

2014

## When Baseball Went White

Ryan A. Swanson

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples>

---

Swanson, Ryan A., "When Baseball Went White" (2014). *University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters*. 270.  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples/270>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Nebraska Press at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# When Baseball Went White

[Buy the Book](#)



# **When Baseball Went White**

Reconstruction, Reconciliation,  
and Dreams of a National Pastime

RYAN A. SWANSON

University of Nebraska Press | Lincoln and London

[Buy the Book](#)

© 2014 by the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska. All rights reserved. Manufactured in the United States of America. ∞

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Swanson, Ryan A.

When baseball went white: reconstruction,  
reconciliation, and dreams of a national pastime /  
Ryan A. Swanson.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8032-3521-2 (hardback: alk. paper)

ISBN 978-0-8032-5518-0 (epub)

ISBN 978-0-8032-5519-7 (mobi)

ISBN 978-0-8032-5517-3 (pdf) 1. Baseball—United States—History—19th century. 2. Racism in sports—United States. 3. Discrimination in sports—United States. 4. African American baseball players—United States—Social conditions. 5. United States—Race relations. I. Title.

G863.A1S955 2014

796.35709034—dc23 2013046027

Set in Minion Pro by Renni Johnson.

Designed by A. Shahan.

## CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	vi
Introduction	vii
Prominent Players and Clubs	xix
PART 1. THE WAR'S OVER, 1865–67	
1. Washington DC: A Game to Be Governed	3
2. Richmond: Make It a Southern Game	21
3. Philadelphia: Baseball's Boomtown	42
PART 2. SORTING OUT NEW DIVISIONS, 1867–69	
4. Philadelphia: Setting Precedent	69
5. Washington DC: Nationalizing Separation	91
6. Richmond: Calibrating a Response	113
PART 3. NEW REALITIES ENTRENCHED, THE 1870S	
7. Philadelphia: Permanent Solutions	137
8. Richmond: The Final Tally	156
9. Washington DC: Professional Separation	171
Epilogue	191
Acknowledgments	199
Notes	201
Bibliography	233
Index	247

## ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Illustration of the White Lot	15
2. Map of Richmond's burned district	25
3. Map of Philadelphia's baseball landscape	43
4. Map of the White House grounds	186

## INTRODUCTION

To say, as many historians have, that baseball's racial segregation resulted from a "gentlemen's agreement" is roughly the equivalent of asserting that the Civil War stemmed from a difference of opinion.<sup>1</sup> There is truth in both statements, but not nearly enough nuance to satisfy even the most recreational of inquisitors. This study attempts to find a better, more precise answer to baseball's segregation question. Baseball boomed in the United States in the 1860s and '70s, becoming a "perfect mania" among the soldiers returning home from the Civil War.<sup>2</sup> Black and white men flocked to urban ball fields. But even as Reconstruction legislators debated how to guide four million former slaves along the path to citizenship, segregation emerged quickly in baseball. White baseball leaders barred black baseball players from joining white leagues and clubs and from owning baseball property. Due to this discrimination, black men created separate baseball communities of their own. By the time the National League (NL) organized in 1876 (as Reconstruction ended), baseball had become an overwhelmingly segregated sport.

How did this happen? Neither historians nor the legion of journalists and baseball writers who have penned, quite literally, hundreds of thousands of pages about the game have fully addressed this question. Instead, the issue of baseball's segregation has been mostly passed over. "Nothing is ever said or written about drawing the color line in the [National] League," *Sporting Life* unapologetically observed in 1895. "It appears to be generally understood that none but whites shall make up the League teams, and so it goes."<sup>3</sup> This statement, while written more than a century ago, is surprisingly germane today. It neatly summarizes the historiography of baseball's segregation. Whereas much has

been written on Jackie Robinson and the process of baseball's racial *desegregation*, not nearly enough attention has been paid to an obvious but oft-overlooked question: how did baseball develop to the point where it needed Jackie Robinson in the first place?<sup>4</sup> This study focuses on the “mechanics of baseball's segregation.” The cities of Philadelphia, Richmond, and Washington DC anchor the analysis, allowing for the investigation of the North and South, both state and federal concerns, and black and white constituencies.

