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At the Hands of Parties Unknown:
The 1880 Lynchings in Montgomery County, Maryland

By Sarah Hedlund

Though they likely never met, George Peck and John Diggs-Dorsey had much in common: they both worked on rural farms in Montgomery County and lived in relative isolation without family nearby; they were both black men in their early twenties accused but not convicted of assaulting white females; and within six months of each other in 1880, they were both terrorized and murdered by white men, their lives choked out at the end of a rope.

The Era of Racial Terror Lynching

In 2017, the Equal Justice Initiative published research documenting more than 4,000 racial terror lynchings in America between 1877 and 1950.\(^1\) Based on fanatical fears regarding interracial sex and the desire to maintain white supremacy through an unquestioned racial hierarchy, lynchings during the post-Reconstruction era (1877 onward) in former slave states like Maryland became particularly targeted to terrorize the black population, often carried out over any infraction, real or imagined.\(^2\) The extra-judicial nature of lynching allowed former enslavers to continue to exert dominance, power, and control over black people.\(^3\) Maryland’s statewide number of lynchings has not been definitively established, as research is ongoing. The number varies between 28 and 40 depending on the time period under consideration, and the majority took place on the Eastern Shore.\(^4\) Lynching activity nationwide peaked between 1880 and 1900, and at least 20 of Maryland’s cases took place within that period,\(^5\) including the three documented lynchings in Montgomery County: George Peck and John Diggs-Dorsey in 1880 and Sidney Randolph in 1896. This article focuses on the two lynchings that occurred in 1880: a dark page from Montgomery County’s past that has often been omitted completely from published histories.

Montgomery County, Maryland: After the Civil War

Maryland’s political and social climate throughout the Civil War was complex, due in no small part to its strategic proximity to Washington and its tenuous status as a slaveholding state that never seceded from the Union. After a brief period of Lincoln-Republican leadership in Maryland, culminating in ratification of a new state Constitution in 1864 that emancipated more than 5,000 individuals, politics after the war swung dramatically in the other direction. By 1867, Maryland saw a re-enfranchisement of former slaveholders, an ultimately unsuccessful attempt to collect reparations from the federal government for lost human property, and in multiple areas including Montgomery County, a persistent culture of white supremacy where the specter of potential “negro domination” at the polls kept the former-Confederate Democrats solidly in power across local politics for decades.\(^6\) The Republican party also had supporters County-wide, most concentrated in the Quaker community in Sandy Spring, but they rarely prevailed in elections.\(^7\)
There had been virtually no celebration of the centennial of America’s Independence on July 4, 1876 in Montgomery County, where the holiday was seen by many former Confederate supporters as an opportunity for the Union states to relive their victory over the South. Instead, most residents enthusiastically celebrated the centennial of Montgomery County itself, which occurred on September 6 of the same year, in a day-long ceremony of speeches and songs revering local heroes and sharing historical reminiscences. By 1880, the small towns and rural farming communities that constituted Montgomery County were poised to embrace the real estate and industry boom that would surge across the countryside atop the B&O Railroad tracks throughout the 1880s and 1890s, yet also still grappling with the effects of the post-Reconstruction-era economic depression that beset the country starting in 1877. Meanwhile, the newspaper based in Rockville, the Montgomery County Sentinel, had consistently published content with a strong bias toward the Democratic party view. With few exceptions, the paper reported on the activities of the black residents of the County (who made up at least one-third of the population in 1880) only when they came into conflict with the law.

George Peck (born c.1858, died 1880)

