwich, in Great Britain. Founded in 1775*. Norwich, 1783.
- Account of the Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress; With the Nature and View of*

*the Institution: Also the Plan and Regulations.* London, 1814.

*The Act of Incorporation, Constitution and By-laws of the Philadelphia Society for the Information of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries.* Philadelphia, 1797.

*Address of the Royal Jennerian Society.* [London], 1803.

*Address of the Royal Jennerian Society, for the Extermination of Small-Pox, with the Plan, Regulations, and Instructions for Vaccine Inoculation.* London, 1803.

*An Address to the Citizens of Baltimore and its Vicinity, Containing a Concise Account of the Baltimore General Dispensary, Its By-laws, and Other Matters Worthy of Notice.* Baltimore, 1812.

*Address to the Public, Respecting the Establishment of a Lunatic Asylum at Edinburgh.* Edinburgh, 1807.

Alden, Timothy. *A Discourse, Delivered before the Members of the Portsmouth Female Asylum.* Portsmouth, NH, 1804.

Aikin, John. *A View of the Life, Travels, and Philanthropic Labors of the Late John Howard.* Philadelphia, 1794.

*The Annual Report of the Lunatic Asylum Erected at York; with a Short History of Its Rise and Progress.* York, [England], 1785.

*Appendix* [to the Massachusetts Humane Society annual discourse; the discourse was not printed that year.] [Boston, 1810]

*Articles and Regulations Proposed for the Society of Universal Good-will, in London, or Elsewhere, 1789.* Norwich, 1789.

*The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush: His 'Travels Through Life' together with his Commonplace Book for 1789-1813.* Ed. George Corner. Princeton: Published for the American Philosophical Society by Princeton University Press, 1948.

Barnard, Thomas. *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At the Semiannual Meeting, June 10, 1794.* Boston, 1794.

Bard, John. *A Letter from John Bard, . . . to the Author of Thoughts on the Dispensary.* New York, 1791.

Bard, Samuel. *A Discourse Upon the Duties of a Physician, with Some Sentiments, on the Usefulness and Necessity of a Public Hospital.* New York, 1769.

Bartlett, John. *A Discourse on the Subject of Animation. Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. June 11, 1792.* Boston, 1792.

Bartlett, Josiah. *An Oration Occasioned by the Death of John Warren, M.D. Past Grand Master. Delivered in the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, at a Quarterly Meeting, In Boston, June 12, 1815.* Boston, 1815.

*Bath Humane Society, Instituted in the Year 1805; Supported by Voluntary Contributions.* Bath [England], 1806.

Bayley, Richard. *A Letter from Doctor Richard Bayley, to Doctor John Bard. . . [A]n Answer to a Part of his Letter Addressed to the Author of Thoughts on the Dispensary.* New York, 1791.

Bell, Andrew. *An Analysis of the Experiment in Education, Made at Egmore, Near Madras.* 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. London, 1807.

*A Brief Account of the New York Hospital.* New York, 1804.

Brooks, John. *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1795.* Boston, 1795.

- Brown, James Baldwin. *Memoirs of the Public and Private Life of John Howard, the Philanthropist, Compiled from his own Diary. . . His Confidential Letters; the Communications of his Surviving Relatives and Friends; and other Authentic Sources of Information.* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London, 1823.
- Butler, Joseph. *Butler's Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel.* Ed. T. A. Roberts. London, 1970.
- Cheever, Abijah. *History of a Case of Incised Dropsy; With a Dissection of the Several Cysts: As Communicated to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Jan. 31, 1787.* Boston, [1794].
- Clarke, John. *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, Eleventh of June 1793.* Boston, 1793.
- Clarkson, Thomas. *An Essay on the Impolicy of the Slave Trade. In Two Parts. To Which is Added, an Oration on the Necessity of Establishing at Paris, a Society to Promote the Abolition of the Trade and Slavery of the Negroes.* J. P. Brissot de Warville. Philadelphia, 1788.
- *The History of the Rise, Progress and Accomplishments of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade, By the British Parliament.* Philadelphia, 1808.
- Clinton, DeWitt. *An Address to the Benefactors and Friends of the New York Free School Society, Delivered at the Opening of that Institution, in their New and Spacious Building.* New York, 1809.
- Clinton, DeWitt. *An Oration on Benevolence, Delivered Before the Society of Black Friars, in the City of New-York, at Their Anniversary Festival, on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 1794.* New York, 1795.
- Cogan, Thomas, trans. *Memoirs of the Society Instituted at Amsterdam in Favour of Drowned Persons, for the Years 1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, and 1771. Translated from the original by Thomas Cogan, M.D.* London, 1773.
- Colman, Henry. *A Discourse Delivered in the Chapel Church, Boston, Before the Humane Society of Massachusetts.* Boston, 1812.
- Colquhoun, Patrick. *A New and Appropriate Education for the Labouring People.* London, 1806.
- The Constitution of the Humane Society of the State of New York.* New York, 1795.
- The Constitution of the Pennsylvania Society, for Promoting Abolition, and the Relief of Free Negroes, Unlawfully Held in Bondage. Begun in the Year 1774, and Enlarged on the Twenty-third of April, 1787. To Which Are Added in the Acts of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery.* Philadelphia, 1787.
- A Continuation of the Proceedings of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, from the second Tuesday in June 1788, to the second Tuesday in June 1789.* Boston, 1789.
- Coombe, Thomas. *The Influence of Christianity on the Condition of the World: A Sermon, Preached in Trinity Chapel, Conduit Street, on Sunday, December 13, 1789.* London, 1790.
- Cooper, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached in Boston, New-England, Before the Society for Encouraging Industry, and Employing the Poor; August 8, 1753.* Boston, 1753.
- Coxe, John Redman. *A Short View of the Importance and Respectability of Medicine. Read Before the Philadelphia Medical Society, on the 7<sup>th</sup> of February, 1800.* Philadelphia, 1800.

- Danforth, Thomas. *A Discourse, Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Boston, June 14, 1808.* [Boston], 1808.
- Darwin, Erasmus. *The Botanic Garden.* 1791; rpt. Merton, Yorkshire.
- Dingley, Amasa. *An Oration. On the Improvement of Medicine: Pronounced before a Respectable Auditory of Citizens, in the Federal Hall in the City of New York; . . . on the 16<sup>th</sup> January, 1794.* New York, 1795.
- Duncan's New York City Directory for 1791.* [New York, 1791].
- Dunn, Thomas. *Discourse, Delivered in the New Dutch Church, Nassau-Street, on Tuesday, the 21<sup>st</sup> October, 1794, Before the New York Society for the Information and Assistance of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries.* New York, [1794].
- Elofson, W. M. with John A. Woods, eds. *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke. Vol. 1.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Emerson, William. *A Discourse Delivered in the First Church, Boston, on the Anniversary of the Massachusetts Humane Society, June 9, 1807.* Boston, 1807.
- Equiano, Olaudah. *The Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa the African Written by Himself.* Edited with an introduction by Paul Edwards. Harlow, 1992.
- Fleet, John. *A Discourse Relative to Animation, Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting June 13<sup>th</sup>, 1797.* Boston, 1797.
- Fothergill, Anthony. *An Essay on the Preservation of Shipwrecked Mariners, in Answer to the Prize Questions Proposed by the Royal Humane Society.* London, 1799.
- A Further Account of the Success attending the Attempts Made at Liverpool, for the Recovery of Drowned Persons: Extracted from the Reports of the London Humane Society.* [London? 1785?].
- Gardiner, John Sylvester John. *A Sermon Delivered Before the Humane Society, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1803.* Boston, 1803.
- General Instructions for the Agents of the Scots Society at Norwich, and the Branches Thereof.* Norwich, 1780.
- A General Report of the Workington and Harrington Dispensary for the Year 1796.* Workington, 1796.
- George, Daniel. *An Almanack for the Year 1780.* Newbury, 1780.
- Gray, Thomas. *The Value of Life and Charitable Institutions. A Discourse Delivered before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semi-Annual Meeting, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 1805.* Boston, 1805.
- Hardie, James. *The Philadelphia Directory and Register for 1794.* Philadelphia, 1794.
- Harris, Thaddeus Mason. *A Discourse Delivered before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.* Boston, 1806.
- Hawes, William. *An Address to the King and Parliament of Great Britain, on the Important Subject of Preserving the Lives of its Inhabitants. . . With an Appendix, in which is Inserted a Letter from Dr. Lettsom to the Author.* London, 1782.
- *The Transactions of the Royal Humane Society.* Vol. 1 of 2 Vols. ([London, 1795]).
- Haygarth, John. *An Inquiry How to Prevent the Small-Pox. And Proceedings of a Society for Promoting General Inoculation at stated periods, and preventing the Natural Smallpox in Chester.* Chester, England, 1784.

