

THE PRESIDENTS  
OF THE UNITED STATES





3

Micro. H. 300-335,



BRL


2046 REF



THE PRESIDENTS  
OF THE UNITED STATES

If you would understand history, study men

CHARLES KINGSLEY




Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2011 with funding from

The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant







1792

Girsch

*George Washington*

THE PRESIDENTS  
OF THE UNITED STATES

1789-1894

BY

JOHN FISKE, CARL SCHURZ, WILLIAM E. RUSSELL,  
DANIEL C. GILMAN, WILLIAM WALTER PHELPS,  
ROBERT C. WINTHROP, GEORGE BANCROFT,  
JOHN HAY, AND OTHERS

EDITED BY

JAMES GRANT WILSON

*ILLUSTRATED*

NEW YORK  
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

1894

COPYRIGHT, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1894,  
By D. APPLETON AND COMPANY.

ELECTROTYPED AND PRINTED  
AT THE APPLETON PRESS, U. S. A.

## P R E F A C E .

---

MANY of the brief biographies of the twenty-three Presidents of the United States contained in this volume were written by distinguished scholars and statesmen who were peculiarly fitted by their training or contact with our chief magistrates to render ample justice to their subjects, and also to treat them with what Edmund Burke describes as "the cold neutrality of an impartial judge." Several of the monographs were especially prepared for this work, while the larger number were written for "Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography." In some instances they have been revised and enlarged for the present volume. These three-and-twenty articles contain a complete record of the most important events in the nation's history from the inauguration of our first President to the summer of 1894, a period of more than one hundred and five years, and including twenty-seven administrations. The well-known writers of these model biographies of our chief magistrates are not responsible for the brief notices of the ladies of the White House, for the sketches of other persons connected with the families of the Presidents, for the bibliographies accompanying their monographs, nor for the selection of the many illustrations in the text, which it is believed will enhance the interest and value of the volume. These have been added by the editor. The twenty-three steel portraits have been engraved from the best originals obtainable, and the interesting series of facsimiles, with three excep-

tions, were taken from the editor's complete collection of letters written by the Presidents, concerning some of whom—such as Washington, the elder Adams, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Grant—it may safely be said, “upon the adamant of their fame the stream of time beats without injury.” For those of John Adams, James Monroe, and Andrew Johnson the publishers are indebted to the courtesy of William Evarts Benjamin, the New York dealer in autographs and engravings, as those three examples in the editor's set of letters of our chief magistrates were not well adapted for use in this work.

NEW YORK, *August, 1894.*

## CONTENTS.

---

ARTICLE.	AUTHOR.	PAGE
GEORGE WASHINGTON . . . .	Robert C. Winthrop . . . .	1
JOHN ADAMS . . . . .	John Fiske . . . . .	36
THOMAS JEFFERSON . . . .	James Parton . . . . .	62
JAMES MADISON . . . . .	John Fiske . . . . .	88
JAMES MONROE . . . . .	Daniel C. Gilman . . . . .	107
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS . . . .	John Fiske . . . . .	120
ANDREW JACKSON . . . . .	John Fiske . . . . .	137
MARTIN VAN BUREN . . . .	James C. Welling . . . . .	169
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON .	Arthur E. Bostwick . . . .	185
JOHN TYLER . . . . .	John Fiske . . . . .	195
JAMES K. POLK . . . . .	George Bancroft . . . . .	216
ZACHARY TAYLOR . . . . .	Jefferson Davis . . . . .	233
MILLARD FILLMORE . . . .	James Grant Wilson . . . .	246
FRANKLIN PIERCE . . . . .	Bainbridge Wadleigh . . . .	262
JAMES BUCHANAN . . . . .	George Ticknor Curtis . . . .	277
ABRAHAM LINCOLN . . . . .	John Hay . . . . .	300
ANDREW JOHNSON . . . . .	James Phelan . . . . .	336
ULYSSES S. GRANT . . . . .	Horace Porter . . . . .	347
RUTHERFORD B. HAYES . . .	Carl Schurz . . . . .	397
JAMES A. GARFIELD . . . .	William Walter Phelps . . . .	426
CHESTER A. ARTHUR . . . .	William E. Chandler . . . .	444
GROVER CLEVELAND . . . . .	William E. Russell . . . . .	468
BENJAMIN HARRISON . . . .	William P. Fishback . . . .	492





## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

### PORTRAITS ON STEEL.

	ARTIST.	FACING PAGE
WASHINGTON, GEORGE . . . .	<i>Stuart</i> . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
ADAMS, JOHN . . . . .	<i>Stuart</i> . . . . .	36
ADAMS, JOHN QUINCY . . . .	<i>Marchant</i> . . . . .	120
ARTHUR, CHESTER A. . . . .	<i>Bell</i> . . . . .	444
BUCHANAN, JAMES . . . . .	<i>Smith</i> . . . . .	277
CLEVELAND, GROVER . . . . .	<i>Bogardus</i> . . . . .	468
FILLMORE, MILLARD . . . . .	<i>Baker</i> . . . . .	246
GARFIELD, JAMES A. . . . .	<i>Sarony</i> . . . . .	426
GRANT, ULYSSES S. . . . .	<i>Kurtz</i> . . . . .	347
HARRISON, BENJAMIN . . . . .	<i>Bogardus</i> . . . . .	492
HARRISON, WILLIAM HENRY . .	<i>Marceau</i> . . . . .	185
HAYES, RUTHERFORD B. . . . .	<i>Landy</i> . . . . .	397
JACKSON, ANDREW . . . . .	<i>Longacre</i> . . . . .	137
JEFFERSON, THOMAS . . . . .	<i>Brown</i> . . . . .	62
JOHNSON, ANDREW . . . . .	<i>Brady</i> . . . . .	336
LINCOLN, ABRAHAM . . . . .	<i>Hesler</i> . . . . .	300
MADISON, JAMES . . . . .	<i>Stuart</i> . . . . .	88
MONROE, JAMES . . . . .	<i>Vanderlyn</i> . . . . .	107
PIERCE, FRANKLIN . . . . .	<i>Healy</i> . . . . .	262
POLK, JAMES KNOX . . . . .	<i>Poole</i> . . . . .	216
TAYLOR, ZACHARY . . . . .	<i>Brady</i> . . . . .	233
TYLER, JOHN . . . . .	<i>Longacre</i> . . . . .	195
VAN BUREN, MARTIN . . . . .	<i>Brady</i> . . . . .	169

FACSIMILES OF LETTERS BY THE PRESIDENTS.

	FACING PAGE
George Washington to James Madison (last page) . . . . .	18
John Adams to Judge William Cranch . . . . .	55
Thomas Jefferson to Mrs. Margaret Harrison Smith . . . . .	81
James Madison to Mrs. Margaret Harrison Smith . . . . .	100
James Monroe to the General Assembly of Virginia . . . . .	113
John Quincy Adams to Charles Francis Adams . . . . .	124
Andrew Jackson to James K. Polk . . . . .	149
Martin Van Buren to Fitz-Greene Halleck . . . . .	178
William Henry Harrison to David K. Este . . . . .	190
John Tyler to David S. Gardiner (last page) . . . . .	211
James Knox Polk to Mrs. Sarah C. Polk (last page) . . . . .	222
Zachary Taylor to John J. Crittenden (last page) . . . . .	239
Millard Fillmore to James Grant Wilson . . . . .	256
Franklin Pierce to William L. Marcy . . . . .	269
James Buchanan to Aaron V. Brown . . . . .	296
Abraham Lincoln to John S. Stuart . . . . .	325
Andrew Johnson to David D. Patterson (last page) . . . . .	342
Ulysses S. Grant to James Grant Wilson . . . . .	377
Rutherford B. Hayes to the Editor . . . . .	422
James Abram Garfield to James H. Rhodes . . . . .	437
Chester Alan Arthur to James Grant Wilson . . . . .	460
Grover Cleveland to Mrs. James Grant Wilson . . . . .	475
Benjamin Harrison to the Editor . . . . .	498

ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT.

	PAGE
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Mary Washington . . . . .	2
The Birthplace of George Washington . . . . .	3
Drawing of the Locality by General Sherman . . . . .	4
Portrait and Autograph of Washington in Early Life . . . . .	7
The Episcopal Church at Pohick, Va. . . . .	11
Trumbull's Portrait of Washington . . . . .	13
Washington's Headquarters at Newburgh, N. Y. . . . .	16
Marble Bust of Washington, by Houdon . . . . .	20
Wertmüller's Portrait of Washington . . . . .	21
Portrait of Washington, by Du Simitière . . . . .	25
The Tomb of George Washington, at Mount Vernon . . . . .	26