In 1880 Poolesville, life had changed very little in the years since the war. As the Potomac River nearby was a key strategic point for army encampments, both Union and Confederate troops had marched alternately through the town during the fighting. Poolesville’s proximity to Virginia made it more sympathetic to the cause of the Confederacy than other parts of the County. After the skirmish at Harper’s Ferry, the residents of Poolesville swore allegiance to the South, dedicating their resources “to protect and defend Southern rights against the aggression of the North.” At the end of the conflict, Poolesville quietly rebuilt and repaired the extensive damage left by the war, incorporating as a town in 1867 and slowly transitioning from small rural farming to increasingly industrialized agriculture. Meanwhile, local emancipated and now land-owning blacks established settlements in and around Poolesville starting in 1865, including Jonesville, Jerusalem, and Sugarland, which became one of the largest. These grew alongside several already-existing free black communities nearby such as Big Woods, Mt. Ephraim, and Martinsburg. Many residents of these numerous and diverse local black communities continued to work in neighboring white communities—on the farms and in nearby Seneca Quarry—while building and expanding their own independent communities of residence. However, some of the formerly enslaved did become tenants and servants on the same farms where they had been forced to work as slaves. Comparing the 1867 Slave Statistics with the United States Census of 1870 shows migration between households as former slaves became live-in servants in white households, but in many cases the geographic locations of individuals in that smaller segment of the local black population stayed consistent. One of these black laborers living within the white community was a young man named George Peck.
George W. Peck had lived in the Poolesville area since he was a child. He was first documented in the 1867 Slave Statistics as a nine-year-old boy enslaved by William Poole, with no indication of his having family members nearby, then or later. However, along with the young Peck, Poole had held Louisa (King) Lear and five of her children, who stayed in the area following Emancipation and may have maintained contact with Peck. In 1870, Peck was found residing with Howard Griffith and his family near Beallsville, while the Lears lived nearby in the household of John A. Jones. By early 1880, George Peck (about age 21) was working for local storekeeper Lemuel Beall and Louisa Lear (now age 60) was enumerated in Beall’s household, working as a cook. As they had been enslaved together, it is certain Lear and Peck had known each other for as long as fifteen years before they both worked for Beall.

Lemuel Beall had also recently employed a young white girl named Ada Hayes, whose family had just moved to the Poolesville area from Loudoun County, Virginia. In 1873, Hyrocles M. Reeves had married Mollie E. Hayes, a widow with two young girls, Annie and Ada Hayes, who became Reeves’ stepdaughters. The couple had four more children by the time of their move to Montgomery County in 1880, when Ada was eleven years old. Since they didn’t stay long enough to appear in a Montgomery County census, it is unclear where the family was residing in January of 1880. The entire family might have been living with Beall, or they may have been boarding elsewhere in the region while Ada alone was living at Beall’s property and working for him. The Reeves family had left by the time of the 1880 census taken in June, so this is guesswork based on local customs, and the clear indication that the family was not wealthy, nor did they own any land.

According to newspaper accounts (the only records of the incident currently available), on the morning of Saturday, January 10, 1880, the Reverend Calvin Amy heard screams in the barn near his house. Accounts describe how he discovered George Peck there, apparently in the act of attempting to rape Ada Hayes by forcing her into a straw rick against her will. Calvin Amy was the recently-installed pastor at the Baptist Church in Poolesville, having moved his family to a house down the street from Lemuel Beall’s in 1879. Amy intervened—some sources indicate he happened to be carrying a revolver—and informed Lemuel Beall of what he had seen; meanwhile, George Peck returned to his duties on the farm. The local doctor, John W. Ayler, examined Ada, concluding she was somewhat bruised but otherwise unharmed. Beall and Amy left the scene to fetch the constable from Poolesville, James Uriah “Hugh” Miles, who had been appointed to the position in 1878. Miles was also a nephew of Peck’s employer Lemuel Beall, the son of Beall’s sister Elvira. When he saw the officer approaching, Peck tried to run into the nearby woods, but was quickly captured by the other men, handcuffed and chained. The constable took him to Poolesville (about 1.5 miles away) and brought him before local Justice of the Peace Stephen G. Donohoe, where he allegedly admitted his guilt, and his intention to complete the act of rape if he had not been interrupted. Newspaper reports about black men accused of crimes often contained this common element: a “confession” reported, though usually after the fact by the same law enforcement officers who later allowed the prisoners in their charge to be abducted and killed.
Miles did not immediately take Peck to the jail in Rockville. A journey to Rockville would have taken at least four hours at this time; however, as the jailer lived in the building and could be roused to admit a prisoner, captors often did arrive at the jail at any hour of the night. Instead of transporting Peck to the jail, the constable held him in the Odd Fellows Hall in Poolesville, ostensibly intending to take him to Rockville on Monday morning. This decision put Peck in considerably increased danger from locals who knew he was not secured by the Sheriff in the County jail, but merely in the sole custody of a small-town constable. Indeed, as news of the incident spread through the area, an angry crowd began to gather around the building, and Miles reconsidered his plan. He decided to move Peck from the Odd Fellows Hall to his own residence for the night, indicating to at least one reporter that he did not wish “to leave him unguarded.”