- Haygarth, John. *A Private Letter Addressed to the Right Reverend Dr. Porteus, the Late Lord Bishop of London; to Propose a Plan which Might Give a Good Education to All the Poor Children in England, at a Moderate Expense (Printed at His Lordship's Desire)*. New edition. Bath and London, 1812.
- Haygarth, John. *A Sketch of a Plan to Exterminate the Casual Small-Pox from Great Britain; and to Introduce General Inoculation*. London, 1793.
- History of the Humane Society of Massachusetts*. Boston, 1845.
- History of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: with a Selected List of Premiums awarded by the Trustees, from its Commencement to the Present Time, and a List of the Members and Officers. Prepared by Direction of the Trustees*. Boston, 1876; rpt. Michigan Historical Reprint Series.
- Hogan, Edmund. *The Prospect of Philadelphia and Check on the Next Directory*. Philadelphia, 1795.
- Hosack, David. *An Enquiry into the Causes of Suspended Animation from Drowning; with the Means of Restoring Life*. New York, 1792.
- Howard, John. *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales, with Some Preliminary Observations, and an Account of Some Foreign Prisons*. London, 1777.
- *An Account of the Present State of Prisons . . . in the Norfolk Circuit*. London, [1789].
- *An Account of the Present State of Prisons . . . in the Oxford Circuit*. London, [1789].
- *An Account of the Principal Lazarettos of Europe: With Some Papers Relative to Plague*. Warrington, 1789.
- [Howard, John.] *Appendix; Containing Observations Concerning Foreign Prisons and Hospitals: Collected by Mr. Howard, in his Concluding Tour*. Ed. John Aikin. [London, 1791].
- Howard, John Clark. *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 12, 1804*. Boston, 1804.
- Huntingford, George Isaac. *A Sermon Preached at the Anniversary of the Royal Humane Society, in St. James's Church, Westminster, on Sunday, April 24, 1803*. London, 1803.
- Hurd, Isaac. *A Discourse Delivered in the Church in Brattle Street, in Boston, Tuesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 1799, Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*. Boston, 1799.
- Information for Emigrants to the New England States*. Boston, 1795.
- Information to Those Who Are Disposed to Migrate to South-Carolina*. Charleston, 1795.
- The Institution of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*. Boston, 1786.
- The Institution of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*. Boston, 1788.
- The Institution of the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: with the Rules for regulating said Society, and the Methods of Treatment to be used with Persons apparently dead; with a Number of recent Cases proving the happy Effects thereof*. Boston, 1788.
- The Institution of the Merrimack Humane Society, With the Rules for Regulating Said*

- Society, and the Methods of Treatment to Be Used with Persons Apparently Dead.* Newburyport, 1803.
- The Institution of the Merrimack Humane Society.* Newburyport, 1809.
- Johnson, Alexander. *A Short Account of a Society at Amsterdam Instituted in the Year 1767 for the Recovery of Drowned Person; With Observations Shewing the Utility and Advantage that Would Accrue to Great Britain from a Similar Institution Extended to Cases of Suffocation by Damps in Mines, Choaking, Strangling, Stifling, and other Accidents.* London, 1773.
- The Journal of Dr. John Morgan of Philadelphia from the City of Rome to the City of London 1764 Together with a Fragment of a Journal Written at Rome, 1764 and a Biographical Sketch [by Julia Harding Morgan].* Philadelphia, 1907.
- Kendall, James. *A Discourse Delivered in King's Chapel, Boston, Before the Humane Society of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 8, 1813.* Boston, 1813.
- Lathrop, John. *A Discourse Before the Humane Society, in Boston: Delivered On the Second Tuesday of June, 1787.* Boston, 1787.
- *A Discourse Before the 'Society for Propagating the Gospel Among Indians, and Others, in North-America.' Delivered on the 19<sup>th</sup> of January, 1804.* Boston, 1804.
- Lettsom, John Coakley. *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence.* Vol. 1 (of 1 vol.) London, 1797.
- *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science.* 3 vols. London, 1801.
- London Vaccine Institution, for Inoculating and Supplying Matter Free of Expense.* London, 1813.
- Longworth's New York City Directory for 1802.* New York, 1802.
- Medical Register.* London, 1780.
- Medical Register.* London, 1783.
- Morse, Jedidiah. *A Sermon Preached Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1801.* Boston, 1801.
- [Murray, John.] *An Enquiry into the Origin, Progress, & Present State of Slavery: With a Plan for the Gradual, Reasonable, & Secure Emancipation of Slaves. By a Member of the Society of UNIVERSAL GOODWILL in London and Norwich.* London, 1789.
- The New York City Directory for 1789.* New York, 1789.
- The New York City Directory for 1790.* New York, 1790.
- The New York Directory and Register for the Year 1794.* New York, 1794.
- [New York Hospital]. *Charity Extended to All. State of the New York Hospital for the Year 1797.* [New York, 1798].
- New-York Society for the Information and Assistance of Persons Emigrating from Foreign Countries.* New York, 1794.
- Paine, Thomas. *Common Sense and Related Writings.* Edited with an Introduction by Thomas P. Slaughter. Boston, 2001.
- Parkman, Francis. *A Sermon Delivered at the Internment of the Rev. John Lathrop. Pastor of the Second Church in Boston, who Died Jan. 4, 1816, in the Sixty-Sixth Year of His Age, and Forty-Eighth of his Ministry.* Boston, 1816.
- Paxton, John. *The Philadelphia Directory for 1813.* Philadelphia, 1813.
- [Philadelphia Dispensary]. *A Comparative View of the Natural Small-Pox, Inoculated*



- Small-Pox, and Vaccination in their Effects on Individuals and Society.* Philadelphia, 1803.
- [Philadelphia Humane Society]. *Directions for Recovering Persons, Who Are Supposed to Be Dead, from Drowning, Also for Preventing & Curing the Disorders, Produced by Drinking Cold Liquors, and By the Actions of Noxious Vapours, Lightning, and Excessive Cold and Heat, Upon the Human Body.* Philadelphia, [1788].
- Plan of the Finsbury Dispensary, St. John's Square, Clerkenwell, for Administering Advices and Medicines to the Poor.* [London, 1794?].
- Plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor.* Philadelphia, 1787.
- Plan of the Philadelphia Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor.* Philadelphia, 1808.
- Plan of the Westminster General Dispensary. Instituted 1774.* London, 1776.
- Porter, Eliphalet. *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 8, 1802.* Boston, 1802.
- Pratt, Samuel Jackson. *Gleanings through Wales, Holland, and Westphalia; With the Views of War and Peace at Home and Abroad.* Vol. 1. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London, 1796.
- Proceedings at the Annual and Other Meetings of the Scots Society in Norwich, in 1778, 1779, and 1780.* Norwich, 1780.
- Public Characters, or Cotemporary [sic] Biography.* Baltimore, 1803.
- [Proclamation, September 4, 1738]. By His Excellency Jonathan Belcher [of Massachusetts].
- Report of the Central Committee at Paris, on the Subject of Vaccine or Cowpox; Made on the 24<sup>th</sup> November, 1802.* London, n.d.
- A Report of the Infirmary, Dispensary, Lunatic Hospital, and Asylum in Manchester. From the 25<sup>th</sup> of June, 1793, to the 24<sup>th</sup> of June, 1794.* [Manchester, 1794].
- The Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Improving the Comforts of the Poor.* Vol. 2. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London, 1805.
- The Report of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor.* Vol. 3. London, 1802.
- Reports of the Society for the Recovery of the Apparently Drowned. Part II.* [London], 1774.
- Reports of the Sunderland Humane Society, From It's [sic] Institution in September 1791, to the Commencement of the Year 1793.* Sunderland, 1793.
- Robbins, Chandler. *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their Semiannual Meeting, June 14, 1796.* Boston, 1796.
- Robinson, James. *The Philadelphia Directory for 1809.* Philadelphia, 1809.
- . *The Philadelphia Directory for 1810.* Philadelphia, 1810.
- [Royal Humane Society]. *A Brief Account of the Humane Society.* [London], 1789.
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Brief Account of the Royal Humane Society.* 1792.
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Society for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned. Instituted M.D.CC.LXXIV.* [London, 1774]. (1)
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Society for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned. Instituted M.D.CC.LXXIV.* [London, 1774]. (2)