The fanatical desire by white baseball leaders to foster a “national game” was the preeminent force behind baseball's segregation. Northern baseball leaders worked tirelessly to spread baseball's popularity south of the Mason-Dixon line. White newspapermen and baseball writers spoke passionately about how baseball could heal and empower all Americans.<sup>5</sup> This desire to form a national baseball constituency (in a geographical sense) was not new during Reconstruction. At a convention in 1857, baseball leaders had boldly declared: “Base ball is about becoming a great national institution.”<sup>6</sup> As the pursuit of nationalization and sectional “reconciliation” became the *modus operandi*, however, the fear of introducing political acrimony into the white baseball community became paramount. And therein David Blight's contention that “the practice of reconciliation” compromised racial progress is proved accurate again and again in baseball communities, only sooner.<sup>7</sup> White baseball players pursued civil rights—damning reconciliation almost immediately after the Civil War.

Henry Chadwick, the self-proclaimed “father of baseball,” spoke repeatedly in “reconciliationist” terms, such as when he stated in 1866, “Our national game is intended to be national in every sense of the word.”<sup>8</sup> He also clarified the racial complexion of this national game, as in his *Base Ball Manual, for 1871*: “Both games [baseball and cricket] rest, first, upon the desire of the Anglo-Saxon (we do not say Caucasian, or Aryan, because we like to be exact) to arm himself with a stick and drive a small round body with it; and, secondly, upon the desire of any other Anglo-Saxon who happens to be in the way to stop this body, to deprive the other of his stick, and ‘bat’ himself.”<sup>9</sup> These two beliefs about baseball—that it was to be national and dominated by white men—were intertwined. Newspapermen encouraged reunion and warned against possible fractures that might hinder baseball's development.

White ballplayers were to avoid “undue partisanship” (read: issues of racial policy) so that “the great American game” might flourish. “This is the spirit,” Washington’s *Chronicle* wrote of baseball’s great quest for apolitical behavior, “that should animate every organization, for without it dissensions may arise, and hard feelings originate therefrom, to the detriment and disfavor of the game.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, ironically, in the name of creating a “national pastime,” baseball excluded black ballplayers.

In addition to sectional reconciliation, the removal of political radicals from positions of leadership within the white baseball community, violence against black players, and the unequal partitioning of baseball land made baseball an increasingly white game. So too did the trend of linking baseball with Confederate-memorializing causes. Similarly, the emergence of the open professionalization in the 1870s solidified many segregationist trends. Equally as important, the success of black ball clubs, even amid hostile circumstances (*Memphis Public Ledger*: “The colored base ball brigade is one of the greatest nuisances about the suburbs of the city. Enough lazy, thieving niggers swing a base-ball bat to raise a thousand bales of cotton, if they would”), also influenced emerging baseball norms.<sup>11</sup>

Baseball historians have mostly passed over Reconstruction-era “baseballists.” And those studies that have looked at Reconstruction baseball have focused primarily on the action on the field, rather than the broader context of baseball.<sup>12</sup> But the task of understanding the Reconstruction-era baseball segregation is important because it informs us about the process of segregating society at large and about the failure of political Reconstruction. Baseball here should contribute to discussions led by the likes of C. Vann Woodward and Eric Foner.<sup>13</sup> To be clear, this is a Reconstruction history—even though there are more bats and ball than legislators and political speeches. The entire nation, not just the former Confederacy, faced new postwar realities. Certainly, the national legislation of Reconstruction cannot be ignored. The Civil Rights Acts of 1866 and 1875; the passage of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments; and the work of the Freedmen’s Bureau (active in Washington DC and throughout the South) all contributed to erecting a legal basis for racial equality. But despite these measures, segregation—both *de facto* and *de jure*—overwhelmed the national political and legal initiatives set forth by politicians.<sup>14</sup>