	PAGE
The Washington Obelisk, in Washington, D. C. . . . .	27
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Martha Washington . . . . .	30
View of Mount Vernon, Virginia . . . . .	32
Arlington House, near Washington, D. C. . . . .	33
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. E. P. Lewis . . . . .	34
Houses in which John Adams and his Son were born . . . . .	36
Early Portrait and Autograph of John Adams . . . . .	37
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Abigail Adams . . . . .	60
Monticello, the Home of Thomas Jefferson . . . . .	72
Impression of Thomas Jefferson's Seal . . . . .	77
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Martha Randolph . . . . .	87
Portrait and Autograph of James Madison . . . . .	98
Montpelier, the Residence of James Madison . . . . .	102
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Dolly Madison . . . . .	106
Oak Hill, the Residence of James Monroe . . . . .	110
Tomb of President Monroe, Richmond, Va. . . . .	117
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Elizabeth Monroe . . . . .	118
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Louisa C. Adams . . . . .	129
Portrait and Autograph of Charles Francis Adams . . . . .	133
Jackson's Headquarters near New Orleans . . . . .	146
The Hermitage, the Home of General Jackson . . . . .	159
Valle's Early Portrait of Jackson, and Autograph . . . . .	165
Portrait and Autograph of Martin Van Buren . . . . .	173
John Van Buren's Portrait and Autograph . . . . .	182
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Angelica Van Buren . . . . .	184
Portrait and Autograph of Benjamin Harrison, the Signer . . . . .	186
General William Henry Harrison Campaign Medal . . . . .	192
Mrs. Anna Harrison's Portrait and Autograph . . . . .	194
Sherwood Forest, the Residence of John Tyler . . . . .	202
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Julia Gardiner Tyler . . . . .	215
James K. Polk's Residence in Nashville, Tenn. . . . .	225
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Sarah C. Polk . . . . .	231
General Taylor's House as it now appears . . . . .	241
Monument and Statue of General Taylor . . . . .	243
Portrait and Autograph of Millard Fillmore . . . . .	252
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Abigail Fillmore . . . . .	258
Birthplace of Franklin Pierce, Hillsborough, N. H. . . . .	265
The Tomb of President Pierce, Concord, N. H. . . . .	272
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Jane M. A. Pierce . . . . .	275

	PAGE
Wheatland, the Residence of James Buchanan . . . . .	287
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Harriet Lane Johnston . . . . .	299
Early Portrait of Lincoln, and Autograph . . . . .	301
Lincoln's Residence in Springfield, Ill. . . . .	304
Statue of Lincoln, by St. Gaudens, in Chicago . . . . .	308
Lincoln's Statue, by Henry K. Browne, in New York . . . . .	312
Statue of Lincoln, by Randolph Rogers, in Philadelphia . . . . .	315
House in Washington where Lincoln died . . . . .	319
Death Mask of Lincoln, taken by Leonard W. Volk . . . . .	324
President Lincoln's Tomb, Springfield, Ill. . . . .	329
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Mary Lincoln . . . . .	333
Portrait and Autograph of Robert T. Lincoln . . . . .	335
Andrew Johnson's Workshop, Greenville, Tenn. . . . .	337
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Eliza M. Johnson . . . . .	345
Birthplace of General Grant, Mount Pleasant, Ohio . . . . .	348
Portrait of Grant as a Lieutenant, and Autograph . . . . .	352
Grant's Last Portrait, taken at Mount McGregor . . . . .	361
McLean House, the Scene of Lee's Surrender . . . . .	370
Gold Medal voted by Congress to General Grant . . . . .	379
House at Mount McGregor where Grant died . . . . .	384
Equestrian Statue of Grant, by Rebisso, in Chicago . . . . .	388
Eastern Façade of the Structure and Statue . . . . .	391
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Julia D. Grant . . . . .	395
Home of President Hayes, Fremont, Ohio . . . . .	403
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Lucy W. Hayes . . . . .	425
Birthplace of James A. Garfield, "The Wilderness," Ohio . . . . .	427
Statue of President Garfield, Washington, D. C. . . . .	435
Tomb of General Garfield, Cleveland, Ohio . . . . .	441
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Lucretia R. Garfield . . . . .	443
Tomb of President Arthur, in Rural Cemetery, Albany, N. Y. . . . .	465
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Mary A. McElroy . . . . .	467
Northeast View of the White House, Washington, D. C. . . . .	472
Gray Gables, Grover Cleveland's Summer Residence . . . . .	479
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Francis Cleveland . . . . .	491
Benjamin Harrison's Portrait and Autograph . . . . .	494
Residence of President Harrison in Indianapolis . . . . .	500
Portrait and Autograph of Mrs. Caroline S. Harrison . . . . .	506

# LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS.

---

## GEORGE WASHINGTON.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, first president of the United States, born at Pope's Creek, near Bridge's Creek, Westmoreland co., Va., 22 Feb., 1732; died at Mount Vernon, 14 Dec., 1799. Of his English ancestry various details are given in more than one formal biography of him, and very recently several questions of his genealogy have been satisfactorily solved by Mr. Henry F. Waters, Mr. Moncure D. Conway, and Mr. W. C. Ford, which had eluded even the labors of the late Col. J. L. Chester. It is perhaps too early to regard his English ancestry as beyond all further question. At all events, this memoir may well be allowed to begin with his American history.