- [Royal Humane Society]. *The Plan of an Institution for Affording Immediate Relief to Persons Apparently Dead, from Drowning. And also for Diffusing a General Knowledge of the Manner of Treating Persons in a Similar Critical State, from Various Other Causes; Such as Strangulation by the Cord, Suffocation by Noxious Vapours, &c. &c. Published by Order of the Society.* London, 1774.
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Plan and Report of the Society for the Recovery and Persons Apparently Drowned.* [London, 1774].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Plan and Reports of the Society Instituted at London . . . for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned.* [London, 1775].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Report of the Society Instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned.* [London, 1775].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned. For the Year MDCCLXXVI.* [London, 1776].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned. For the Year MDCCLXXVII.* [London, 1778].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned. For the Year MDCCLXXVIII.* [London, 1778].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned for the Years MDCCLXXIX and MDCCLXXX.* [London, 1781].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned for the Years MDCCLXXXI and MDCCLXXXII.* [London, 1782/3?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned for the Years MDCCLXXXIII and MDCCLXXXIV.* [London, 1784/5?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774, for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Drowned for the Years MDCCLXXXIV and MDCCLXXXVI.* [London, 1787.].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Reports of the Royal Humane Society instituted in the Year 1774; with an Appendix of Miscellaneous Observations on the Subject of Suspended Animation. For the Years MDCCLXXXVII, MDCCLXXXVIII and MDCCLXXXIX.* [London, 1790].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. Instituted 1774.* [For 1790]. [London, 1790].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, Instituted 1774. Published for the Anniversary Festival 1791.* [London, 1791?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, Instituted 1774. Published for the Anniversary Festival 1792.* [London, 1792?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, Instituted 1774: The Annual Report. Published for the Anniversary Festival 1793 by W. Hawes, M.D. Register.* [London, 1793?].

- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, Instituted 1774: The Annual Report. Published for the Anniversary Festival 1794 by W. Hawes M.D. Register.* [London, 1794?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, Instituted 1774: The Annual Report. Published for the Anniversary Festival 1795 by William Hawes M.D.* [London, 1795?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, Instituted 1774: The Annual Report. 1796 By William Hawes M.D.* [London, 1796?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *The Annual Report 1797 by W. Hawes M.D.* [London, 1797?].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, 1774 . . . The Annual Report, published for he Anniversary Festival 1798 by W. Hawes M.D.* [London, 1798].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, 1774, Annual Report 1799 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1799].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, 1774, Annual Report 1800 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1800].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society, 1774, Annual Report 1801 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1801].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. Established 1774, for the Restoration of Human Life . . . Annual Report, 1802 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1802].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. 1774, Annual Report 1803 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1803].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. For the Restoration of Human Life . . . Annual Report, 1804 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1804].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. Annual Report, 1805 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1805].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. Annual Report, 1806 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1806].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. Annual Report, 1807 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1807].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Royal Humane Society. Annual Report, 1808 by W. Hawes M.D.* London, [1808].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society 1809.* London, [1809].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society 1810.* London, [1810].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society 1811.* London, [1811].
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society for the Recovery of the Apparently Drowned 1812.* London, 1812.
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society. 1813.* London, 1813.
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society. 1814.* London, 1814.
- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society. 1815.* London, 1815.

- [Royal Humane Society]. *Annual Report of the Royal Humane Society*. 1820. London, 1820.
- Rules and By-Laws of the Baltimore General Dispensary*. Baltimore, 1803.
- Rules of the City Dispensary for the Medical Relief of the Poor. Instituted at New York. February 1, 1791*. New York, 1791.
- Rules of the (New York) City Dispensary, for the Medical Relief of the Poor*. [n.d., c. 1792].
- Reports of the Sunderland Humane Society, From It's [sic] Institution in September 1791, to the Commencement of the Year 1793*. Sunderland, 1793.
- Say, Benjamin. *An Annual Oration Pronounced Before the Humane Society of Philadelphia, on the Objects & Benefits of Said Institution; the 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 1799*. Philadelphia, 1799.
- Shaw, Lemuel. *A Discourse, Delivered Before the Officers and Members of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, 11 June, 1811*. Boston, 1811.
- Short Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Lunatic Asylum at Edinburgh*. Edinburgh, 1812.
- Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the Humane Society of the City of New York*. New York, 1814.
- Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. 1759; Prometheus books edition, New York, 2000.
- Smith, James. *The Additional Letters of Humanitas*. [Baltimore], 1801.
- Stafford, Cornelius William. *The Philadelphia Directory for 1798*. Philadelphia, 1798.
- A Statement of Premiums Awarded by the Trustees of the Humane Society of Massachusetts, from July 1817 to April 1829*. Boston, 1829.
- Staughton, William. *A Discourse, Occasioned by the Sudden Death of Three Young Persons, by Drowning. Delivered on the 28<sup>th</sup> of May, 1797, at the Baptist Meeting House in Bordentown, New Jersey*. Philadelphia, 1797.
- Stephen's Philadelphia Directory, for 1796*. Philadelphia, 1796.
- Swain, John Hadley. *A Sermon Preached at St. Martin's in the Fields, London, on Sunday, March 30, and at Hampstead Church, Middlesex, on Sunday, May 25, 1783, for the Benefit of the Humane Society*. London, 1783.
- Thacher, Thomas. *A Discourse Delivered at Boston, Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1800*. Boston, 1800.
- Third Festival of the Royal Jennerian Society*. (From the *Gentleman's Magazine*, June 1805.)
- Thompson, Benjamin, Count Rumford. *Essays, Political, Economical, and Philosophical*. 3 vols. London, 1796.
- Tudor, William. *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society, at their Anniversary, May, 1817*. Boston, 1817.
- Walter, William. *A Discourse Delivered Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the Semiannual Meeting Twelfth of June, 1798*. Boston, 1798.

- Warren, John. *An Eulogy on The Honourable Thomas Russell, Esq, Late President of The Society for Propagating the Gospel Among the Indians and Others, in North America; the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; the Agriculture Society; the Society for the Advice of Immigrants; the Boston Chamber of Commerce; and the National Bank in Boston.* Boston, 1796.
- Waterhouse, Benjamin. *On the Principle of Vitality. A Discourse Delivered in the First Church in Boston, Tuesday, June 8<sup>th</sup>, 1790. Before the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.* Boston, 1790.
- Waterhouse, Benjamin. *A Prospect for Exterminating the Smallpox.* Cambridge, 1802.
- Watkins, Tobias. *An Eulogium on the Character of Brother John Crawford.* Baltimore, 1813.
- White, Daniel Appleton. *An Address to the Members of the Merrimack Humane Society, at their Anniversary Meeting, in Newburyport, Sept. 3, 1805.* Newburyport, 1805.
- Wood, William. *The Christian Duty of Cultivating a Spirit of Universal Benevolence Amidst the Present Unhappy National Hostilities. A Sermon Preached at Bradford in Yorkshire, Before an Assembly of Dissenting Ministers, and Published at Their Request.* Leeds, 1781.

### **Newspapers and Periodicals**

- American Museum*  
(Edinburgh) *Annals of Medicine for the Year 1801*  
*Barbados Gazette*  
*Barbados Mercury*  
*Boston Magazine*  
(Baltimore) *Companion and Weekly Miscellany*  
*The (London) Annual Biography and Obituary, for the Year 1819*  
*Gentleman's Magazine*  
*Hibernian Magazine*  
*Memoirs of the Medical Society of London, Instituted 1773*  
*New York Daily Advertiser*  
*The (Baltimore) Observer*  
*Royal American Magazine*  
(Halifax) *Royal Gazette and Nova Scotia Advertiser*

### **Miscellaneous**

- Klepp, Susan E. *"The Swift Progress of Population": A Documentary and Bibliographic Study of Philadelphia's Growth, 1642-1859.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1991.