By 11:00 pm, Miles thought the crowd had dispersed. Taking the shackled Peck with him, he walked across the street to the general store run by William T. Walter to pick up a few items on his way home. Several sources state this action took place between 11:00 pm and 12:00 am, though it seems improbable that a store would still be open. A gunshot signal sounded in the street, and a group of 35 to 100 men entered the store and seized Peck, overpowering Miles. Accounts vary widely on numbers, though the lower end seems more likely given the population of the town. Some of the men were wearing masks, but most “made no effort whatever to conceal their identity, and were easily recognized, nearly all of them being residents of Beallsville.” Several men cried “Lynch him!” Some accounts state members of the party subdued Miles and blindfolded him; others say that he was injured in his struggles to fight off the crowd. One account states the stove inside the general store was pushed over, almost setting fire to the building. The men forced a noose around Peck’s neck and dragged him across the road, throwing him over a post-and-rail fence into a vacant lot across from the Poolesville Presbyterian Church. According to later accounts, Peck verbally pleaded for his life, but made little physical resistance. Then they tossed the rope over a low branch of a locust tree, hoisting Peck five feet in the air, and tied the end to the fence rail. Once they thought he was dead the men slowly dispersed. Some articles claim they also fired bullets into Peck’s body, which “took effect.”

Above left: Poolesville Presbyterian Church c. 1900. It appears much the same today. (Photo credit: Poolesville Presbyterian Church). Above right: This photo is attributed as the “buggy parking lot” for the Poolesville Presbyterian Church, probably 1895-1915. It is possible this view was taken from the road and may depict a portion of the land on which George Peck was killed in 1880. It also shows a rail fence, of the type Peck was hauled over on his way to the tree. (Photo credit: Montgomery History)
Reports indicate that Peck was still hanging, in full view of the townspeople and only 50 yards from the Presbyterian Church, until 9:00 am or 10:00 am on Sunday morning, when his body was finally cut down (possibly by Miles himself). This was likely not an oversight but an intentional message for the community, most especially for black members of the community. Justice Donahoe summoned a local jury of inquest to hear testimony and render a verdict on cause of death. The *Baltimore Sun* stated that the jury could not unanimously agree on the statement of verdict, as some insisted on endorsing the actions of the lynching party, and therefore the Justice discharged this first jury. The report then listed a second jury, composed of Charles Elgin, Fremont Jones, Frank Williams, William Griffith, Lemuel Beall, Richard Spates, Frank Spates, Frank Sparrough, Charles Matthews, G. Mackintosh, Thomas Davis, and Thomas Fyffe, who “re-entered a verdict of death by strangulation at the hands of unknown parties.”

The jury represented established landowners and community leaders from families with residential longevity in the Poolesville/Beallsville area at the time, including many former slaveowners. The names of the initial discharged jurors were not given in this article. Other accounts do not mention names of any jurors, nor the existence of a discharged jury, and state that no attempt was made to identify the perpetrators (though according to earlier statements, most were easily recognized). All reports framed George Peck as a known convict who had been in jail before and accused of similar crimes in the past, though it is unlikely, especially during this time period, that he would still be employed in the same small town in which he had lived his entire life if this were the case. No records or newspaper accounts have been found that support these statements of his previous deeds alleged in the press.

Peck’s body was moved to a stable shed, and later “buried quietly in a field.” According to the *Sun*, within days he was “exhumed by colored people and buried in their churchyard near the village.” This probably refers to Elijah United Methodist Church Cemetery on Beallsville Road just outside of Poolesville, property used by the African American community for a church, school, and cemetery since 1870. There is evidence of burials starting then, most unmarked, which predated the construction of the first church building. In the *Hopkins Atlas*, it is marked as a “colored schoolhouse.” It is likely that George Peck’s remains are buried there still. The local black community’s act of claiming his body and the dignity conveyed by a churchyard burial suggests he was not a notorious criminal, but simply one of their own. The records of this church were lost in a fire in 1950.