Baseball is a perfect conduit for the study of race relations during Reconstruction. As Elliott Gorn explains in his work on prizefighting, sports can provide unique insights into a culture: “Most workers did not spend their free time reading the *Rights of Man*, toasting Tom Paine, and struggling to resist oppression. . . . [Instead] look closely at [workers’] folklore and recreations, their pastimes and sports, for it has been in leisure more than in politics or labor that many men and women have found their deepest sense of meaning and wholeness.”<sup>15</sup> I concur. Studying black and white baseball offers vital social and cultural context to the political history of Reconstruction. Although it has been warned that “history without politics descends to mere literature,” history focused too narrowly on politics and politicians misses the mark as well.<sup>16</sup> By examining baseball communities in America’s major cities, oft-peripheral abstractions will be presented in a more tangible fashion. The panic of 1873, for example, led to many baseball teams folding. Baseball also reveals how land was important to African Americans living in cities, just as it was in the countryside. Although not looking for the “40 Acres and Mule” promised by General William T. Sherman’s Special Order No. 15, baseball clubs jostled for control of public space. Not surprisingly, black clubs rarely came out ahead in this struggle.<sup>17</sup>

Baseball clubs carved out space to play the game in the midst of office buildings and factories. Some teams played in beautiful public parks; others made do with rough, trash-hewn vacant lots. The field standards were not high. Still, the best—that is, flattest, driest, and most centrally located—parcels of space often teemed with baseball activity. Baseball’s most supportive newspaper, the *New York Clipper*, rejoiced in the chaotic activity at baseball hot spots: “The way the balls fly in every direction is enough to remind a veteran of the army of the time when he found himself like the ‘six hundred’ in the Crimea, who had ‘balls to the right of them, balls to the left of them.’”<sup>18</sup>

Competition for baseball grounds intensified when it became clear that there was money to be made charging admission to games. A baseball “enclosure” movement resulted. The battle for baseball space in Washington DC took place literally on the president’s doorstep. The “White Lot,” located between the Washington Canal (which today is Constitution Avenue) and the White House, played host to the District’s biggest games of the 1860s and ’70s. Presidents occasionally

ambled down from the executive mansion to take in the action and invited visiting teams into the White House.<sup>19</sup> The sharing of baseball space, however, rarely lasted. In each city the dominant teams eventually took control of the best baseball space. Tellingly, when the Athletic Club of Philadelphia planned to open its new grounds in 1871, the *New York Clipper* reported: “A substantial board fence, ten feet high is to be erected, and other improvements made, so that the grounds shall be the finest in the country.”<sup>20</sup> The description of the fence, and then everything else, accurately depicted the focus on controlling baseball space.

Both black and white ballplayers played roles in shaping how baseball’s segregated environment emerged and functioned. Many white clubs did what they could to keep black clubs from using the best fields and joining leagues. Black players, however, were hardly waiting idly for invitations to join white teams. In fact, very little evidence exists to suggest that black ballplayers during the Reconstruction period yearned for positions on white clubs, and certainly not at the expense of their black-led and black-populated clubs. Equality rather than social proximity was the goal. Charles Douglass, the son of Frederick Douglass, for one, knew what it was to work with white men (in the Freedmen’s Bureau and the Treasury Department), but he invested in playing baseball among black men—first with the Washington Mutual Base Ball Club (BBC) and then the Alert.<sup>21</sup>

White baseball players had professional opportunities that their black counterparts did not. “It is estimated that professional ball tossers get paid larger salaries than three-fourths of the ministers of the Gospel of the United States,” the *Washington Sunday Herald* reported in October 1873. This was not a criticism. Ministers made less for good reason: “Religion is not the national game you know,” the *Sunday Herald* explained.<sup>22</sup> Baseball’s popularity following the Civil War crossed state lines, class barriers, and racial divides. The game grew up in urban environments, and the nation’s biggest cities—New York City, Philadelphia, and Boston—were early leaders in the game. The nation’s most populous city, New York City, and the still-independent Brooklyn, led the way. The New York Knickerbocker Base Ball Club had organized in 1845.<sup>23</sup> The Brooklyn Eckfords, the Brooklyn Atlantics, and the New York Mutuals each claimed, at one time or another during baseball’s early years, to be the nation’s “champion” club.