### **Electronic Sources**

- Readex America's Historical Newspapers, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, <http://infoweb.newsbank.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/>  
<http://dohistory.org/diary/index.html>  
Palmer's Index to the Times, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan,

## SECONDARY SOURCES

### Books and Articles

- Abraham, James Johnston. *Lettsom: His Life, Times, Friends and Descendants*. London, William Heinemann Medical Books, 1933.
- Alexander, John K. *Render Them Submissive: Responses to Poverty in Philadelphia, 1760-1800*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1980.
- Alleyne, Warren. "It So Happened." (Barbados) *Sunday Sun of the Nation*. May 31, 1998.
- Anderson, Stuart. *Race and Rapprochement: Anglo-Saxonism and Anglo-American Relations, 1895-1904*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh University Press, 1981.
- Andrew, Donna T. and Randall McGowen. *The Perreaus & Mrs. Rudd: Forgery and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century London*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Andrew, Donna T. *Philanthropy and Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth-Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Andrews, Jonathan. "'Hardly a Hospital but a Charity for Pauper Lunatics'?: Therapeutics at Bethlem in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State*, 63-81. Eds. Jonathan Barry and Colin Jones. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Armitage, David, ed. *Theories of Empire*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.
- Armstrong, Eva V. and Claude K. Deischer. "Dr. Henry Moyes, Scotch Chemist." *Journal of Chemical Education* 24 (1947): 169-174.
- Baker, James. *The Life of Sir Thomas Bernard, Baronet*. London, 1819
- Banner, Lois. "Religious Benevolence as Social Control: A Critique of an Interpretation." *Journal of American History* 60 (1973): 23-41.
- Bannet, Eve Tavor. *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1688-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Barker, Hannah Barker. *Newspapers, Politics, and Public Opinion in Late Eighteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Barry, Jonathan and Christopher Brooks. *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society and Politics in England, 1550-1800*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- Barry, Jonathan. "Publicity and the Public Good: Presenting Medicine in Eighteenth-century Bristol." In *Medical Fringe and Medical Orthodoxy, 1750-1850*, 29-39. Eds. W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter. London: Croom Helm, 1987.
- "Urban Associations and the Middling Sort." In *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society and Politics in England, 1550-1800*, 84-112. Eds. Jonathan Barry and Christopher Brooks. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- Baumgartner, Leona. "John Howard (1726-1790) Hospital and Prison Reformer." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 7 (1939): 486-625.
- Beattie, J. M. *Crime and the Courts in England 1660-1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Bell, Whitfield J. "Dr. James Smith and the Public Encouragement for Vaccination for Smallpox." *Annals of Medical History*, 3<sup>rd</sup> series 2 (1940): 500-517.
- "Philadelphia Medical Students in Europe, 1750-1800." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 67 (1943): 1-29.

- , *John Morgan Continental Doctor*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965.
- Bellows, Barbara L. *Benevolence Among Slaveholders: Assisting the Poor in Charleston 1670-1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.
- Bender, Thomas, ed. *The Antislavery Debate: Capitalism and Abolitionism as a Problem in Historical Interpretation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Berg, Maxine. *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Berlin, Ira. *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.
- “Biography of Dr. Amos Windship (1745-1813).” *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, 25 (1924): 141-171.
- Bittle, William G. and R. Todd Lane. “Inflation and Philanthropy in England: A Re-Assessment of W.K. Jordan’s Data.” *The Economic History Review* 29 (1976): 203-210.
- Black, Jeremy. *The English Press 1621-1861*. Thrupp, Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2001.
- Blake, John B. *Benjamin Waterhouse and the Introduction of Vaccination: A Reappraisal*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957.
- Black, Jeremy. *British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century*. New York, St. Martin’s Press, 1992.
- Bohman, James and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, eds. *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant’s Ideal*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1997.
- Booth, Christopher. *John Haygarth, FRS: A Physician of the Enlightenment*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2005.
- Borsay, Anne. *Medicine and Charity in Georgian Bath: A Social History of the General Infirmary, c. 1739-1830*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Bossy, John. *Christianity in the West 1400-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Bowers, John Z. “The Odyssey of Smallpox Vaccination,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 55 (1981): 17-33.
- Boyer, Paul S. *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Boylan, Anne M. *The Origins of Women’s Activism: New York and Boston, 1797-1840*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Brace, Laura. *The Idea of Property in Seventeenth-Century England: Tithes and the Individual*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998.
- Breckenridge, Carol A., Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha and Dipesh Chakrabarty, eds., *Cosmopolitanism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Breen, T. H. *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped the American Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Brewer, John. “Commercialization and Politics.” In *Birth of a Consumer Society*. Eds. Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

- Brewer, John Brewer. *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1997.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- Brock, Helen. "North America: A Western Outpost of European Medicine." In *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*, 194-216. Eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French. Cambridge, 1990.
- Brown, Christopher Leslie. *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Brown, Irene Q. and Richard D. Brown. *The Hanging of Ephraim Wheeler*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Brown, Richard D. "The Emergence of Urban Society in Rural Massachusetts, 1760-1820." *Journal of American History* 61 (1974): 29-51.
- . *Knowledge is Power: The Diffusion of Information in Early America, 1700-1865*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Brown, Thomas J. *Dorothea Dix: New England Reform*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Brunton, Deborah C. "The Transfer of Medical Education: Teaching at the Edinburgh and Philadelphia Medical Schools." In *Scotland and America in the Age of Enlightenment*, 242-258. Eds. Richard B. Sher and Jeffrey R. Smitten. Princeton, 1990.
- Bullock, Steven C. *Revolutionary Brotherhood: Freemasonry and the Transformation of the American Social Order, 1730-1840*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Burke, John. *Burke's Landed Gentry*. Vol. 2. London, 1846.
- Burstein, Andrew. "The Political Character of Sympathy." *Journal of the Early Republic* 21 (2001): 601-632.
- Bushman, Richard L. *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- Butler, Jon. *The Huguenots in America: A Refugee People in New World Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Bynum, W. F. "Hospital, Disease and Community: The London Fever Hospital, 1801-1850." In *Healing and History: Essays for George Rosen*, 97-115. Ed. Charles E. Rosenberg. New York: Dawson Science History Publications, 1979.
- . "Physicians, Hospitals and Career Structures in Eighteenth-Century London." In *William Hunter and the Eighteenth-Century Medical World*, 106-123. Eds. W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Cage, R. A. *The Scottish Poor Law 1745-1845*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1981.
- Campbell, Lyall. *Sable Island, Fatal and Fertile Crescent*. Windsor, NS: Lancelot Press, 1974.



- Camic, Charles. "Experience and Ideas: Education for Universalism in Eighteenth-Century Scotland." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 25 (1983): 50-82.
- Carretta, Vincent. *Equiano The African: Biography of a Self-Made Man*. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 2005.
- Cash, Arthur. *John Wilkes: The Scandalous Father of Civil Liberty*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Cash, Philip. "Setting the Stage: Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse's Reception in Boston, 1782-1788." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Science* 1992 (47): 5-28.
- Cassell, Ronald. *Medical Charities, Medical Politics: The Irish Dispensary System and the Poor Law, 1836-1872*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 1997.
- Chaplin, Joyce E. *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-1815*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
- Clark, Charles E. "Early American Journalism: News and Opinion in the Popular Press." In *A History of the Book in America Volume One: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World*, 347-366. Eds. Hugh Amory and David Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Clark, Peter. *British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800: The Origins of an Associational World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Cleary, Patricia. *Elizabeth Murray: A Woman's Pursuit of Independence in Eighteenth-Century America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000.
- Clemens, Paul G. E. "The Consumer Culture of the Mid-Atlantic, 1760-1820." *William and Mary Quarterly* 62 (2005): 577-624.
- Cody, Lisa Forman. "Living and Dying in Georgian London's Lying-in Hospitals." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78 (2004): 309-348.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Colley, Linda. *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600-1850*. New York: Anchor Books, 2002.
- Conway, Stephen. "From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783." *William and Mary Quarterly* 59 (2002): 65-100.
- Copeland, David. "America 1750-1820." In *Press, Politics and the Public Sphere in Europe and North America, 1760-1820*, 140-158. Eds. Hannah Barker and Simon Burrows. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Corfield, P. J. *The Impact of English Towns 1700-1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Crowe, Charles. "Bishop James Madison and the Republic of Virtue." *The Journal of Southern History* 30 (1964): 58-70.
- Crowley, John E. *The Invention of Comfort: Sensibilities and Design in Early Modern Britain and Early America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Croxson, Bronwyn. "The Public and Private Faces of Eighteenth-Century London Dispensary Charity." *Medical History* 41 (1997): 127-149.
- Cunningham, Hugh and Joanna Innes, eds. *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform; From the 1690s to 1850*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

