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George Engelmann’s Barometer

Measuring Civil War America from St. Louis

Adam Arenson

April 12, 1861, 7 A.M.

Barometer, observed height 29.215
Thermometer 52.0
in open air
meteorological observations, St. Louis University

May the storms which are now disturbing the air be no indication for the course of events which brought our unhappy country to the edge of destruction by all this insanity and passions, especially not for your city.

Adolph Francis Alphonse Bandelier, Letter to George Engelmann, 1862

When the Confederate Army began firing on Fort Sumter early on Friday morning, April 12, 1861, Peter J. Koning, member of the Society of Jesus, stood ready in St. Louis, dutifully recording the conditions. On that fateful day, the barometer continued its decline. The spring morning dawned cool, with temperatures hovering in the low 50s. As is common with low pressure, soon the rain clouds let forth their moisture; under “Casual Phenomena,” the priests and brothers of the St. Louis University meteorological team inscribed, “A little shower at 11½ A.M. & at 2, 2½ and 3½ P.M.”

The Civil War was underway.

Of course, many would argue that the Civil War did not begin at Fort Sumter. The firing that morning was merely the flashpoint along a smoldering front, one that had been building for decades, rolling across the nation like a political thunderhead. As far as I know, no one blames the weather for the Civil War, its complexities on changes in barometric pressure. Yet like the weather, the history of American expansion, slavery and emancipation, a new birth of freedom and the construction of new means to curtail rights — the history of Civil War and Reconstruction — touched every corner of the nation. Like a spring rain or the summer heat, the first frost or the spring thaw, the factors and causes of the great American conflict seeped into every-day lives, shaped the observation of events, and influenced the course of history in ways minor and profound.

And through it all, the careful reading of the barometer provided a baseline.

This is not really an essay about the weather, nor about the science of barometers. Reading the barometer — like consulting library records, courthouse murals, piecing together park dedications — might not seem obvious sources for local politics, the national mood, and international connections. But the story of the barometers at St. Louis holds all this.

This essay considers real and metaphorical barometers in St. Louis, a city split between the nation’s three regions — North, South, and West. The geographic baseline in St. Louis, created with one of the first barometers west of the Mississippi, played a role in mapping the newly acquired Western territories after 1848.

And the metaphorical barometer of St. Louis — a city that mirrored the nation’s political, ethnic, cultural, and ideological diversity of the nation during the Civil War Era as no other. Measurements in St. Louis offer a baseline, not only recording national storms and the ripples of international sea changes, but the human actions to observe, record, and even change those conditions. St. Louis provides a remarkable place to consider the agenda of the American West during the Civil War, and how advocates for each region — including a few scientists, barometers in hand — measured the transformations that the nation experienced.

In the age of the 24-hour Weather Channel, the newspaper’s weather page, and confident predictions of the weather every 10 minutes on the radio, it is easy enough to forget how omnipresent and how unknowable the weather truly is. We have easy access to tables of seasonal norms, record highs and lows, and to satellite imagery and computer predictions. The meteorologists appear in public with their prognostications but do not face censure when their predictions are wrong. They rarely report whether the barometer is rising or falling, converting this information instead into automated computer graphics and shorthand phrases. They often receive data from the National Weather Service,
Peter J. Koning, Meteorological Observations for April 1861, St. Louis University Archives
rather than recording it carefully as Koning did, three times a day, in large hand-written records, each column perfectly ruled.

Yet in the nineteenth century, records of the sunrise and sunset, temperature, barometric pressure, and casual phenomena, once amassed and analyzed, provided the most accurate method for mapping the landscape yet known, identifying ridges and basins, the best acres of farmland and the easiest routes across the continent. In a model of Enlightenment cooperation, scientists from around the world shared data and constructed an accurate globe, with latitude and longitude recorded, and altitude pinpointed by readings from a barometer. They calculated seasonal norms and created climate zones, making the weather legible, conditions known. Within measurements of pressure, Alexander Humboldt and John Nicolas Nicollet, Peter Koning, and George Engelmann found their world transformed.

Francis H. Stuntebeck, Ignatius Panken, and John Lunemann worked alongside Peter J. Koning at St. Louis University, recording meteorological observations as part of their duties as instructors in physics, astronomy, and natural philosophy. All four of these men had been born in Europe in German- or Dutch-speaking communities, common enough among St. Louisans. Their university was the oldest and most prestigious educational institution in the city, the place where William Clark, upon returning from his explorations West, sent the son of Sacagawea and Toussaint Charbonneau for schooling. The instructor-priests were not monks, dedicated to seclusion, working in silence or measuring natural phenomena solely as a way to observe and understand God’s creations. Their lives were those of good Jesuits, an order deeply engaged with the community and interested in intellectual inquiry. Their weather observations were only one of the ways in which these men cared deeply about the place of St. Louis and served its populace.