The 1880 census was taken in June of that year, five months after the lynching. By then both Calvin Amy’s family and the Reeves family had left Montgomery County. Reeves moved to Baltimore; Annie and Ada, the older Hayes girls (now with the last name Reeves) were recorded as working in a cotton mill near Hampden. Twenty years later, by the next extant census in 1900, many of the Medley District people named in the incident were either deceased or had dispersed to other areas.
A Note About A Name

The second documented victim of a lynching in Montgomery County was a man most newspaper articles referred to as John Diggs. It was stated by many newspaper reports that he had several “aliases” including John Dorsey, John Williams, and that he alternately used the given name Henry, but it is unclear where that information about his name(s) originated. In the 1880 census, he was indicated as living with or near James and Mary Tschiffely (pronounced “Shiff-AY-lee”), for whom he worked, and was enumerated as John Dorsey. The census also indicated John Dorsey was illiterate, yet later reports stated he received a letter from his father, and one report from the lynching event quoted him as saying he had written letters to several people, explaining his situation. It’s possible that the census-taker was given the information about John Dorsey by his employer rather than by the man himself, which brings the accuracy of the census information into question. Concurrently, several newspapers—including the local Sentinel—told his story beginning with the name John Diggs (used once) but then referred to him as Dorsey for the remainder of the article, suggesting that was the name he used locally. At this time, historians have no concrete evidence of his physical location or his family origins prior to 1880, and no direct information supporting a hypothesis for which name he identified with, or preferred. For this reason, we have chosen to refer to him as “John Diggs-Dorsey,” honoring both names in an attempt to represent his identity as fully as is possible, from a remove of 140 years.

John Diggs-Dorsey (born 1856-1860, died 1880)

In contrast to Poolesville, the Rockville area in 1880 had already experienced the earliest revitalizing effects of the B&O Railroad’s Metropolitan Branch line, which stretched up from Washington allowing faster transport of crops like wheat and corn as well as dairy products from newly diversified Montgomery County farms. Early speculation from real estate developers and the success of the first resort hotels catering to wealthy residents of Washington looking for a summer retreat began to increase the value of land in the County by the end of the 1870s. As a result, areas nearer to the Washington border started engaging in manufacturing and service industries besides traditional farming and milling. But progress was slow-going. After the auspicious opening of the Metropolitan Branch line in 1873, the County, along with the rest of the country, had slid into an economic depression by 1877. The effects lasted several years, delaying improvements to the new rail system and increasing the number of migrant workers (sometimes referred to as “tramps”) roaming the County looking for work. The “boom” of the later 1880s was still in the future.

Darnestown, the setting of the incident that led to the second Montgomery County lynching, bore many similarities to Poolesville in 1880. The populations of the two towns contained 200 and 275 people respectively; the majority of residents were involved in farming, and Darnestown had also endured raids and occupation by Union troops during the Civil War, followed by steady community development post-war. It’s not exactly clear where the life of John Diggs-Dorsey fit within the history of Montgomery County, but the story of his death, like the Metropolitan line itself, spreads across the County from Darnestown to Gaithersburg, into Washington, out to Sandy Spring and back to Rockville, the final stop.
According to the 1880 census, which was taken in June, a 23-year-old black man named John Dorsey was living on or next to property owned by James Tschiffely (age 36) and his wife Mary (age 44), off Seneca Road between the towns of Darnestown and Seneca. John Dorsey's relationship to the head of house was listed as "servant," and his occupation as "laborer," meaning he was probably a farm hand employed by the Tschiffelys. According to James Tschiffely, John Diggs-Dorsey had been in his employ for five months, had said he was from the Damascus area of Montgomery County, and that he had been formerly enslaved by "Mr. King," of King's distillery. It is possible this explanation was a story Diggs-Dorsey told to his potential employer, in order to sound more like a local worker (a better prospect to hire), as opposed to an itinerant/migrant worker (a stranger) from Washington. Several papers suggested he was from Washington, perhaps part of a group of workers coming up into the County from there, and, if this is accurate, the existence of the letter from a possible father living in Washington (later described) also supports this version of his place of origin. Alternately, some sources said he was from Port Tobacco, Maryland, or that his mother lived at Port Tobacco in Charles County. John Diggs-Dorsey’s young age, as well as both the inconsistency and commonality of his name(s) make it difficult to verify his origins.

James Tschiffely and Mary Malinda Lysle (who went by Linnie) had been married in the Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C. in 1873. Linnie was originally from Pennsylvania, but had been living in Kentucky with her parents, William and Caroline Lysle, and two sisters until her father died in 1871. A few months after their wedding, a deed was executed in Linnie's name for land in Montgomery County, not far from James’s father’s land. James was the son of Frederick A. Tschiffely, a wealthy government clerk from Washington, who had purchased land in Montgomery County before the Civil War.