- Curti, Merle. *American Philanthropy Abroad*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1963.
- Dain, Angela. "An Enlightened and Polite Society." In *Norwich Since 1550*, 193-218. Eds. Carole Rawcliffe and Richard Wilson with Christine Clark. London, Hambledon and London, 2004.
- Dalrymple, William. *White Mughals: Love and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century India*. New York: Viking, 2003.
- Daniels, Christine and Michael V. Kennedy, eds. *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500-1820*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Davis, David Brion. *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of New World Slavery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.
- . *Trickster Travels: A Sixteenth-Century Muslim Between Worlds*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2006.
- Dawson, Kevin. "Enslaved Swimmers and Divers in the Atlantic World." *Journal of American History* 92 (2006): 1327-1355.
- Dekker, Jeroen J. H. "Transforming the Nation and the Child: Philanthropy in the Netherlands, Belgium, France and England, c. 1780-c. 1850." In *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform From the 1690s to 1850*, 130-147. Eds. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Devine, T. M. *Scotland's Empire 1660-1815*. London: Penguin Books, 2003
- Dierks, Konstantin. "The Familial Letter and Social Refinement in America, 1750-1800." In *Letter Writing as a Social Practice*, 31-41. Eds. David Barton and Nigel Hall. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1999.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48 (1983): 147-160.
- Dorsey, Bruce. *Reforming Men & Women: Gender in the Antebellum City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Drayton, Richard. *Nature's Government: Science, Imperial Government, and the 'Improvement' of the World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Drescher, Seymour. *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Duffy, Eamon. "Correspondence Fraternelle: The SPCK, the SPG, and the Churches of Switzerland in the War of the Spanish Succession." In *Reform and the Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750*, 251-280. Ed. Derek Baker. Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwell, 1979.
- Duffy, Eamon. "The Society of [sic] Promoting Christian Knowledge and Europe: The Background to the Founding of the Christenumsgesellschaft." In *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, 28-42. Eds. Martin Brecht, et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Duffy, John. *Epidemics in Colonial America*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University

- Press, 1953.
- . "History of Public Health and Sanitation in the West since 1700." In *The Cambridge World History of Human Disease*, 200-206. Ed. Kenneth Kiple. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Easterly, William. "How, and How Not, To Stop Aids in Africa." *New York Review of Books*. 54 (August 16, 2007).
- . *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Help the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*. New York: Penguin Press, 2006.
- Edwards, Michael. *Just Another Emperor? The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*. Demos: A Network for Ideas and Action and the Young Foundation, 2008.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. 1939; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Elliott, J. H. *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America 1492-1830*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Ellis, Frank H. "The Background of the London Dispensary." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 20 (1965): 197-212.
- Epps, John. *The Life of John Walker*. London, 1831.
- Eustace, Nicole. "The Sentimental Paradox: Humanity and Violence on the Pennsylvania Frontier." *William and Mary Quarterly* 65 (2008): 29-64.
- Fideler, Paul A. *Social Welfare in Pre-Industrial England*. Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Fiering, Norman. "Irresistible Compassion: An Aspect of Eighteenth-Century Sympathy and Humanitarianism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37 (1976): 195-218.
- Fisher, Richard B. *Edward Jenner 1749-1823*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1991.
- Fissell, Mary E. *Patients, Power, and the Poor in the Eighteenth-Century Bristol*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Fladeland, Betty. *Men and Brothers: Anglo-American Antislavery Cooperation*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972.
- Foster, Charles I. *An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.
- Foster, Hannah W. *The Coquette*. Ed. and with an intro. by Cathy N. Davidson. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Freeman, Joanne. *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Friedman, Lawrence J. and Mark D. McGarvie. *Charity, Philanthropy and Civility in American History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Games, Alison. "Beyond the Atlantic: English Globetrotters and Transoceanic Connections." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3<sup>rd</sup> series 63 (2006): 675-692.
- Gascoigne, John. *Science in the Service of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Gaustad, Edwin Scott. *The Great Awakening in New England*. 1957; reprint Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968.

- Gevitz, Norman. "‘But All Those Authors Are Foreign’: American Literary Nationalism and Domestic Medical Guides." In *The Popularization of Medicine 1650-1850*, 232-251. Ed. Roy Porter. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Ginzberg, Lori D. *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Glover, Richard. *Britain at Bay: Defence Against Bonaparte, 1803-14*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1973.
- Golinski, Jan. *Science as Public Culture: Chemistry and Enlightenment in Britain, 1760-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Goodman, Nathan. *Benjamin Rush Physician and Citizen 1746-1813*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934.
- Gould, Eliga. "American Independence and Britain’s Counter-Revolution," *Past and Present* 154 (1997): 107-141.
- Granovetter, Mark. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (1974): 1360-80.
- Granshaw, Lindsay. "The Rise of the Modern Hospital in Britain." In *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*, 197-218. Ed. Andrew Wear. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Greene, Jack P. *Imperatives Behaviors & Identities: Essays in Early American Cultural History*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.
- Greene, Jack P. *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Grell, Ole Peter and Andrew Cunningham, eds. *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Grell, Ole Peter, Andrew Cunningham, and Robert Jutte. *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Northern Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- Grell, Ole Peter, Andrew Cunningham, and Bernd Roeck, eds. *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century Southern Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Griffin, Clifford S. *Their Brothers’ Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1865*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1960.
- Grob, Gerald N. *The Mad Among Us: A History of the Care of America’s Mentally Ill*. New York: Free Press, 1994.
- Hai, Ambreen. "Border Work, Border Trouble: Postcolonial Feminism and the Ayah in Bapsi Sidhwa’s *Cracking India*," *Modern Fiction Studies* 46 (2000): 379-426.
- Hackett, Paul. "Averting Disaster: The Hudson’s Bay Company and Smallpox in Western Canada during the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78 (2004): 575-609.
- Halttunen, Karen. "Humanitarianism and the Pornography of Pain in Anglo-American Culture." *American Historical Review* 100 (1995): 303-334.
- . *Murder Most Foul: The Killer and the American Gothic Imagination*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Hancock, David J. *Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Community, 1735-1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

- , "Commerce and Conversation in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic: The Invention of Madeira Wine." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 29 (1998): 197-219.
- , "The Trouble with Networks: Managing the Scots' Early-Modern Madeira Trade." *Business History Review* 79 (2005): 467-491.
- Hansen, Morten T. "The Search-Transfer Problem: The Role of Weak Ties in Sharing Knowledge across Organizational Subunits." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44 (1999): 82-111.
- Harris, Marc. "Civil Society in Post-Revolutionary America." In *Empire and Nation: The American Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1797-355*. Eds. Eliga H. Gould and Peter S. Onuf. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Harrison, John Anthony. "Blind Henry Moyes, 'An Excellent Lecturer in Philosophy.'" *Annals of Science* 13 (1957): 109-125.
- Harrison, Richard. *Princetonians 1769-1775: A Biographical Dictionary*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Haskell, Thomas L. "Capitalism and the Origins of the Humanitarian Sensibility, Parts 1 & 2." *American Historical Review* 90 (1985): 339-361, 547-566.
- Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. Yale: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Haviland, Margaret Morris. "Beyond Women's Sphere: Young Quaker Women and the Veil of Charity in Philadelphia, 1790-1810." *William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994): 419-446.
- Hawke, David Freeman. *Benjamin Rush: Revolutionary Gadfly*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1971.
- Heal, Felicity. *Hospitality in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- , "The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 102 (1984): 66-93.
- Hendrickson, David C. *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding*. Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2003.
- Hewitt, Nancy A. *Women's Activism and Social Change: Rochester, New York, 1822-1872*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.
- Heyrman, Christine Leigh. "The Fashion Among More Superior People: Charity and Social Change in Provincial New England, 1700-1740." *American Quarterly* 34 (1982): 107-124.
- Hilton, Boyd. *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Hirschman, Albert. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before its Triumph*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Hitchcock, Tim. *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London*. London: Hambledon and New York, 2004.
- , "Pauper and Preachers: The SPCK and the Parochial Workhouse Movement." In *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689-1750*, 145-166. Eds. Lee Davison, et al. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Hont, Istvan and Michael Ignatieff. *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