Ballplayers became regional celebrities in Reconstruction-era America. “Callow sportsmen worship them reverently, enthusiasts abase themselves before their spike boots, and at rural hostelries say ‘that’s them!’ and compete with each other for the honor of carrying their bats.”<sup>24</sup> Baseball developed quickly following the Civil War. The *New York Times* in 1869 estimated more than 1,000 baseball clubs were active in the United States and that more than two hundred thousand fans attended games annually. *Wilkes’ Spirit of the Times* reported higher numbers, counting 2,000 organized clubs by 1867. Newspaper tallies make clear that dozens of clubs organized and played in each Philadelphia, Richmond, and Washington every year during the Reconstruction era. Philadelphia almost certainly had the most clubs of the three cities, nearly equaling New York City in terms of sheer numbers if not in the quality of its clubs. Baseball clubs varied significantly in their approach to and proficiency in baseball. The “Shoo-Fly” and “Don’t Bodder Me” nines of the Census Bureau, for example, took an obviously lighthearted approach to the game, while the Washington Nationals, Philadelphia Athletics, and Richmond Pastime each pursued baseball excellence far more seriously.<sup>25</sup>

Baseball games attracted large and enthusiastic audiences. Crowds as large as forty thousand gathered to watch games between the clubs of Philadelphia and New York. Matches attracting more than a thousand fans occurred regularly in the 1860s. “It was a sight to behold the crowd,” wrote one reporter, “as they stood waiting their turns to deposit their quarters previous to taking seats to see the grand base ball performances of the day.”<sup>26</sup> In addition to the throngs of fans that assembled for games, the baseball men themselves loved to convene. In 1866, the first full year after the Civil War ended, 202 clubs—representing seventeen states and the District of Columbia—sent delegates to the convention of the National Association of Base Ball Players (NABBP). Baseball’s organizing bodies—the NABBP beginning in 1857, then, in 1871, the National Association of Professional Base Ball Players (NAPBBP)—had annual conventions and played a significant role in determining the game’s rules and customs.<sup>27</sup>

Newspapers also helped grow the game. Competition for baseball readers was fierce at times, leading to dissension among the baseball presses. The *Philadelphia Sunday Mercury*, for example, derided its

crosstown baseball rival, the *City Item*, calling it a “weak, wishy-washy sheet.”<sup>28</sup> This pattern generally played out in each city. One or two papers, whether as a market strategy or simply due to their editors’ preference, became known as *the* baseball paper for the city. To supplement the coverage of the city presses, three major sporting dailies arose: the *New York Clipper* (1853–1924), *Wilkes’ Spirit of the Times* (1861–77), and the *Ball Players’ Chronicle* (1867–68). The *Ball Players’ Chronicle* described the need for such sports-specific papers due to the fact that city dailies often became distracted with other issues: “The sudden absence of the base ball reports in the daily papers is no indication of a sudden close of the season, as about this time of year election topics absorb all the space the dailies have to spare to local topics, and the moral exercise of base ball is crowded out of the columns.”<sup>29</sup> The sporting presses gave the baseball community the exposure it needed to transcend its early New York City base. The papers printed letters, answered baseball questions, announced rule changes, published schedules, and reported scores.<sup>30</sup>