His earliest ancestor in this country was John Washington, who had resided for some years at South Cave, near the Humber, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, England, and who came over to Virginia, with his brother Andrew, in 1657. Purchasing lands in Westmoreland county and establishing his residence at Pope's Creek, not far from the Potomac, he became, in due course, an extensive planter, a county magistrate, and a member of the house of burgesses. He distinguished himself, also, as colonel of the Virginia forces in driving off a band of Seneca Indians who were ravaging the neighboring settlements. In honor of his public and private character, the parish in which he resided was called Washington. In this parish his grandson, Augustine, the second son of Lawrence Washington, was born in 1694. By his first wife Augustine had four children. Two of them died young, but two sons, Lawrence and Augustine, survived their mother, who died in 1728. On 6 March, 1730, the father was again married. His second wife was Mary Ball, and George was her first child.

If tradition is to be trusted, few sons ever had a more lovely and devoted mother, and no mother a more dutiful and affectionate son. Bereaved of her husband, who died after a short illness in 1743, when George was but eleven years of age, and with four



*Mary Washington*

younger children to be cared for, she discharged the responsibilities thus sadly devolved upon her with scrupulous fidelity and firmness. To her we owe the precepts and example that governed George's life. The excellent maxims, moral and religious, which she found in her favorite manual—"Sir Matthew Hale's Contemplations"—were impressed on his memory and on his heart, as she read them aloud to her children; and that little volume, with the autograph inscription of Mary Washington, was among the cherished treasures

of his library as long as he lived. To her, too, under God, we owe especially the restraining influence and authority, that held him back, at the last moment, as we shall see, from embarking on a line of life that would have cut him off from the great career that has rendered his name immortal.

Well did Dr. Sparks, in his careful and excellent biography, speak of "the debt owed by mankind to the mother of Washington." A pleasing conjectural picture, not without some weight of testimony, has been adopted by Mr. Lossing in his "Mary and Martha," representing her at the age of twenty-three.\* She delighted in saying simply that "George had always been a good son"; and her own life was fortunately prolonged until she had seen him more than fulfil every hope of her heart. On his way to his first inauguration as president of the United States Washington came to bid his mother a last farewell, just before her death.

That parting scene, however, was not at his birthplace. The primitive Virginia farm-house in which he was born had long ceased to be the family residence, and had gradually fallen into

---

\* See vignette, from the original in the possession of Mrs. S. F. B. Morse.


ruin. The remains of a large kitchen-chimney were all that could be identified of it in 1878, by a party of which Secretary Evarts, General Sherman, and the late Mr. Charles C. Perkins, of Boston, were three, who visited the spot with a view to the erection of a memorial under the authority of congress. Not long after the birth that has rendered this spot forever memorable, Augustine Washington removed to an estate in Stafford county, on the east side of the Rappahannock, opposite Fredericksburg, and resided there with his family during the remaining years of his life. That was the scene of George's early childhood. There he first went to school, in an "old-field" school-house, with Hobby, the sexton of the parish, for his first master. After his father's death, however, he was sent back to the old homestead at Pope's Creek, to live for a while with his elder half-brother, Augustine, to whom the Westmoreland estate had been left, and who, on his marriage, had taken it for his residence. There George had the advantage of at least a better school than Hobby's, kept by a Mr. Williams. But it taught him nothing except reading, writing, and arithmetic, with a little geometry and surveying. For this last study he evinced a marked preference. Many of his copy-books of that period have been preserved, and they show no inconsiderable proficiency in the surveyor's art, even before he finally left school, toward the close of his sixteenth year.

One of those manuscript books, however, is of a miscellaneous and peculiarly interesting character, containing carefully prepared forms for business papers; a few selections or, it may be, original compositions in rhyme; and a series of "Rules of Behavior in Company and Conversation," most of them translated from a French Book of "Maximes," discovered by Mr. Conway, of which the last and most noteworthy one, not in the French series, and which he may have added himself, must never be omitted from the story of Washington's boyhood: "Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire, *Conscience*." All these schoolboy manuscripts bear witness alike to his extreme care in cultivating a neat, clear,



and elegant handwriting, and his name is sometimes written almost as if in contemplation of the great instruments and state papers to which it was destined to be the attesting signature.

Meantime he was training himself for vigorous manhood by all sorts of robust exercises and athletic sports. He played soldier, sometimes, with his school-mates, always asserting the authority of captain, and subjecting the little company to a rigid discipline. Running, leaping, and wrestling were among his favorite pastimes. He became a fearless rider, too, and no horse is said to have been too fiery for him. "Above all," as Irving well says, "his inherent probity, and the principles of justice on which he regulated his conduct, even at this early period of his life, were soon appreciated by his school-mates;



he was referred to as an umpire in their disputes, and his decisions were never reversed." A crisis in Washington's life occurred before he left school. His eldest half-brother, Lawrence, had already been an officer in the English service, and was at the siege of Carthage under Admiral Vernon, for whom he formed a great regard, and whose name he afterward gave to his estate on the Potomac. Observing George's military propensities, and thinking that the English navy would afford him the most promising field for future distinction, Lawrence obtained a midshipman's warrant for him in 1746, when he was just fourteen years old, and George is said to have been on the point of embarking on this English naval service. The earnest remonstrance of his mother was interposed, and the project reluctantly abandoned. He thereupon resumed his studies, and did not leave school till the autumn before his sixteenth year. Soon afterward he went to reside with his brother Lawrence, who had married a Fairfax of Belvoir, and had established himself at Mount Vernon.