- Hopkins, Donald R. *The Greatest Killer: Smallpox in History with a New Introduction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Hoppit, Julian. *Risk and Failure in English Business 1700-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Horsmann, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Howard, D. L. *John Howard: Prison Reformer*. London: C. Johnson, 1958.
- Howe, Barbara. "The Emergence of Scientific Philanthropy, 1900-1920: Origins, Issues and Outcomes," in *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, 25-54. Ed. Robert Arno. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1980.
- Howe, Mark A. DeWolfe. *The Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: An Historical Review, 1785-1916*. Boston, 1918.
- Iannini, Christopher. "'The Itinerant Man': Crevecoeur's Caribbean, Raynal's Revolution, and the Fate of Atlantic Cosmopolitanism," *William and Mary Quarterly* 61 (2004): 201-234.
- Ibarra, Maria de la Luz. "Buscando La Vida: Mexican Immigrant Women's Memories of Home, Yearning, and Border Crossings," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 24 (2003): 261-281.
- Ignatieff, Michael. *Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*. New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- Innes, Joanna. "The 'Mixed Economy of Welfare' in Early Modern England: Assessments of the Options from Hale to Malthus (c. 1683-1803)." In *Charity, Self-Interest and Welfare in the English Past*, 139-180. Ed. Martin Daunton. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Innes, Joanna. "The State and the Poor: Eighteenth-Century England in European Perspectives." In *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany*, 113-132. Eds. John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth. London: German Historical Institute, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Jacob, Margaret C. *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- . *Strangers Nowhere in the World: The Rise of Cosmopolitanism in Early Modern Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Jaffee, David. "The Village Enlightenment in New England, 1760-1820." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3<sup>rd</sup> Ser., 47 (1990): 327-346.
- James, Francis Godwin. "Charity Endowments as Sources of Local Credit in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century England." *Journal of Economic History* 8 (1948): 153-170.
- James, Sydney V. *A People Among Peoples: Quaker Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Jasanoff, Maya. *Edge of Empire: Lives, Culture, and Conquest in the East, 1750-1850*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005.
- John, Richard R. *Spreading the News: The American Postal System from Franklin to Morse*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Johnson, Paul E. *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.
- Jones, Gareth H. *History of the Law of Charity, 1532-1827*. Cambridge: Wm. M. Gaunt

- & Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Jones, M. G. *The Charity School Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. *White over Black: American Attitudes Towards the Negro, 1550-1812*. 1968; New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1977.
- Jordan, W.K. *The Charities of London, 1480-1660*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1960.
- *The Charities of Rural England, 1480-1660*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1961.
- *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1959.
- Juster, Susan. *Disorderly Women: Sexual Politics & Evangelicalism in Revolutionary New England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Kann, Mark E. *Punishments, Prisons, and Patriarchy: Liberty and Power in the Early American Republic*. New York: New York University Press, 2005.
- Kaplan, Catherine O'Donnell. *Men of Letters in the Early Republic*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Karras, Alan L. *Sojourners in the Sun: Scottish Migrants in Jamaica and the Chesapeake, 1740-1800*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Katz, Michael B. *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986.
- Kilpatrick, Robert. "Living in the Light': Dispensaries, Philanthropy and Medical Reform in Late Eighteenth-Century London." In *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*, 254-280. Eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Kingdon, Robert M. "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva." *American Historical Review* 76 (1971): 50-69.
- Kleingeld, Pauline. "Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60 (1999): 505-524.
- Knapp, Samuel L. *The Life of Thomas Eddy*. 1834; reprint edition, New York, 1976.
- Knott, Sarah. "Sensibility and the American War for Independence." *American Historical Review* 109 (2004): 19-40.
- Kraus, Michael. *The Atlantic Civilization: Eighteenth-Century Origins*. Ithaca: Published for the American Historical Association, Cornell University Press, 1949.
- Kristof, Nicholas D. "Aid: Can It Work?," *New York Review of Books* 53:15, October 5, 2006.
- Lambert, David and Alan Lester. "Geographies of Colonial Philanthropy." *Progress in Human Geography* 28 (2004): 320-341.
- Langford, Paul. *A Polite and Commercial People: England, 1727-1783*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Landau, Norma. "The Laws of Settlement and the Surveillance of Immigration in Eighteenth-Century Kent." *Continuity and Change* 3 (1998): 391-420.
- "The Regulation of Immigration, Economic Structure and Definitions of the Poor in Eighteenth-Century England." *The Historical Journal* 33 (1990): 541-571.
- Langstaff, J. Brett. *Dr. Bard of Hyde Park*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1942.
- Larabee, Eric. *The Benevolent and Necessary Institution: The New York Hospital 1771-*

1971. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1971.
- Lawrence, Susan C. *Charitable Knowledge: Hospital Pupils and Practitioners in Eighteenth-Century London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Lehmann, Hartmut. "Transatlantic Migration, Transatlantic Networks, Transatlantic Transfer: Concluding Remarks." In *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century America*, 307-330. Eds. Hartmut Lehman, Hermann Wellenreuther and Renate Wilson. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- Lindemann, Mary. "Urban Growth and Medical Charity: Hamburg 1788-1815." In *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State*, 113-132. Eds. Jonathan Barry and Colin Jones. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. London: Verso, 2000.
- Linebaugh, Peter. "The Tyburn Riot Against the Surgeons." In *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth Century England*, 65-118. Ed. Douglas Hay. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975.
- Llorens, Hilda. "Dislocated Geographies: A Story of Border Crossings." *Small Axe* 10 (2006): 74-93.
- Lloyd, Katherine and Cindy Burgoyne. "The Evolution of a Transatlantic Debate on Penal Reform, 1780-1830." In *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform From the 1690s to 1850*, 208-227. Eds. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Lloyd, Sarah. "Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners: Conviviality, Benevolence, and Charity Anniversaries in Eighteenth-Century London." *Journal of British Studies* 41 (2002): 23-57.
- Lobo, Francis M. "John Haygarth, Smallpox and Religious Dissent in Eighteenth-Century England." In *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*. Eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French, 217-253. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Longmore, Paul. *The Invention of George Washington*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1999.
- Loudon, I. S. L. "The Origins and Growth of the Dispensary Movement in England." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 55 (1981): 322-342.
- MacDonald, Michael and Terence R. Murphy. *Sleepless Souls: Suicide in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Mann, Bruce. *Republic of Debtors: Bankruptcy in the Age of American Independence*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Marshall, P. J. *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America c. 1750-1783*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- "The Moral Swing to the East: British Humanitarianism, India and the West Indies." In P. J. Marshall. *A Free though Conquering People*, '69-95. 1986; reprint Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- "Who Cared about the Thirteen Colonies? Some Evidence from Philanthropy." In *'A Free though Conquering People': Eighteenth-Century Britain and Its Empire*, 53-67. Ed. P. J. Marshall. 1999; reprint Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- 68.



- Masur, Louis P. *Rites of Execution: Capital Punishment and the Transformation of American Culture, 1787-1865*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- May, Henry. *The Enlightenment in America*. New York, 1976.
- McCandless, Peter. "'A House of Cure': The Antebellum South Carolina Lunatic Asylum." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 64 (1990): 220-242.
- McCarthy, Kathleen D. *American Creed: Philanthropy and the Rise of Civil Society 1700-1865*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- McClellan, James E. III. *Science Reorganized: Scientific Societies in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- McClure, Ruth. *Coram's Children: The London Foundling Hospital in the Eighteenth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- McCoy, Drew R. *The Elusive Republic: Political Economy in Jeffersonian America*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1982.
- McCusker, John J. "The Demise of Distance: The Business Press and the Origins of the Information Revolution in the Early Modern Atlantic World." *American Historical Review* 110 (2005): 295-321.
- McElroy, James. "Social Control and Romantic Reform in Antebellum America: The Case of Rochester, New York." *New York History* 58 (1977): 17-46.
- McGowan, Randall. "Power and Humanity, or Foucault among the Historians." In *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body*, 91-112. Eds. Colin Jones and Roy Porter. London: Routledge 1994.
- McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb. *Birth of a Consumer Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.
- McKenna, Katherine M. J. *A Life of Propriety: Anne Murray Powell and Her Family, 1755-1849*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.
- Meranze, Michael. *Laboratories of Virtue: Punishment, Revolution, and Authority in Philadelphia, 1760-1835*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Midgley, Clare. *Women Against Slavery: The British Campaigns, 1780-1870*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Mignolo, Walter D. "The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." In *Cosmopolitanism*, 157-187. Eds. Carol A. Breckenridge, Homi K. Bhabha, Sheldon Pollock, and Dipesh Chakrabarty. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Miller, Genevieve. *The Adoption of Smallpox Inoculation in England and France*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957.
- Miller, Samuel. *Memoirs of the Rev. John Rodgers, D.D. Late Pastor of the Wall-Street and Brick Churches, in the City of New-York*. New York, 1813.
- Mitchison, Rosalind. *The Old Poor Law in Scotland: The Experience of Poverty, 1574-1845*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.
- Mohl, Raymond. "The Humane Society and Urban Reform in Early New York, 1787-1831." *New-York Historical Society Quarterly* 54 (1970): 30-52.
- "Humanitarianism in the Preindustrial City: The New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism." *Journal of American History* 57 (1970): 576-599.
- *Poverty in New York, 1783-1825*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Morgan, Rod. "Divine Philanthropy: John Howard Reconsidered." *History* 62 (1977): 388-410.