Additionally, the press shaped the game’s values and traditions. Henry Chadwick in particular took on a leading role in shaping baseball into a gentlemen’s game. Chadwick wrote widely about baseball, mostly for the *New York Clipper*, and in books and pamphlets on the game’s rules and results. Chadwick’s 1868 guide, *The Game of Baseball: How to Learn It, How to Play It, and How to Teach It*, outlined the game’s rules (“If the ball he hits should be caught by any one of the fielders before touching the ground—or ‘on the fly,’ as it is called—he is out”) and urged players to engage in fair play and uphold orderliness at all times.<sup>31</sup> Chadwick sanctimoniously promoted baseball as the nation’s most noble and “manly” pastime.<sup>32</sup>

One of the baseball community’s strictest demarcation lines involved gender. Women in the 1860s and ’70s had few roles in “official baseball”—they could not join baseball leagues and rarely competed in the admission-charging games covered by newspapers. Although women’s college baseball games would become more common in the late nineteenth century and girls undoubtedly played at neighborhood sandlots, women’s roles in the burgeoning game were usually confined to being spectators. Women’s attendance was thought to keep the crowds orderly and bring respectability to the game, distinguishing it from unrestrained male pursuits such as boxing.<sup>33</sup>

In terms of the game on the field, modern baseball fans would recognize the nineteenth-century game as baseball. The game then, as now, revolved around one man throwing a ball and another attempting to hit it. But there were many rule debates. Two rule changes in particular—the adoption of the “fly game” and the codification of pitching standards—shaped the development of Reconstruction-era baseball. The debate over the “fly game” versus the “bound rule” dominated the National Association of Base Ball Players’ convention of 1864. At issue was whether a fielder had to catch the ball “on the fly” to record an out or if it was acceptable to allow the ball to bounce first. The fly game, perceived as “manlier” and as rewarding “creditable risks,” won out.<sup>34</sup>

The rule changes regarding the delivery of the ball to the batter also significantly shaped baseball’s development. Ballplayers *pitched* because they were forbidden to throw. Rules gradually shifted from the pitcher having to release the ball from below the level of his waist to, by the late 1860s, below the level of his shoulder.<sup>35</sup> Even in 1868 when Chadwick published his baseball missive, however, the pitcher-batter relationship was not one of outright confrontation.<sup>36</sup> “When the batsman takes his position at home base, the umpire asks him where he wants a ball, and the batsman responds by saying, ‘knee high,’ or ‘waist high,’ or by naming the character of the ball he wants, and the pitcher is required by the rules to deliver the batsman a ball within the legitimate reach of his bat and as near the place indicated as he can.”<sup>37</sup> Pitchers changed speeds and mixed up their deliveries as much as possible, but the batters’ advantage resulted in scores that often reached triple digits—an 1866 score of Richmond 76, Spotswood 102 not being overly atypical.<sup>38</sup>

Baseball’s rules fit the times. Placing restrictions on pitchers, for the purpose of giving the batter a chance to hit the ball, meant to ensure fair competition. The ideas of amateurism, fairness, order, and respectability remained entrenched in late-nineteenth-century baseball culture. Throughout the rule changes of the 1860s and ’70s, baseball ethos continued to include an emphasis on bringing together gentlemen for dignified competition. “The efforts of gentlemen to elevate the national game to something like dignity and refinement, are fast being realized,” wrote one baseball reporter in 1869.<sup>39</sup>

This quest for respectability did not, it should be noted, immediately demand racial exclusion. Black baseball clubs existed as a part of the broad

baseball community, albeit often on the periphery. One of the first reported games of baseball involving black men occurred in New York City in 1859. The Henson and Unknown Clubs, both of Jamaica, Long Island, engaged in a 54–43 battle. The *Brooklyn Eagle* reported on another black contest in 1862, this time between the Unknown and Monitor Clubs, and applied the respectability scale to the participants: “The dusky contestants enjoyed the game hugely, and to us a common phrase, they ‘did the thing genteelly.’”<sup>40</sup> Deciding just how integrated baseball clubs and leagues should be, of course, became a central issue in the post–Civil War baseball world.