Francis H. Stuntebeck is the most remembered of these four men today, having risen through the ranks to become chancellor and rector of St. Louis University, serving in academies from Cincinnati to Kansas along the way. At his death in 1898, the *St. Louis PostDispatch* declared him “one of the oldest and best-known Jesuits in the United States,” and the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* deemed him one of the best Jesuits the editors had ever encountered. Ignatius Panken lived a long life of service, following his teaching with work as a missionary to the American Indian tribes of Wyoming in the 1890s, before retiring back to St. Louis, where he died and was buried in 1906. Neither Peter Koning nor John Lunemann saw long life; both died in their thirties, amid the Civil War and most likely because of it, succumbing to diseases acquired from attending to war wounded and the displaced. Yet they too left a legacy: Koning is remembered for his early and fervent work on behalf of St. Louis’s African American slaves, a community Panken also served, becoming the first pastor of the first designated African American parish, St. Elizabeth’s, and remaining with that congregation for twenty-two years. And Lunemann left a remarkable notebook.

“Table (M): Mean Height of the Barometer in various Latitudes, reduced to the level of the sea, and to the freezing point,” reads a chart in John Lunemann’s lecture notes from 1856. There he listed the reference calculations for thirty locales around the globe, from London, Königsburg, and Paris, to the Cape of Good Hope and Macao, Funchal in the Madeiras, and “Reikiavig,” Iceland. The names appear in his careful handwriting, alongside practice problems and lecture outlines; a logarithmic refraction table, to help bring pressure calculations to this standard temperature and altitude, is pasted into the front. As the charts suggest, the astronomical and meteorological work Lunemann set out to teach his pupils — young explorers and traders among them — had a global reach. Data came from the learned capitals of Europe and the vast reaches of the European empires, an expanse replicated on the vast territory between the American cities he listed (Philadelphia, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Savannah, Georgia) and the western reaches of the nation’s territory, in the Louisiana Purchase and the newer Mexican Cession. The scientists at St. Louis stood somewhere in the middle, in communication with both the centers of knowledge and the unknown frontier, balancing the calculations from both locales in their baseline.

At the beginning of the notes for lesson eight, Lunemann made the object of all these measurements clear, and acknowledged the source of his method. “To determine the Longitude of a place,” he titled that day’s lecture, which began, “The following method, which was invented by M. M. Nicolai [sic] and Baily, . . .” The life of Joseph Nicholas Nicollet spanned the global community of the barometer and intimately connected its seemingly arcane measurements to questions of nation and knowledge along the frontiers of the nineteenth-century. Hard at work in Paris on the paths of comets and the grand Enlightenment project of an accurate topographic map of France, Nicollet had worked with the esteemed astronomer Pierre Laplace and corresponded with the scientific polymath Alexander von Humboldt. After the July Revolution of 1830 threw his patrons out of favor and destroyed his savings, Nicollet became one of the many young men inspired by Humboldt to venture into the blank spaces of the map. But unlike many of those enamored with the adventures and almost mystical writing style of Humboldt, Nicollet also had a solid scientific education, and could follow the intricacies of Humboldt’s calculations and the nature of his postulates. Along with British astronomer Francis Baily,
Nicollet perfected Humboldt’s system for measuring altitude through the process of compound barometric leveling, also known as hypsometry.\textsuperscript{21}

When Lewis and Clark set out from the region around St. Louis to explore the West, they carried no barometer.\textsuperscript{22} The mercury and glass contraptions were too delicate and not considered a high enough priority by the men or their patron, President Thomas Jefferson. By the time their party left the Dakota camps, all the similarly fragile thermometers had broken, leaving temperature to guesswork as they trekked out to the Pacific and back.\textsuperscript{23} With an astrolabe, Lewis and Clark’s party could make readings of latitude, and their chronometer allowed for some longitude calculations, but as for the altitude of the mountains, basins, and ridges they reported, the men resorted to guesses educated by their experience on the trail. While William Clark’s map of the lands the team explored holds a remarkable \textit{general} likeness to the West as it came to be known to further explorers, the sorts of errors it includes — the angle of the mountain range, mistaken distances between rivers or to passable valleys — would confound any traveler relying on what Lewis and Clark had sketched.\textsuperscript{24}