- Morris, R. J. "Voluntary Societies and British Urban Elites, 1780-1850." In *The Eighteenth-Century Town 1688-1820*, 338-366. Ed. Peter Borsay. London, 1990.
- Mulcahy, Matthew. *Hurricanes and Society in the British Greater Caribbean, 1624-1783*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Mullan, John. *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in Eighteenth-Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Muncy, Robyn. *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890-1935*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Namier, Sir Lewis and John Brooke. *The House of Commons*. Vol. 2. New York: Published for the History of Parliament Press by Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Newman, Richard S. *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Newman, Simon P. "American Political Culture and the French and Haitian Revolutions: Nathaniel Cutting and the Jeffersonian Republicans." In *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, 72-89. Ed. David P. Geggus. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- . *Embodied History: The Lives of the Poor in Early Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- North, Eric McCoy. *Early Methodist Philanthropy*. New York: [The Methodist Book Concern], 1914.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. and Joshua Cohen, eds. *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- O'Brien, Susan. "Eighteenth-Century Publishing Networks in the First Years of Transatlantic Evangelicalism." In *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990*. New York, 1994.
- O'Connell, Neil J. "George Whitefield and Bethesda Orphan-House," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 54 (1970): 41-62.
- O'Donnell, John M. "Cullen's Influence on American Medicine." In *William Cullen and the Eighteenth Century Medical World*. Eds. A. Doig, J. P. S. Ferguson, I. A. Milne and R. Passmore. Edinburgh, 1993.
- One Hundred Years of History of the Baltimore General Dispensary*. Baltimore, 1901.
- O'Shaughnessy, Andrew. *An Empire Divided: The American Revolution and the British Caribbean*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Owen, David. *English Philanthropy 1660-1960*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Parrish, Susan Scott. *American Curiosity: Cultures of Natural History in the Colonial British Atlantic World*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Pencak, William. *Jews and Gentiles in Early America*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2005.
- Pernick, Martin. "Back from the Grave: Recurring Controversies over Defining and Diagnosing Death in History." In *Death: Beyond Whole-Brain Criteria*, 17-74. Ed. Richard M. Zaner. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988.

- Phillips, Joseph W. *Jedidiah Morse and New England Congregationalism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983.
- Plaisted, Arthur H. *The Manor and Parish Records of Medmenham*. London, 1925.
- Plumb, J. H. "The Acceptance of Modernity." In *Birth of a Consumer Society*, 316-334. Eds. Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.
- Pocock, J. G. A. *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays of Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Porter, Roy. "Cleaning up the Great Wen: Public Health in Eighteenth-Century London." In *Living and Dying in London*. Eds. W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter. *Medical History Supplement* No. 11, 1991.
- *The Creation of the Modern World: The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 2000.
- "The Gift Relation: Philanthropy and Provincial Hospitals in Eighteenth-Century England." In *The Hospital in History*, 149-178. Eds. Lindsay Granshaw and Roy Porter. London: Routledge, 1989.
- "Lay Medical Knowledge in the Eighteenth Century: Evidence from the *Gentleman's Magazine*." *Medical History* 29 (1985): 138-168.
- "The Rise of Medical Journalism in Britain to 1800." In *Medical Journals and Medical Knowledge: Historical Essays*, 6-28. London: Routledge, 1992.
- and Mikalus Teich, eds. *The Enlightenment in National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Powell, John Harvey. *Bring Out Your Dead: The Great Plague of Yellow Fever in Philadelphia in 1793*. 1949; New York: Arno Press, 1970.
- Powell, Walter W., Kenneth W. Koput, and Laurel Smith-Doerr. "Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation: Networks of Learning in Biotechnology." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41 (1996): 116-145.
- Powell, Walter M. and Laurel Smith-Doerr. "Networks and Economic Life." In *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Eds. Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg. Princeton, 1994.
- Poynter, J. R. *Society and Pauperism: English Ideas on Poor Relief, 1795-1834*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Prest, Wilifrid. *Albion Ascendant: English History 1660-1815*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Prochaska, F. K. *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Pybus, Cassandra. "Billy Blue: An African American Journey through Empire in the Long Eighteenth Century." *Early American Studies* 5 (2007): 252-288.
- "'A Less Favourable Specimen': The Abolitionist Response to Self-Emancipated Slaves in Sierra Leone, 1793-1808." *Parliamentary History* 26 Supplement (2007): 97-112.
- Radcliffe, Evan. "Burke, Radical Cosmopolitanism, and the Debates on Patriotism in the 1790s." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 28 (1999): 311-339.
- "Revolutionary Writing, Moral Philosophy, and Universal Benevolence in the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 54 (1993): 221-240.

- Reid-Maroney, Nina. "Scottish Medicine and Christian Enlightenment at the Pennsylvania Hospital, 1775-1800." In *Nation and Province in the First British Empire: Scotland and the Americas, 1600-1800*, 245-264. Ed. Ned C. Landsman. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2001.
- Richards, Eric. "Scotland and the Uses of Atlantic Empire." In *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*, 67-114. Eds. Bernard Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute for Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1991.
- Riley, James C. *The Eighteenth-Century Campaign to Avoid Disease*. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- Rippy, J. Fred. *Joel R. Poinsett: Versatile American*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1935.
- Risch, Erna. "Immigrant Aid Societies before 1820." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 60 (1936): 15-34.
- Risse, Guenter B. "Medicine in the Age of Enlightenment." In *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*, 149-196. Ed. Andrew Wear. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Roberts, M. J. D. *Making English Morals: Voluntary Associations and Moral Reform in England, 1787-1886*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Robertson, Thomas S. and Yoram Wind. "Organizational Cosmopolitanism and Innovativeness." *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 332-338.
- Robbins, Christine Chapman. *David Hosack: Citizen of New York*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1964.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Rose, Craig. "Politics and the London Royal Hospitals, 1683-92." In *The Hospital in History*, 123-148. Ed. Lindsay Granshaw and Roy Porter. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Rosenband, Leonard. "The Competitive Cosmopolitanism of an Old Regime Craft," *French Historical Studies* 23 (2000): 455-476.
- Rosenberg, Charles E. *The Care of Strangers: The Rise of America's Hospital System*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987.
- . *Caring for the Working Man: The Rise and Fall of the Dispensary Movement*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1989
- . "Health in the Home: A Tradition of Print and Practice." In *Right Living: An Anglo-American Tradition of Self-Help Medicine and Hygiene*, 1-20. Ed. Charles E. Rosenberg. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Rosenthal, Joel. *The Purchase of Paradise: Gift Giving and the Aristocracy, 1307-1485*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Rothman, David J. *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.
- Rozin, Mordechai. *The Rich and the Poor: Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1999.
- Rubin, Miri. *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Ryan, Bryce and Neal C. Gross, "The Diffusion of Hybrid Seed Corn in Two Iowa Communities." *Rural Sociology* 8 (1943): 15-24.

- Sachs, Jeffrey D. "How Aid Can Work," *New York Review of Books* 53: 20, December 21, 2006.
- Sandage, Scott. *Born Losers: A History of Failure in America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Schickel, Richard. *Intimate Strangers: The Culture of Celebrity in America, with a New Afterword by the Author*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000.
- Schlechter, Boyd Stanley. "'To Convert the Poor People in America': The Bethesda Orphanage and the Thwarted Zeal of the Countess of Huntingdon." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 78 (1994): 225-256.
- Schlereth, Thomas J. *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought*. Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Schultz, Edward T. *History of Freemasonry in Maryland*. Vol. 2. Baltimore: J. H. Medairy & Co., 1885.
- Scull, Andrew. *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in England, 1700-1900*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Sensbach, Jon. *Rebecca's Revival: Creating Black Christianity in the Atlantic World*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Shipton, Clifford K., ed. *Sibley's Harvard Graduate*. Vol. 15 of 18 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1970.
- *Sibley's Harvard Graduate*. Vol. 17 of 18 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1970.
- Shyroock, Richard Harrison. *Medicine and Society in America 1660-1860*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972.
- Siena, Kevin. *Venereal Disease, Hospitals and the Urban Poor: London's 'Foul Wards,' 1600-1800*. Rochester, NY: Rochester University Press, 2004.
- Simey, Margaret B. *Charitable Effort in Liverpool in the Nineteenth Century*. Liverpool: University Press, 1951.
- Slack, Paul. *The English Poor Law, 1531-1782*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- *From Reformation to Improvement: Public Welfare in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- *Poverty and Policy in Tudor & Stuart England*. London: Longman, 1998.
- Smith, Billy G, ed. *Down and Out in Early America*. University Park, Penna.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004.
- Snell, K. D. M. *Annals of the Labouring Poor: Social Change and Agrarian England, 1660-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- *Parish and Belonging: Community, Identity and Welfare in England and Wales, 1700-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- "Pauper Settlement and the Right to Poor Relief in England and Wales." *Continuity and Change* 6 (1991): 375-416.
- Solkin, David H. *Painting for Money: The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England*. Yale: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1992.
- Spadafora, David. *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