Although no major baseball cities will go untouched, this study uses Philadelphia, Richmond, and Washington DC as its mooring points. There are several practical reasons for these choices. First, the mid-Atlantic region had the most concentrated population of African Americans in the United States during the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>41</sup> Second, the region was home to many of the nation’s finest baseball clubs—black and white. Third, within the roughly two hundred miles that separated Philadelphia from Richmond, both the complexities and the overarching patterns of the Reconstruction era surfaced. Philadelphia demonstrated that those states above the Mason-Dixon line could hardly avoid the post–Civil War readjustment period. Richmond faced the Freedmen’s Bureau and former slaves. Washington DC became engulfed in the politics of the federal Reconstruction process.

Philadelphians entered the Reconstruction era with a detachment that the residents of Richmond and Washington must have envied. A return to prewar normalcy seemed possible, as Philadelphia neither had suffered the war damage experienced by Richmond nor was it saddled with Washington’s duties to administer Reconstruction or the teeming slave refugee camp that existed in the nation’s capital. Philadelphia was the United States’ second-largest city, possessing a seemingly sizable black population, 22,147 in 1870, the largest of any urban area in the North. Black Philadelphians, however, made up only 4 percent of the more than 670,000 residents of the city. White Philadelphians before and after the Civil War had bitter debates over the issues of race relations and civil rights. The city’s tradition of strong pro-Southern sentiments and its legacy of abolition activism created conflict.<sup>42</sup>

During Reconstruction the city’s divided loyalties continued to couple opportunity with opposition for black Philadelphians. The char-

acterization of Philadelphia as “Up South,” denoting the city’s virulent strain of racism even though it was physically removed from the South, rang true. Because nearly 100,000 Philadelphians had served in the Union army, the city celebrated the military defeat of the South. What remained less cohesive, however, was the city’s collective support for rebuilding the South, providing for the former slaves, and granting equal rights to the black residents of Philadelphia after the war had ended.<sup>43</sup> “Brotherly love” in Philadelphia, it often seemed, extended only as far as one’s definition of whiteness.

Richmond, of course, faced trials following the Civil War that neither Philadelphia nor Washington DC had to confront. Retreating Confederates had burned the city in the final days of the war, crippling Richmond’s banking and business sector. Most industries, including the city’s vital tobacco factories and iron plants, did not return to their prewar production rates even by 1870. An economy that had been humming before the war sputtered badly after it, as one local daily lamented:

In no branch of business in this city has the effect of the war been more sadly felt than in the manufacture of tobacco. Before the war our streets resounded with the cheerful songs of the negroes, as with willing hands they manipulated this great staple of Virginia in the factories which line every street of our beautiful city, but now the song is hushed, the factories are in ruins, many of the former proprietors are in their graves, many ruined by the disastrous fire of the 3rd of April and the negroes that once worked so merrily, being thrown out of work by the destruction of the factories, spend their time in idleness.<sup>44</sup>

The “negroes with willing hands” had been, of course, slaves, and the fires of April 3, 1865, had been set by retreating Confederates, but the reality remained that Richmond faced dire economic challenges during the Reconstruction era.

In nearly every aspect of Richmond’s reconstruction, questions of race and manifestations of racism made progress difficult. How would blacks and whites work together, live together, and play together? What barriers would maintain white domination with slavery now gone? These questions resonated constantly in Richmond and other Southern

cities. In addition to the legacy of slavery, Richmond's demographics made its race question more pressing to whites than in either Philadelphia or Washington. The 1870 census reported that blacks in Richmond (23,180) made up nearly half of the city's total 51,038 residents.<sup>45</sup>

Washington DC had strong connections to both the North and the South. The District sat between two slave states and just across the Potomac River from Confederate general Robert E. Lee's home. Southern transplants dominated Washington's citizenry. The presence of the federal government, though, defined the city in many ways. The District changed rapidly during Reconstruction. By 1870 the city's black population had increased nearly fourfold since 1860, from 11,131 to 43,404. In 1870 African Americans composed 33 percent of the population, compared to only 15 percent a decade earlier.<sup>46</sup>

Because it fell under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Congress, Washington DC functioned as a testing ground for Reconstruction and race policy. District slaves, for example, had received their emancipation in April 1862, six months before Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation enacted the same freedom in the rebellious South.<sup>47</sup> African Americans in Washington and Georgetown received the right to vote in 1866, earlier than in many other places in the United States. The Freedmen's Bureau also had a postwar presence in the city. The city gained a measure of independent governance in 1867 and then lost it in 1870, returning to the status of a federally controlled territory.<sup>48</sup> Reflecting the position of their city, the baseball teams of Washington DC never quite fit with either their Northern or their Southern counterparts.