On the afternoon of Saturday, July 24, 1880, James Tschiffely left town to conduct business in Beltsville, leaving his wife alone in the house with John Diggs-Dorsey on site to look after the grounds and livestock. According to an account given by Mrs. Tschiffely to a reporter from Baltimore, she had visitors in and out all day, and in the afternoon, she sent Diggs-Dorsey into Darnestown to get coal oil. Neighbor Amos West stayed with her until 11:00 pm and offered to spend the night in the house since she was alone. She declined the offer and he left.
According to Linnie Tschiffely’s story, Diggs-Dorsey came to the back door of the house later that night, demanding wine or money and when she refused, he forcibly entered the house and locked the door. She said he “boldly announced his intention to outrage her,” choked her insensible, and took her upstairs. She claimed through innuendo that he raped her and forced her to remain in the bedroom with him throughout the night, threatening to tie her up and burn the house with her inside if she tried to get away. She stated she did escape in the early morning hours and attempted to reach a neighbor’s house, but that he caught her escaping, dragged her back into the house by her hair, and struck her with the arm of a chair (or with his fists) disfiguring her face and damaging at least one eye. He then allegedly ransacked the house but found nothing of value to steal, and left in the early morning on foot, rather than taking either of two horses. The injured Tschiffely related how she then crawled to the West house across the street, where Amos West raised the alarm, starting a manhunt for Diggs-Dorsey. Tschiffely gave this narrative to one or more reporters; the story printed in multiple newspapers is her version of the events of July 24-25, 1880. No newspaper printed a verbatim account of John Diggs-Dorsey’s version of events, though several reporters interviewed him directly. Extrapolating from the few second-hand statements that were printed, Diggs-Dorsey implied the sexual encounter was consensual, and that he walked off his employer’s property on Sunday morning, having been dismissed by Linnie Tschiffely. According to almost all newspaper reports, Diggs-Dorsey vehemently denied beating her, or physically harming her in any way.

By Sunday morning, July 25, word had spread about the attack on James Tschiffely’s wife, and a “vigilance committee” was formed in Montgomery County to search for Diggs-Dorsey, who was now considered a fugitive. These men, including two of Tschiffely’s brothers, tracked bare footprints from the Tschiffely property through plowed fields heading toward Gaithersburg, and surmised that Diggs-Dorsey may have boarded a freight train at the depot there, going to Washington. The postmaster recalled a letter delivered the day before, for “John Diggs, care of Jas. Tschiffely,” still unopened. The men opened it; the letter, sent from his “affectionate father” John H. (or John E.) Williams, who was living in Washington at 410 E Street, SE, Navy Yard, was a request for money. A married sister of Diggs-Dorsey’s lived near “the insane asylum” as it was referred to by the reporter, at that time the Government Home for the Insane (now called St. Elizabeths Hospital) in Congress Heights.

Since they thought John Diggs-Dorsey might have been headed toward Washington, Sheriff John H. Kelchner and/or Frederick A. Tschiffely, Sr. traveled there to notify the authorities, speaking with Detectives McDevitt and Acton at the police station, and showing them the letter. At approximately 1:00 am on Monday morning (July 26), the Williams family homes in D.C. were raided by police; they did not find Diggs-Dorsey, but John Williams and John Diggs-Dorsey’s unnamed sister were questioned. Williams said he hadn’t heard from his son John in a while and knew only that he was working on a farm and seemed to be doing well. The sister gave a description of her brother (“a very black, round-headed man, between twenty and twenty-three years old, about five feet high, stammered when he talked and blinked his eyes”), but provided no further information on his possible whereabouts.
The manhunt continued on Monday, July 26, in both Maryland and Washington, with rumors of sightings and elaborate capture stories traveling the gossip mill, along with John’s physical description: “Look out for and arrest John Dorsey, a very black man, five feet high, between eighteen and twenty years old, dressed in dark coat and pants, slouch hat and white shirt.” In the late afternoon on Monday, Zachariah Joseph Davis was driving back from Germantown via Mechanicsville (Olney) to his home in Sandy Spring, with his two young granddaughters in a horse-drawn wagon. A few miles outside Mechanicsville around 5:00 or 6:00 pm, he overtook a man fitting the description of the suspect, walking along the road heading in the same direction. Davis called out to him and asked where he was going. According to Davis, the man stated he was looking for work, as he had been dismissed on Saturday morning and paid off. Davis offered Diggs-Dorsey both a ride to Mechanicsville and help finding work, which he accepted. Once there, Davis drove up outside a store and said, “Hold the lines, John; I want to get something here.” He went inside and “came out with a coil of rope, with a noose in one end, and with the help of two or three men who came out of the store with me, I got the noose over his neck and we tied him fast.” According to this same source, Davis stated that keeping his prisoner with him, he drove on to his own house in Sandy Spring to have supper, and gave supper to the still-bound Diggs-Dorsey as well. Davis said, “I then told Diggs that we would have to take him to Rockville, and he replied: ‘Yes, I’ll go there and I’ll kill anybody who says I did any harm to Mrs. Tschiffely.’” Davis then enlisted the help of his son, Edward Davis, and the two drove their prisoner back to Rockville; it was 11:00 pm when they arrived at the door of the jail. Diggs-Dorsey was turned over to the custody of Sheriff Kelchner, who (realizing a lynch attempt was imminent) quickly assembled a posse of armed local men to secure the building.