Humboldt, after decades of his own exploration into the locales most remote from his home castle in Berlin, came to understand something about these difficulties, as well as how to solve them. Study of the stars, combined with accurate clocks, could synchonize readings around the globe. If each observatory kept their chronometer set to Greenwich Mean Time, and then recorded the sunrise and sunset, or the motion of the planets, calculations would pinpoint the longitude, the angle of difference from the established meridian. Accurate thermometers and barometers placed at these reference points could provide a series of baselines for altitude measurements; if weather conditions could be recorded and accounted for, the remaining difference in a column of air would reveal how much less atmosphere pressed down at a mountain peak than at a college observatory.

Humboldt was one of the first to understand these methods, and he used his worldwide renown to launch a series of observatories around the world. Numbers poured in; men hired as computers could determine the coordinates and the topology. The German explorer set up his Western Hemisphere observatories in Central and South America, the terrain he had explored; his Northern Hemisphere knowledge was from Europe. Humboldt could map most of the world; it was left to Nicollet to map America.\textsuperscript{25}

So Nicollet came to the United States in 1832, equipped with a pocket barometer and a compass, just as Humboldt recommended.\textsuperscript{26} Nicollet established himself in Baltimore, the scientific center closest to the capital, and befriended the necessary politicians to fund an expedition; by 1835, Nicollet had arrived in St. Louis, to gather materials and more funds for the documentation of the Upper Mississippi basin.\textsuperscript{27} During one such visit, Nicollet raised funds by using his French to pore over old documents and write a short history of the city’s founding; on another, his assistant, Charleston-born John C. Frémont, met the woman he was to marry, Jessie Benton, the daughter of the state’s imposing senator.\textsuperscript{28} Most important, Nicollet worked to ensure the establishment of a baseline: in the summer of 1835 he installed the necessary apparatus for the Jesuit observatory at St. Louis University, and, on his return in 1837, he set up a barometer with his most capable local adherent, George Engelmann.\textsuperscript{29} Nicollet later did the same upriver, working at Fort Snelling, in Minnesota, on the advice of the artist George Catlin; somewhere on the fort grounds, while Nicollet calibrated barometers, a St. Louis slave by the name of Dred Scott and his wife Harriet labored.\textsuperscript{30}

By the time Nicollet returned to St. Louis, amateurs could get into the measuring business. Jacob Blattner was advertising his skills as “\textsc{MAKER OF MATHEMATICAL, OPTICAL, AND PHYSICAL INSTRUMENTS,}” allowing any interested farmer to track how storms on their farms in Illinois related to the readings they found in their correspondence, or soon saw in their newspapers.\textsuperscript{31}

William Clark maintained a museum of scientific and anthropological artifacts in town, and interest in science even reached the level of public entertainments, with lectures at the St. Louis Mercantile Library by the noted Swiss geologist and Harvard professor, Louis
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Agassiz, and by the Cincinnati astronomer O. M. Mitchell, later a Union general.\textsuperscript{32}

Nicollet returned to the East Coast in 1841, never to see the land he was mapping again. The combination of work on the master map and his steadily worsening tuberculosis kept him overburdened; the \textit{Map of the Hydrographical Basin of the Upper Mississippi River} was completed in 1843, but the printing in quantity occurred only after Nicollet’s death that same year.\textsuperscript{33} Nicollet’s map was a grand accomplishment. It fulfilled the Humboldtian vision by providing topographic detail, and pleased his political sponsors, who could more accurately plan for the settlement on plots of land whose dimensions and character could now be systematically recorded and tracked. Nicollet’s instructions allowed Frémont to pursue careful mapping on his expeditions, and the barometers he provided created a baseline and a valuable cache of continuous records (with ties that reach to the St. Louis University meteorologist today, who gives many of the local weather forecasts on the radio).\textsuperscript{34}

From St. Louis to the Smithsonian and the General Land Office, and later to the U.S. Weather Service, these lines of information connected the landscape the same way that the measured phenomena — a cold front, warm summer winds, a hurricane — tracked across the Plains or up the Mississippi Valley, without regard to any political boundaries.\textsuperscript{35} Whether it was French or Spanish territory, over Indian tribes or American settlers, raining on Union or Confederate troops — the weather patterns were the same, the measurements the same.