In these three cities, and in the broader constituencies that they represent, baseball served as a barometer of the Reconstruction process. Baseball teams never escaped the realities of their times when they took to the ball fields. Rather, baseball players played as they lived, amid a complicated and rapidly evolving post-Civil War society. For the historian there is great opportunity in analyzing America's "national pastime." The segregated world that baseball created in the 1860s and '70s mirrored, and helps explain, the segregated norms that would emerge subsequently outside the lines of the country's baseball diamonds. Unfortunately, as the "national pastime" went, on racial matters at least, so too went the nation.



## PROMINENT PLAYERS AND CLUBS

### *Philadelphia*

**Raymond Burr**—Member of the Pythian Base Ball Club, African American, Pythian Club representative at the 1867 Pennsylvania Association of Amateur Base Ball Players (PAABBP) convention

**Octavius Catto**—Member and officer of the Pythian Base Ball Club, African American, Union army veteran, instructor at Banneker Institute, political organizer

**Thomas Fitzgerald**—Cofounder of the Athletic Base Ball Club (president, 1861–66), Republican Party political organizer, owner and editor of the *City Item*, playwright, president of the National Association of Base Ball Players in 1863

**Hicks Hayhurst**—Member and president of the Athletic Base Ball Club, president of the PAABBP (1867)

### SIGNIFICANT CLUBS

Athletic Base Ball Club

City Item Base Ball Club

Excelsior Base Ball Club (African American)

Keystone Base Ball Club

L'Overture Base Ball Club (African American)

Olympic Base Ball Club

Philadelphia Base Ball Club

Pythian Base Ball Club (African American)

### *Richmond*

**Alexander Babcock**—“Father of Richmond baseball,” deserted the Union army for the Confederacy during the Civil War, established the Richmond Base Ball Club, established the Pastime Base Ball Club, owner of an ice delivery business

**Henry Boschen**—Founder of the Pacific Base Ball Club, led baseball revival in Richmond in 1875, owner of a Richmond shoe factory  
**Edward Cohen**—Banker, first president of the Richmond Base Ball Club, president of Richmond’s Keshel Shel Barzel lodge, a “pioneer of Richmond Jewry,” delegate at the Virginia Association of Base Ball Players in 1866

#### SIGNIFICANT CLUBS

Old Dominion Base Ball Club  
Pacific Base Ball Club  
Pastime Base Ball Club  
Reindeer Base Ball Club (African American)  
Richmond Base Ball Club  
Robert E. Lee Base Ball Club  
Southern Base Ball Club  
Union Base Ball Club (composed of federal officers)

#### *Washington DC*

**Charles Douglass**—Son of Frederick Douglass, African American, served in the Union army, member of the Alert Base Ball Club, member of the Mutual Base Ball Club, federal government employee  
**Arthur Gorman**—U.S. senator (Maryland), president of the NABBP (1867), personal friend of President Andrew Johnson, member and officer of the National Base Ball Club  
**Nicholas Young**—Federal government employee, member of the Olympic Base Ball Club, officer in the NAABBP, NAPBBP, and National League

#### SIGNIFICANT CLUBS

Alert Base Ball Club (African American)  
Capital Base Ball Club  
Creighton Base Ball Club  
Jefferson Base Ball Club  
Mutual Base Ball Club (African American)  
National Base Ball Club  
Olympic Base Ball Club  
Potomac Base Ball Club