Washington's education was now finished, so far as schools and schoolmasters were concerned, and he never enjoyed or sought the advantages of a college. Indeed, only a month



after he was sixteen he entered on the active career of a surveyor of lands, in the employment of William Fairfax, the father of his brother's wife, and the manager of the great estate of his cousin, Lord Fairfax. In this work he voluntarily subjected himself to every variety of hardship and personal danger. Those Alleghany valleys and hills were then a wilderness, where difficult obstructions were to be overcome, severe exposures to be endured, and savage tribes to be conciliated or encountered. For three successive years he persevered undauntedly in this occupation, having obtained a commission from the president and master of William and Mary college as a public surveyor for Culpeper county, which entitled his surveys to a place in the county office, where they were held in high esteem for completeness and accuracy. During these three years he allowed himself but little relaxation, yet found time in the winter months for an occasional visit to his mother, and for aiding her in the management of her affairs.

And now, at nineteen years of age, he received an appointment as adjutant-general, with the rank of major, to inspect and exercise the militia in one of the districts into which Virginia was divided in view of the French encroachments and the Indian depredations with which the frontiers were menaced. Before he had fairly entered on this service, however, he was called to accompany his brother Lawrence to the West Indies, on a voyage for his brother's health, and was absent from home for more than four months, during which he had a severe attack of small-pox. His brother remained longer, and returned at last only to die, leaving George as one of his executors, and involving him in large responsibilities as well as in much personal affliction. Meantime his appointment as adjutant-general was renewed by Gov. Dinwiddie, and he was assigned to the charge of one of the grand military divisions of the colony. A wider field of service was thus opened to Washington, on which he entered with alacrity.

War between France and England was now rapidly approaching, involving a conflict for the possession of a large part of the American continent. French posts were already established on the banks of the Ohio, with a view of confining the English colonies within the Alleghany mountains. Gov. Dinwiddie, under instructions from the British ministry, resolved upon sending a commissioner to the officer commanding the French forces to in-

quire by what authority he was invading the king's dominions, and to ascertain, if possible, his further designs. Washington was selected for this delicate and dangerous mission, after several others had declined to undertake it. He accepted it at once, and toward the end of November, 1753, he set out from Williamsburg, without any military escort, on a journey of nearly 600 miles—a great part of it over “lofty and rugged mountains and through the heart of a wilderness.” The perilous incidents of this expedition cannot be recounted here. His marvellous and providential escapes, at one time from the violence of the savages, at another from assassination by a treacherous guide, at a third from being drowned in crossing the Alleghany river on a raft, have been described in all the accounts of his early manhood, substantially from his own journal, published in London at the time. He reached Williamsburg on his return on 16 Jan., 1754, and delivered to Gov. Dinwiddie the reply of the French commander to his message of inquiry. No more signal test could have been afforded of Washington's various talents and characteristics, which this expedition served at once to display and to develop. “From that moment,” says his biographer, Irving, “he was the rising hope of Virginia.”

He was then but just finishing his twenty-first year, and immediately after his return he was appointed to the chief command of a little body of troops raised for meeting immediate exigencies; but the military establishment was increased as soon as the governor could convene the legislature of Virginia, and Washington was appointed lieutenant-colonel of a regiment, with Joshua Fry, an accomplished Oxford scholar, as his colonel. Upon Washington at once devolved the duty of going forward with such companies as were enlisted, and the sudden death of Col. Fry soon left him in full command of the expedition. The much-misrepresented skirmish with the French troops, resulting in the death of Jumonville, was followed, on 3 July, 1754, by the battle of the Great Meadows, where Washington held his ground, in Fort Necessity, from eleven in the morning to eight at night, against a great superiority of numbers, until the French requested a parley. A capitulation ensued, in every way honorable to Washington as it was translated and read to him, but which proved, when printed, to contain terms in the French language which he never would have

signed or admitted had they not been suppressed or softened by the interpreter.\*