St. Louis stood as a particularly sensitive place to measure which way the winds were blowing, whether political, economic, or meteorological. As the combination of racial equality and meteorology in the careers of the St. Louis University priest-scientists suggest, those who measured the weather also embodied the experience of the times, all the while recording conditions on a regular scheduled.\textsuperscript{36} These literal and figurative measurements of the nation intersect most in the life of George Engelmann.

George Engelmann did not think of himself as a weather scientist; his passion was plants. “Ich . . . be-setzte mich selbst als ein Knabe leidenschaftlich mit Botanik,” Engelmann introduced himself to a new correspondent in 1868; “I . . . occupied myself even as a youngster passionately with botany,” he wrote, “. . . and after having travelled all by myself on horseback through the western territory, I settled in 1835 here in St. Louis as physician.”\textsuperscript{37} As the town doctor in a growing community, Engelmann found a perfectly pleasing profession. But it was his avocation that drove him and caused correspondents to seek him out, whether seeking his carte-de-visite for an album of “all the living American Botanists”; asking him to write up the Missouri flora for a national centennial exhibition; or requesting he tell fellow cofounders of the National Academy of Sciences what should be included on their seal.\textsuperscript{38} With other doctors and local dabblers, Engelmann had founded the Academy of Science of St. Louis in 1856, and served as its first president.\textsuperscript{39} He became the chief scientific advisor to Henry Shaw, whose plantings became the world-renowned Missouri Botanical Garden, and together they established a school of botany at Washington University.\textsuperscript{40} No matter which label he preferred, Engelmann was instrumental in making St. Louis a key center for scientific observation.

Given his sedentary lifestyle and dislike of the hardships of an expedition, Engelmann’s special expertise — the taxonomy of cacti — might seem unlikely. “Before I continue,” Engelmann confided, “let me say, that I have never seen a wild cactus except the locally growing \textit{Opuntia Rafinesquii}! All my examination[s] have been made with cultivated or dried specimens.” St. Louis was the ideal location for such work, as Engelmann was in constant contact with the explorers and scientists throughout the American West, as well as the world’s experts in Washington, Philadelphia, and the capitals of Europe. “Though my practice does not permit much observation of plants in nature,” Engelmann explained, “I study the copious material flowing in from friends from distant parts.”\textsuperscript{41} (These connections enabled Engelmann’s most toasted, if not necessarily best known, contribution to world botany: when French grapevines were endangered by the phylloxera in the 1870s, Engelmann’s experience with Missouri varietals helped him craft the eventual solution — grafting all of Europe’s wine grapes to American rootstock.\textsuperscript{42})

Engelmann’s interest in plant cultivation and his wide array of correspondents also led him to be a careful observer of meteorological phenomena and a natural conduit for barometrical measurements. He also had good teachers: “I am writing to thank you again for your erudite assistance in my research during my stay in St. Louis,” Nicollet wrote after the trip on which he left Engelmann a barometer, in 1837.\textsuperscript{43} The two men began an active correspondence, with Engelmann receiving technical advice, Nicollet anguishing over the painstaking calculations and the need to successfully gain and maintain federal patronage.\textsuperscript{44} Engelmann tracked his friend in correspondence with others in Washington, and mourned his untimely death. “Our friend Nicollet has been very ill again for the last week or ten days, indeed dangerously so,” Henry King reported to Engelmann on one of many such occasions. “We often talk about you and picture the beautiful things we shall do together on our return to St. Louis.”\textsuperscript{45} Nicollet’s last letter to Engelmann was unanswered when news came of his death. Engelmann marked top of the letter in German script: “Nicollet died 11 Sept. in Baltimore.”\textsuperscript{46}
When Nicollet was ailing, he had worried about his legacy. "Notre Standard Baromètre est prêt depuis trois mois," Nicollet had written to Engelmann in 1841; "Our Standard Barometer has been ready for three months." But, Nicollet fretted, "I don’t know how you will send it safely through the mountains. I don’t dare entrust it to Mr. Frémont, who is very rushed, and who isn’t used to carrying this kind of instrument." Frémont’s reputation for impetuous behavior would follow him into the mountains and out again, into politics and Army service.