An alternate capture story, reported by one or two Washington sources, stated two young boys spotted Diggs-Dorsey and told several local vigilantes on horseback. The Sentinel reported many people waiting at the train station for hours, expecting the prisoner to arrive from Silver Spring, Beltsville, Washington, or other places. Rumor, conjecture, and false information spread on Monday by word of mouth, by telegraph, and in print.
Once news of Diggs-Dorsey’s capture spread on the evening of Monday, July 26, a crowd began forming in town and many reporters suspected a lynching was likely to occur that night. One paper even printed, via dispatch, “He will probably be lynched to-day.” A horseman was sent to Darnestown (approximately a 90-minute trip from Rockville each way, on horseback) to deliver the news to the residents there. The crowd gathering in small groups around Rockville had been instructed to wait until James Tschiffely could arrive from Darnestown before moving to kidnap John Diggs-Dorsey from jail. Several papers report the Sheriff’s assertion that Diggs-Dorsey gave a full confession to him while in jail, explaining he was drunk that night. In printing their interpretations of statements allegedly made by John Diggs-Dorsey himself, both while in jail and also while in the clutches of the lynchers, reporters consistently state that he had admitted to committing the “outrage” (i.e, rape) but vehemently denied striking her with a chair or injuring her in any way. Two accounts relate that in his statement to the Sheriff regarding the outrage, he cast aspersions on Linnie Tschiffely (suggesting that in his version of events, the sexual encounter was consensual). At least three reporters interviewed Diggs-Dorsey one-on-one while he was in his jail cell, yet none of them printed direct quotes the way they had in relating the versions of events given by Tschiffely and Davis.

By 3:00 am (now Tuesday, July 27), James Tschiffely and other men from Darnestown had arrived, some in masks and with an appointed “captain;” the group of about 30 to 40 men marched in formation up to the jail and demanded entrance, stating that Tschiffely wished to identify the prisoner. The Sheriff replied that Tschiffely could come in alone, but the rest had to disperse before he would allow it. This prompted a conference among the group, and they decided to force entry into the jail. Certain individuals were assigned to subdue particular guards. One report stated an aggressive pair of bloodhounds normally kept at the jail was enticed away. The group rushed the entrance; four men seized Sheriff Kelchner and pulled him away from the outer door, which was forced open. William O. Kingsbury, the jailer guarding from inside the building, turned over the keys to the jail cell easily once the Sheriff was subdued. “I surrender these keys in protest,” said the deputy sheriff [Kingsbury], to which the Sheriff shouted, “Do not give them up at all!” Some members of the deputy posse that the Sheriff had assembled were actually in sympathy with the vigilance-committee-turned-lynch-mob, and quickly changed loyalties. One of the Sheriff’s deputized men—Samuel Matlack—attempted to brandish a revolver in defense of the prisoner, but was quickly disarmed. The Sheriff later stated that if his men had stayed loyal, he could have held the jail against the lynchers, but among all the armed men enlisted to guard the jail, including the Sheriff himself, only Matlack pulled his gun.
Several reporters, who were camped out since the arrival of the prisoner at Rockville’s jail waiting for the likely outcome, followed the group of lynchers and stayed among them the entire time. One reporter from Washington had “improvised a bed in the jail yard and requested to be awakened when the fun begins.” One *Washington Post* article stated that after the lynching party removed the prisoner from the jail, their “correspondent left with the party.” The *Daily Gazette* report from Wilmington, Delaware stated: “Your correspondent saw the body about one hour after the hanging...” and proceeded to describe gruesome details. Several reporters directly quoted participants, and referred coyly to the leaders of the group by assigned titles—“the captain,” “the leader,” “the horseman,” etc.—even stating those individuals were deliberately unmasked and therefore unconcerned about revealing their identities. One reporter described the self-appointed leader as a “sturdy, six-foot, wealthy farmer” who was unmasked. As for James Tschiffely: most sources report he sent word that the lynchers should wait until his arrival in Rockville, “so he could be present for the ending of Diggs.” He was the only named person associated with the lynching party, and the participation of at least two of his brothers might also be presumed, as they were active in the manhunt for John Diggs-Dorsey over the preceding 48 hours, and were likely a portion of “the Tschiffelys” that arrived with the others from Darnestown around 3:00 am.