The course now adopted by Gov. Dinwiddie in the reorganization of the Virginia troops, against which Washington remonstrated, and which would have reduced him to an inferior grade, led at once to his resignation, and, after a brief visit to his mother, he retired to Mount Vernon. He was soon solicited by Gov. Sharpe, of Maryland, then the commander-in-chief of the English forces, to resume his station, but under circumstances and upon conditions incompatible with his self-respect. In declining the invitation he used this memorable language: "I shall have the consolation of knowing that I have opened the way, when the smallness of our numbers exposed us to the attacks of a superior enemy; and that I have had the thanks of my country for the services I have rendered." But now Gen. Braddock was sent over from England with two regiments of regulars, and Washington did not hesitate to accept an appointment on his staff as a volunteer aide-de-camp. The prudent counsels that he gave Braddock before he set out on his ill-fated expedition, and often repeated along the road, were not followed; but Washington, notwithstanding a violent attack of fever, was with him on the bloody field of the Monongahela, behaving, as his fellow aide-de-camp, Col. Orne, testified, "with the greatest courage and resolution," witnessing at last Braddock's defeat and death, and being the only mounted officer not killed or disabled. "By the all-powerful dispensations of Providence," wrote he to his brother, "I have been protected beyond all human probability or expectation; for I had four bullets through my coat, and two horses shot under me, yet I escaped unhurt, although death was levelling my companions on every side." It fell to him by a striking coincidence—the chaplain being wounded—to read the funeral service at the burial of Braddock at the Great



*George Washington*

\* See note at end of chapter xii., vol. i., of Irving's "Life of Washington."

Meadows, the scene of his own capitulation the year before. In a sermon to one of the companies organized under the impulse of Braddock's defeat, and in view of the impending dangers of the country, the Rev. Samuel Davies, an eloquent and accomplished preacher, who, in 1759, succeeded Jonathan Edwards as president of Princeton college, after praising the zeal and courage of the Virginia troops, added these prophetic words: "As a remarkable instance of this, I may point out to the public that heroic youth, Col. Washington, whom I cannot but hope Providence has hitherto preserved in so signal a manner for some important service to his country."

A force of 2,000 men having now been ordered to be raised by the Virginia assembly, Washington was appointed to the chief command, and established his headquarters at Winchester. He broke away from the perplexing cares of this place in February, 1756, to make a hurried visit to Gov. Shirley in Boston, where he settled successfully with him, then the commander-in-chief of the English forces on this continent, a vexatious question of precedence between the provincial officers and those appointed by the crown. On his return he devoted himself to measures for the security of the frontier. In the course of the following year he was again the subject of a violent fever, which prostrated him for several months. "My constitution," he wrote to a friend, "is much impaired, and nothing can retrieve it but the greatest care and the most circumspect course of life." Under these circumstances he seriously contemplated again resigning his command and retiring from all further public business. But his favorite measure, the reduction of Fort Duquesne, was at length to be undertaken, and, after much disappointment and delay, Washington, on 25 Nov., 1758, was privileged to "march in and plant the British flag on the yet smoking ruins" of that fort—henceforth to be known as Fort Pitt, in honor of the great minister of England, afterward Lord Chatham.

Meantime Washington had chanced to meet on his way to Williamsburg, at the house of a hospitable Virginian with whom he dined, a charming widow, who at once won his heart. Most happily he soon succeeded in winning hers also, and on 6 Jan., 1759, she became his wife. Martha Custis, daughter of John Dandridge and widow of John Parke Custis, was henceforth to be known in history as Martha Washington. He had now


finally resigned his commission as a colonial officer, and was preparing to enjoy something of the retirement of private life. But while he was still absent on his last campaign he had been chosen a delegate to the Virginia house of burgesses, and he had hardly established himself at Mount Vernon, a few months after his marriage, when he was summoned to attend a session of that body at Williamsburg. He was not allowed, however, to enter unobserved on his civil career. No sooner did he make his appearance than the Speaker, agreeably to a previous vote of the house, presented their thanks to him, in the name of the colony, for the distinguished military service he had rendered to his country, accompanying the vote of thanks with expressions of compliment and praise which greatly embarrassed him. He attempted to make his acknowledgments, but stammered and trembled and "could not give distinct utterance to a single syllable." "Sit down, Mr. Washington," said the Speaker, with infinite address; "your modesty equals your valor, and that surpasses the power of any language I possess."

Fourteen or fifteen years more elapsed before the great struggle for American independence began, and during all this time he continued to be a member of the house of burgesses. He was punctual in his attendance at all their sessions, which were commonly at least two in a year, and took an earnest interest in all that was said and done, but "it is not known," says Sparks, "that he ever made a set speech or entered into a stormy debate." He had a passion for agricultural pursuits. He delighted in his quiet rural life at Mount Vernon with his wife and her children—he had none of his own—finding ample occupation in the management of his farms, and abundant enjoyment in hunting and fishing with the genial friends and relatives in his neighborhood. He was a vestryman of two parishes, regular in his attendance at one or the other of the parochial churches, at Alexandria or at Pohick, and both he and his wife were communicants. Meantime he was always at the service of his friends or the community for any aid or counsel that he could render them. He was often called on to be an arbitrator, and his judgment and impartiality were never questioned. As a commissioner for settling the military accounts of the colony, after the treaty of peace of 1763, he spared himself no labor in the execution of a most arduous and complicated task. In a word, he was a good citizen, an exem-

plary Christian, a devoted father, a kind master to the slaves who had come to him by inheritance or marriage, and was respected and beloved-by all.