Engelmann was recording the weather in St. Louis, three times daily, from soon after his arrival; by 1843, he was publishing his meteorological observations in the newspapers.8 When the Academy of Science of St. Louis began publishing proceedings, Engelmann provided tables of mean weather conditions by month and year — the predecessor to today’s notion of “seasonal” temperatures issued by the U.S. Weather Service.9

In 1860, Engelmann could already look back over his work as part of a long history of measurement in St. Louis, with Nicollet’s 1841 observations in “the garden of the Cathedral” continued at St. Louis University and by his own hands.10 Engelmann published a journal article on “the exact altitude of St. Louis,” an interesting fact made essential “because most of the hypsometrical measurements throughout the northern and western regions . . . took the altitude of St. Louis as their starting point.” Engelmann made it clear: the measurements of the American West, he noted, “were based to a great extent on the barometrical observations of these explorers compared with mine.”51

All along, Engelmann collected barometrical recordings from far-flung camps in the West along with his plant specimens. “My barometer until now has proved strong and found a kind of attachment between us,” Engelmann’s close friend and primary field assistant, Frederich Adolphus Wislenzus, wrote from Chihuahua, Mexico, in 1847. “I carried it over 100 miles on my back, and took care to be well served by it.”52 Wislenzus and others worried, however, how useful their measurements would be. From a camp on the Rio Grande — somewhere — John Milton Bigelow wrote that “it is rather a difficult task to mark a locality closely when you are a thousand mile from nowhere,” complaining that between San Antonio to El Paso “there are very few points that have a local habitation and a name.”53 Engelmann’s correspondents had better luck as time went on, and along the continent’s more northerly rivers: “We have sufficient data to obtain an excellent profile of the Country, and, our meteoro-logical force now abundantly strong, are bringing forward excellent results,” wrote Isaac I. Stevens from near the mouth of the Yellowstone River in 1853. “Elevations and depressions, river valleys all have been made points of observation,” scratching down his comprehensiveness.54

Engelmann continually dispensed technical advice to his loyal band of correspondents, and made connections to the newly formed national science institutions.
“You are an old meteorological observer and savant, and will therefore excuse the trouble I am about to give you now,” Bigelow wrote to Engelmann, a decade into their correspondence; the question involved calibrating a wet-bulb thermometer.\textsuperscript{55} Engelmann kept handy the charts that Alexander Dallas Bache, the great-grandson of Benjamin Franklin, had made to track the weather in Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{56} When Bache sought out the best meteorological observations for St. Louis and points west, he wrote to Engelmann. “For a comparison of the connected profiles of the continent of North America,” Bache explained, “you will greatly oblige me by filling up the accompanying blank.”\textsuperscript{57} In its first round of requests for national weather data in 1853, the Smithsonian Institution knew to ask Engelmann for summations of the best authorities,\textsuperscript{58} Engelmann regularly corresponded with Smithsonian officials; on occasion, they would combine their mailings to Engelmann with those for the St. Louis Mercantile Library, where Engelmann was a life member.\textsuperscript{59} The web of connections grew, and the analysis of national conditions came closer to fruition.

While the complex calculations of rain profiles and thermal lines were being completed, local correspondents grasped the palpable impact of patterns drawn from seemingly small, insignificant measurements. “A full year before I had any instruments, I regularly estimated the strength of the wind, cloudiness, etc. etc.,” Adolph Francis Alphonse Bandelier wrote, from Highland, Illinois; Friedrich Arends sent measurements from Huntsville, Missouri, while Friedrich Brendel wrote from Peoria that “I should like to do meteorological studies, if I only could get hold of a good barometer.”\textsuperscript{60} As one of the era’s many cholera epidemics crept up the riverways by means unsure — bad air? immigrants? social vices? citizens nervously wondered — Dr. Edward H. Barton, a former dean of the school of medicine at the University of Louisiana (now Tulane), wrote confidently that “in my ‘Report,’ I think the meteorological elements of yellow fever & cholera are stated with great precision.”\textsuperscript{61} He promised Engelmann, “I have been keeping your Barometer as well as I could,” Barton promised.\textsuperscript{62} Barton and Engelmann stood at the forefront of science, assured that, “if now, we can take another fatal disease from the region of error & uncertainty, & demonstrate the actual etiological condition on which it depends for its existence,” as Barton wrote, “we make another advance in true science, & promote the progress of truth.”\textsuperscript{63}

In contrast, those in Washington often grasped at the maps and topography reports as a chance to propose grandiose plans that went well beyond the known conditions. “I amuse myself occasionally with studying the physical Geography of the great West — Alas how little of it is known to the world[;]be great politicians at the seat of government,” Bigelow wrote from his home, in 1859. “I should greatly deplore the passage by both branches of Congress any of the Pacific Railroad bills I have yet seen.”\textsuperscript{64}