After subduing the Sheriff and breaking into the jail, the men confronted Diggs-Dorsey in his cell, and Tschiffely confirmed his identity. They dragged him out of his cell, and forced him, still in shackles, to walk quickly to a place one-half to three-quarters of a mile down the road towards Darnestown (now called Route 28/Montgomery Avenue in Rockville) to property belonging to Julius West, likely somewhere between current-day Forest Avenue and Laird Street on the north side of the road. The reports were vague about the route taken to the seemingly pre-arranged spot, suggesting the group took their captive via an indirect path on lesser-populated roads before reaching the main road. They were met there, or at a place on the way there, by a man on horseback, pre-arranged. “To those who had been on parties of this kind before, the presence of the horse was easily accounted for,” states the account from the *Post*, alluding to the practice of dropping a hanging victim from a height. The horseman asked those present to form a circle and swear an oath of secrecy: to not reveal the identities of those present, to protect themselves and their families. One reporter quoted this oath: “I do solemnly swear in the presence of Almighty God that I will never reveal the names of those present, or disclose what was done here this day.”

---

House at the corner of Forest Avenue and Montgomery Avenue. Built in 1879, this house would have been on the extreme end of the town of Rockville in 1880; the land beyond was known as West’s farm. *(Photo credit: Sarah Hedlund)*

An 1890 map created by the B&O Railroad Co. to visualize potential suburban development along the Metropolitan Branch line. The arrow indicates the approximate location of the lynching of John Diggs-Dorsey, on land later developed into the West End neighborhood during the 1890s.
Once at the site, the men insisted many times that Diggs-Dorsey should “confess” to his crimes, by which they meant him to show regret or remorse for his actions, but he denied the charges repeatedly. “I didn’t do it,” said Diggs, ‘and you will all suffer for this.” Another article quoted him as saying, “You are damned cowards to take a man out and hang him without giving him a lawyer.” In apparently “an unexpected turn in the proceedings,” the leader of the party suggested they say a prayer for him, and gave him a few moments of reflection, which he reportedly spent in silence, eyes downcast. Another scuffle ensued, but Diggs-Dorsey was roughly subdued and the noose was fixed around his neck. He was asked again if he had anything to say, to which he swore loudly and said “What’s the use of saying anything? You’re going to hang me anyway.” He referred to two letters he had written about the occurrence, but “not much attention was given to this statement.” All accounts describe how they then attempted to seat Diggs-Dorsey on the horse in order to pull it from underneath him, but the animal was too spooked to stand still so that plan was abandoned. Its owner warned it was “a kicker” and someone suggested they let the horse kick their prisoner to death instead. The leader stated, and the men agreed, they were there “to carry out the law,” which meant hanging. They threw the rope over the limb of a large black heart cherry tree and John Diggs-Dorsey was hauled up three feet from the ground and hanged until he was dead. The crowd stayed for perhaps 20 to 30 minutes and then dispersed, leaving the body to be discovered at daybreak.