At length, at forty-three years of age, he was called upon to begin a career that closed only with his life, during which he held the highest and most responsible positions in war and in peace, and rendered inestimable services to his country and to mankind. To follow that career in detail would require nothing less than a history of the United States for the next five-and-twenty years. Washington was naturally of a cautious and conservative cast, and by no means disposed for a rupture with the mother country, if it could be avoided without the sacrifice of rights and principles. But as the various stages of British aggression succeeded each other, beginning with the stamp-act, the repeal of which he hailed with delight, and followed by the tea tax and the Boston port bill, he became keenly alive to the danger of submission, and was ready to unite in measures of remonstrance, opposition, and ultimately of resistance. When he heard at Williamsburg, in August, 1773, of the sufferings resulting from the port bill, he is said to have exclaimed, impulsively: "I will raise a thousand men, subsist them at my own expense, and march with them, at their head, for the relief of Boston." He little dreamed at that moment that within two years he was destined to be hailed as the deliverer of Boston from British occupation. He accepted an election as a delegate to the first Continental congress in 1774, and went to the meeting at Philadelphia in September of that year, in company with Patrick Henry and Edmund Pendleton, who called for him at Mount Vernon on horseback. That congress sat in Carpenter's Hall with closed doors, but the great papers that it prepared and issued form a proud part of American history. Those were the papers and that the congress of which Chatham in the house of lords, in his memorable speech on the removal of troops from Boston, 20 Jan., 1775, said: "When your lordships look at the papers transmitted to us from America, when you consider their decency, firmness, and wisdom, you cannot but respect their cause, and wish to make it your own. For myself, I must declare and avow that in all my reading and observation—and it has been my favorite study—I have read Thucydides, and have studied and admired the master states of the world—that for solidity of reasoning,

force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion, under such a complication of difficult circumstances, no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the general congress at Philadelphia." The precise part taken by Washington within the closed doors of Carpenter's Hall is nowhere recorded, but the testimony of one of its most distinguished members cannot be forgotten. When Patrick Henry returned home from the meeting, and was asked whom he considered the greatest man in that congress, he replied: "If you speak of eloquence, Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina, is by far the



greatest orator; but if you speak of solid information and sound judgment, Col. Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on that floor." It is an interesting tradition that, during the prayers with which Dr. Duché opened that meeting at Carpenter's Hall on 5 Sept., 1774, while most of the other members were standing, Washington was kneeling.


He was again a delegate to the Continental congress (the second) that assembled at Philadelphia on 10 May, 1775, by which, on the 15th of June, on the motion of Thomas Johnson, a delegate of Maryland, at the earnest instigation of John Adams, of Massachusetts, he was unanimously elected commander-in-chief of all the Continental forces raised, or to be raised, for the defence of American liberty. On the next morning he accepted the appointment and expressed his deep and grateful sense of the high honor conferred upon him, "but," added he, "lest some unlucky event should happen, unfavorable to my reputation, I beg it may be remembered by every gentleman in the room that I this day declare, with the utmost sincerity, that I do not think myself equal to the command I am honored with." "As to pay," he continued, "I beg leave to assure the congress that, as no pecuniary consideration could have tempted me to accept this arduous employment, at the expense of my domestic ease and happiness, I do not wish to make any profit of it. I will keep an exact account of my expenses. Those I doubt not they will discharge, and that is all I desire." "You may believe me," he wrote to his

wife at once, "when I assure you, in the most solemn manner, that so far from seeking this appointment, I have used every endeavor in my power to avoid it, not only from my unwillingness to part with you and the family, but from a consciousness of its being a trust too great for my capacity." Washington's commission was agreed to by congress on 17 June, and on the 21st he set out from Philadelphia on horseback to take command of the American army encamped around Boston, of which place the British forces were in possession. The tidings of the battle of Bunker Hill reached him at New York on the 25th, and the next day he was in the saddle again on his way to Cambridge. He arrived there on 2 July, and established his headquarters in the old Vassall (afterward Craigie) mansion, which has recently been known as the residence of the poet Longfellow. On 3 July he took formal command of the army, drawing his sword under an ancient elm, which has of late years been suitably inscribed. The American army numbered about 17,000 men, but only 14,500 were fit for duty. Coming hastily from different colonies, they were without supplies of tents or clothing, and there was not ammunition enough for nine cartridges to a man. Washington's work in combining and organizing this mass of raw troops was most embarrassing and arduous. But he persevered untiringly, and, after a siege of eight months, succeeded in driving the British from Boston on 17 March, 1776. For this grand exploit congress awarded him a splendid gold medal, which bore an admirable likeness of him on one side, and on the other side the inscription "Hostibus primo fugatis Bostonium recuperatum." Copies of this medal in silver and bronze have been multiplied, but the original gold medal has found a fit place, within a few years past, in the Boston Public Library.