The botanical and meteorological work of Engelmann and his correspondents formed a perfect pair. Scouting and surveying parties could pinpoint locations and send back specimens and measurements; statisticians and cartographers could prepare more accurate maps, and politicians could send out further explorations to gather more detail. In Engelmann’s letters, the workings of scientific knowledge are evident. Missives in English, French, and German are filled with charts of measurements, sketches of cacti flowers, arguments about differentiating species and assigning Latin names. Bearded and spectacled, the visage of George Engelmann peers back from the requested carte-de-visite photograph could seem a practical embodiment of solid, scientific knowledge.

Yet lest we think that the amassers of scientific and medical knowledge fit a white labcoat image of impartiality and dispassion, Engelmann’s letters also record how he and his correspondents were highly opinionated about the events around them and actively involved in political and cultural affairs. Engelmann’s frank, even harsh assessments of politicians or their causes provide a window into those other sorts of measurements that can be made at St. Louis, the glimpses of local and national circumstances that guide our historical exploration.

“Toward evening a message arrived, that 5,000 American troops are marching on the Santa Fe road,”

Frederich Adolphus Wislenzus reported alongside his meteorological readings from the Mexican *estado de Nuevo México* in the summer of 1846. “Governor Armigo released a proclamation this afternoon calling all able-bodied men from 18 years up into service.”

Though Wislenzus remarked in his next letter that “I feel a strong dislike to return to the States,” the invading U.S. Army brought the boundary to him in Santa Fe. John C. Frémont, Nicollet’s assistant, jumped from scientific expedition to military campaign in the midst of the war, and ordered the execution of two men near San Rafael, California; his unauthorized action led to a court martial, which Wislenzus followed closely, along with the resulting damage to Frémont’s political stature.

When Wislenzus returned to Washington to lobby for funding to publish his studies, he wrote to Engelmann about the dramatic news from Europe: the aftermath of emancipation. While Wislenzus recorded the slogan that “Seymour Proclamation was declared, his allegiances were on his sleeve: “I wore Confederate buttons on my coat at drill to day,” the younger Engelmann wrote. “Our yankee teacher Stone, immediately noticed it...I was told that if I wore them again, I should not see the inside of the school again.” His father worried for him, writing to Braun that “I will send you my George if the age of conscription is lowered from 20 to 18!”

Both Engelmanns endured the war in St. Louis, unsure of the nation’s direction.

After the Confederate surrender, the senior Engelmann continued to keep Braun current on the bitter ironies of Reconstruction. “Here some of our firmest radicals are in part those who 4 years back stood on the other side,” he wrote. Noting the policies of the new president, he cheered “Johnson, may he be great, but what he wants is definitively a fight with the radical Congress.”

The end of the war meant the reopening of scientific as well as commercial and cultural projects, a renewal of exchanges with “Lindheimer from Texas and Chapman from Florida” — though with “much denying now, that they had ever any sympathy.”

Engelmann’s letters tracked the uncertainty and the advances, focusing at times on how national events would impact the fortunes of St. Louis. They mentioned in passing the concerns that were the focus of cultural, political, and economic wrangling, and will appear later in the book: “Two separate railroads to the Pacific Ocean are being constructed now, one from Chicago, the other from here,” Engelmann explained, while Wislenzus recorded the slogan that “Seymour and Blair! is now the solution.”

In 1869, Wislenzus told Engelmann that the transcontinental railroad path he Engelmann helped to chart would soon be complete. “The Great Pacific Railroad has only 6 more miles to construct,” he wrote at the start of May 1869. “It is supposed to be very defective, but, when finally completed, it will become better,” he hoped.

The world seemed once again on the precipice of change. “Nobody trusts the financial weather,” Wislenzus advised Engelmann at the start of the 1870s, assured his fellow scientist would understand the pun. Wislenzus’s son was then at Washington University, where he graduated valedictorian; in the student newspaper, Jacob Blattner advertised his barometers and thermometers, still for sale. At the height of Reconstruction, the political situation seemed to spiral toward farce: “These are golden times for political adventurers and cheaters of every kind!” Wislenzus wrote, noting how “last week the nomination of this
or language.
individuals from across the spectra of region, politics, that allowed him to build a community of interested cause for boosterish exaggeration or rhetorical flour-
the turbulent times in which he lived. He rarely saw
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