- Sparrow, W. J. *Knight of the White Eagle: A Biography of Sir Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford*. London: Hutchinson, 1964.
- Steele, Ian K. *The English Atlantic 1675-1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Stevens, Laura M. *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Stott, Anne. *Hannah More: The First Victorian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Stout, Harry S. *The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William R. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1991.
- Taylor, George Rodgers. *The Transportation Revolution*. New York, Rinehart, 1951.
- Taylor, James Stephen. "The Impact of Pauper Settlement 1691-1834." *Past and Present* 73 (1976): 42-74.
- . *Jonas Hanway Founder of the Marine Society: Charity and Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. London: Scolar Press, 1985.
- Tercier, John Anthony. *Contemporary Deathbed: The Ultimate Rush*. Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Tiffany, Nina Moore. *Letters of James Murray Loyalist*. Boston, 1901.
- Todd, Janet. *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Thomas, E. G. "The Old Poor Law and Medicine." *Medical History* 24 (1980): 1-19.
- Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Thomson, Elizabeth. "The Role of Physicians in the Humane Societies of the Eighteenth Century." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 37 (1963): 43-51.
- Thorne, Susan. "'The Conversion of Englishmen and the Conversion of the World Inseparable': Missionary Imperialism and the Language of Class in Early Industrial Britain." In *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, 238-262. Eds. Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Transactions of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia*. 3<sup>rd</sup> series. Vol. 9. 1887.
- Turley, David. "British Antislavery Reassessed." In *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1750-1850*, 182-199. Eds. Arthur Burns and Joanna Innes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Turley, David. *The Culture of English Antislavery, 1780-1860*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Tyrell, Ian R. *Sobering Up: From Temperance to Prohibition in Antebellum America, 1800-1860*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Uglow, Jenny. *The Lunar Men: Five Friends Whose Curiosity Changed the World*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002.
- Ulrich, Laurel Thacher. *A Midwife's Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard, Based on Her Diary, 1785-1812*. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Underdown, David. *Fire From Heaven: The Life of an English Town in the Seventeenth Century*. London: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Van Horne, John. Introduction to *Religious Philanthropy and Colonial Slavery: The American Correspondence of the Associates of Dr. Bray*, 1-39. Ed. John Van Horne. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985.

- Vertovec, Steven and Robin Cohen, eds. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Vila, Pablo. *Border Identifications: Narratives of Religion, Gender, and Class on the U.S.-Mexico Border*. Austin, Tx.: University of Texas Press, 2005.
- Vila, Pablo. *Crossing Borders, Reinforcing Borders: Social Categories, Metaphors, and Narrative Identities on the U.S.-Mexico Frontier*. Austin, Tx.: University of Texas Press, 2000.
- Villiers, Marq de and Sheila Hirtle. *Sable Island: The Strange Origins and Curious History of a Dune Adrift in the Atlantic*. New York: Walker and Co., 2004.
- Waldstreicher, David. *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Walters, Ronald. *American Reformers 1815-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.
- Wanko, Cheryl. *Roles of Authority: Thespian Biography and Celebrity in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Lubbock, Tx.: Texas Tech University Press, 2003.
- Waring, Joseph Ioor. *A History of Medicine in South Carolina*. [Charleston?]: Published by the South Carolina Medical Society, 1964.
- Wasserman, Stanley and Katherine Faust, *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Watson, S. M., ed. *The Maine Historical and Genealogical Register*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1973.
- Whelan, Kevin. "The Green Atlantic: Radical Reciprocities between Ireland and America in the Long Eighteenth Century." In *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire 1660-1840*, 216-238. Ed. Kathleen Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- White, Shane. *Somewhat More Independent: The End of Slavery in New York, 1770-1810*. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1991.
- Williams, Carolyn. "The Luxury of Doing Good": Benevolence, Sensibility, and the Royal Humane Society." In *Pleasure in the Eighteenth Century*, 77-107. Ed. Roy Porter and Marie Mulvey Roberts. New York: NYU Press, 1996.
- Williams, Eric. *Capitalism and Slavery, with A New Introduction by Colin A. Palmer*. 1944; rpt. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Williams, William H. "The 'Industrious Poor' and the Founding of the Pennsylvania Hospital." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 97 (1973): 431-443.
- Wilson, Adrian. "Conflict, Consensus and Charity: Politics and the Provincial Voluntary Hospitals in the Eighteenth Century." *English Historical Review* 111 (1996): 599-619.
- Wilson, Adrian. "The Politics of Medical Improvement in Early Hanoverian England." In *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*, 4-39. Eds. Andrew Cunningham and Roger French. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Wilson, Julia. "An Early Baltimore Physician and His Medical Library." *Annals of Medical History* 4 (1942): 63-80.
- Wilson, Julia. "Dr. John Crawford, 1746-1813." *Bulletin of the School of Medicine University of Maryland* 25 (1940): 116-132.

- Wilson, Kathleen. "Urban Culture and Political Activism in Hanoverian England: The Example of Voluntary Hospitals." In *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Century*, 165-184. Ed. Eckhart Hellmuth. London: German Historical Institute, Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Wilson, Renate. "Halle Pietism in Colonial Georgia." *Lutheran Quarterly* 12 (1998): 271-301.
- . "Pietist Universal Reform and the Care of the Sick and the Poor: The Medical Institutions of the Francke Foundation and the Social Context." In *Institutions of Confinement: Hospitals, Asylums, and Prisons in Western Europe and North America, 1500-1950*, 133-152. Eds. Norbert Finzsch and Robert Jutte. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . *Pious Traders in Medicine: A German Pharmaceutical Network in Eighteenth-Century North America*. University Park, Penna.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- Winch, Julie. *James Forten, Gentleman of Color*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Wood, Gordon S. *The Americanization of Benjamin Franklin*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.
- . *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1991.
- Woodward, John. *To Do the Sick No Harm: The British Voluntary Hospital Movement to 1875*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.
- Wright, Conrad Edick. *The Transformation of Charity in Postrevolutionary New England*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992.
- Wright, Robert E. "The Financial Sector and the Reduction of Lending-Related Risks." In *The Wealth of Nations Rediscovered: Integration and Expansion in American Financial Markets, 1780-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Zuckerman, Arnold. "Plague and Contagionism in Eighteenth-Century England: The Role of Richard Mead." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78 (2004): 273-308.

### **Dissertations**

- Bell, Richard J. "Do Not Despair: The Cultural Significance of Suicide in America, 1780-1840." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2006.
- Burgoyne, Cindy. "'Imprisonment the Best Punishment': The Transatlantic Exchange and Communication of Ideas in the Field of Penology, 1750-1820." Ph.D. diss., University of Sunderland, 1997.
- Davidson, Luke. "Raising Up Humanity: A Cultural History of Resuscitation and the Royal Humane Society of London, 1774-1808." Ph.D. diss., University of York, 2001.
- Godfrey, Amy Margaret. "Divine Benevolence to the Poor: Charity, Religion and Nationalism in Early National New York, 1784-1820." Ph.D. diss, Northern Illinois University, 2007.
- Lloyd, Katherine M. R. "Peace, Politics & Philanthropy: Henry Brougham, William Roscoe and America 1808-1868." Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1996.
- McDaniel, William Caleb. "Our Country is the World: Radical Abolitionists Abroad." Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2006.
- Neem, Johann. "The Transformation of Civil Society in Massachusetts, 1780s-1840s." Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 2004.



Ziesche, Philipp. "Cosmopolitan Patriots in the Age of Revolution: Americans in Paris, 1788-1800." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2006.

### **Electronic Sources**

*American National Biography Online*

*Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*

Kolata, Gina. "Marathoners Warned about Too Much Water." *New York Times*. October 20, 2005.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/20/sports/sportsspecial/20marathon.html?sq=marathoners%20warned%20about%20too%20much%20water&st=nyt&scp=1&pagewanted=all#>

[viewed April 26, 2008]

O'Neill, Molly. "Keep the Home Fires Burning." *New York Times*, May 7, 1995.

<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=990CEFDE153FF934A35756C0A963958260> [viewed September 19, 2007]

*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online ed., May 2007

*Oxford English Dictionary*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford, 1989.

[www.savethechildren.org](http://www.savethechildren.org).