A large crowd gradually gathered around the still-hanging body of John Diggs-Dorsey on the morning of Tuesday, July 27; most papers report several hundred people were present. Around 9:00 am, local Justices of the Peace Mordecai Morgan and John Kriger were informed that “a man had got tangled up in a rope in a tree.” They summoned a jury of inquest, consisting of R.A. Scheckells (foreman), Captain James W. Anderson, Nicholas Dorsey Offutt, William A. Veirs, Henry Viett, James C. Nolan, John Steele, Melchisedec Green, William M. Davis, R.S. Patterson, J.T. Ricketts, John P. Mulfinger, and W.H. Carr. The jury met that morning at the site where the body remained, hearing from several witnesses including Dr. Edward Anderson, who had examined the body and determined the cause of death as strangulation, and Kingsbury, the jailer, who stated he did not know the identity of any of the perpetrators. No other witnesses were mentioned by name. The jury then rendered the “usual verdict in such cases,” that of “death by violence committed by parties unknown,” and the jury was discharged. The rope used to hang John Diggs-Dorsey was cut into pieces and taken as souvenirs, as were several items of his clothing. “One enterprising gentleman secured the slouch hat which Diggs wore.” Undertaker William R. Pumphrey transported the body to the Potter’s Field near the Alms House, where it was buried in an unmarked grave.
The news of John Diggs-Dorsey’s murder was printed in dozens of newspapers in no fewer than seventeen states. Many articles carried headlines like “Lynch Law in Maryland,” or “Terrible Outrage in Maryland,” which referred to the inciting incident, not to the lynching, as the outrage. If any opinion was implied, it was usually one in agreement for the punishment of the “brutal negro,” a common phrase (among many others) employed to characterize the lynching victim as deserving his fate. The Washington Post printed an op-ed piece positively lauding the actions of the lynchers as just and moral,120 and The New York Times concluded its report of the incident by saying “In the opinion of some, the execution of such brutes...should serve to make their horrible crime more odious than the court processes by which the criminal is made rather a hero during his trial, and if convicted and executed has a glorified send-off into eternity as one who is stepping straight from the gallows into Paradise.”121

This opinion was shared by the Sentinel. However, there existed both people and newspapers that spoke out against the local attitudes of complacency around “vigilante justice.” On November 19, 1880, the Sentinel printed the report of the Grand Jury, the legal body drawn for two terms per year to hear all criminal cases accrued in the months between sessions. Its report: “In regard to the lynching of Diggs, we have been unable to find any evidence that would lead to the conviction of the party or parties connected therewith.”122 On the same page, the publishers of the Sentinel printed a column-long rant, indignant over critical comments made in the Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser during the previous week.

On November 12, the Sentinel openly scorned statements made by Judge Richard Johns Bowie, a respected Maryland jurist. The paper had printed Judge Bowie’s charge to the Grand Jury, in which he vehemently censured the lynching of John Diggs-Dorsey, but in an article on the same page, the editor(s) accused him of clinging to the “literal enforcement of the principle of law to cases where it is impotent to be effective as a preventive to like offences, and thereby powerless to afford protection to defenceless women.”123 In lengthy prose laid out over multiple columns in two articles, the Sentinel averred the court system was inadequate to punish that greatest offense against the flower of Southern womanhood. Further, the editor stated that in these cases, decent men should be allowed to carry out a more efficient (and literal) execution of “the common law,” against the accused which should be in turn decently overlooked by the more “literal” letter of the actual law.

That in the execution of such fiendish deeds... deeds where the law has failed to protect the sufferer from mental tortures...the perpetrator has forfeited every right to a legitimate trial by a jury of his peers...That the quick and certain execution of punishment upon the offender brings into active operation that principle of law which declares that the object of the punishment of crime is to deter others from a like perpetration. That it relieves the victims... from further disgrace and punishment, by being dragged first before the grand jury and thence into a court of law. That this course on the part of the individual or the community, furnishes that protection, safety and relief which the very doubtful and tardy action of the courts have failed to give.124

The article in the American criticizing the attitude of the press in Montgomery County was quoted in the Sentinel on November 19:

No language that the Judge could have used would have been too strong to express the abhorrence which all good citizens should feel at the murder of a man by a mob, whether that man be accused of crime or not... It is part of the social contract that the state only shall punish violations of its criminal laws; for individuals to commit murder in the name of justice only adds to their offence. Public justice becomes private revenge, and a mob with a craving for a fiercer excitement than a fox hunt, hunts down a fellow being accused of crime and puts him to a horrible and ignominious death. Sometimes, when too late, it finds that he was innocent.125
At the end of that year, two young black men were dead and it seemed the prevailing attitude among the white citizenry was indifference and relief, no matter the circumstances. Historians have not yet discovered any written accounts describing the reactions or opinions of the local black people on these events at the time, but their reality was this: some portion of their white neighbors, employers, and community/religious leaders thought the murder of a black man in the dead of night, in response to accusation alone and without a fair trial, was not only above the law but they considered it an act of righteousness. Judge Bowie was locally and openly criticized for stating one of the most basic tenets of American law: “But who shall say that a man whom the law presumed to be innocent was not so, except a jury of the county by fair and full trial.” That privilege—innocent until proven guilty in a court of law—was not extended to George Peck nor to John Diggs-Dorsey in 1880, and by implication, was denied to the entire black community of Montgomery County.
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