The way was now opened, and the scene of the war was soon transferred to other parts of the country. The day after the evacuation of Boston, five regiments, with a battalion of riflemen and two companies of artillery, were sent to New York. But, as the British fleet was still in Nantasket road, Washington did not venture to move more of his army, or to go away himself, until the risk of a return was over. On 13 April he reached New York, and was soon summoned to Philadelphia for a conference with congress. On his return to New York, while he was anxiously awaiting an attack by the British forces, the



Declaration of Independence, signed on 4 July, was transmitted to him. The regiments were forthwith paraded, and the Declaration was read at the head of the army. "The General hopes," said he in the orders of the day, "that this important event will serve as a fresh incentive to every officer and soldier to act with fidelity and courage, as knowing that now the peace and safety of his country depend, under God, solely on the success of our arms." He hailed the Declaration with delight, and had written to his brother, from Philadelphia, that he was rejoiced at "the noble act" of the Virginia convention, recommending that such a declaration should be adopted. But his little army, according to the returns of 5 Aug. following, hardly numbered more than 20,000 men, of whom six or seven thousand were sick or on furlough or otherwise absent, while the British forces were at least 24,000, supported by a large and thoroughly equipped fleet. The battle of Long Island soon followed, with disastrous results to the Americans, and the British took possession of New York. Other reverses were not long delayed, and the strategy of Washington found its exhibition only in his skilful retreat from Long Island and through the Jerseys. But he was not disheartened, nor his confidence in ultimate success impaired. When asked what was to be done if Philadelphia were



taken, he replied: "We will retreat beyond the Susquehanna, and thence, if necessary, to the Alleghany mountains." His masterly movements on the Delaware were now witnessed, which Frederick the Great is said to have declared "the most brilliant achievements recorded in military annals." "Many years later," Mr. Lossing informs us in his interesting volume on Mount Vernon and its associations, "the great Frederick sent him a portrait of himself, accompanied by the remarkable words: 'From the oldest general in Europe to the greatest general in the world!'" Meantime he had a vast work to accomplish with entirely inadequate means. But he went along with heroic fortitude, unswerving constancy, and unspar-

ing self-devotion, through all the trials and sufferings of Monmouth and Brandywine and Germantown and Valley Forge, until the grand consummation was at last reached at Yorktown, on 19 Oct., 1781. There, with the aid of our generous and gallant allies, he achieved the crowning victory of independence on the soil of his beloved Virginia.

The details of this protracted contest must be left to history, as well as the infamous cabal for impeaching his ability and depriving him of his command and the still more infamous treason of Arnold, in September, 1780. Standing on the field of Yorktown, to receive the surrender of Lord Cornwallis and the British army, Washington was at length rewarded for all the labors and sacrifices and disappointments he had so bravely endured since his first great victory in expelling the British from Boston nearly seven years before. Massachusetts and Virginia were thus the scenes of his proudest successes, as they had been foremost in bringing to a test the great issue of American independence and American liberty. The glorious consummation was at last accomplished. But two years more were to elapse before the treaty of peace was signed and the war with England ended; and during that period Washington was to give most signal illustration of his disinterested patriotism and of his political wisdom and foresight.

Discontent had for some time been manifested by officers and soldiers alike, owing to arrearages of pay, and they were naturally increased by the apprehension that the army would now be disbanded without proper provision being made by congress for meeting the just claims of the troops. Not a few of the officers began to distrust the efficiency of the government and of all republican institutions. One of them, "a colonel of the army, of a highly respectable character and somewhat advanced in life," whose name is given by Irving as Lewis Nicola, was put forward to communicate these sentiments to Washington, and he even dared to suggest for him the title of King. Washington's reply, dated Newburgh, 22 May, 1782, expressed the indignation and "abhorrence" with which he had received such a suggestion, and rebuked the writer with severity. "I am at a loss to conceive," wrote he, "what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to an address which to me seems big with the greatest mischiefs that can befall my country. If I am not deceived in the knowledge of myself, you

could not have found a person to whom your schemes are more disagreeable. . . . Let me conjure you, then, if you have any regard for your country, concern for yourself or posterity, or respect for me, to banish these thoughts from your mind, and never communicate, from yourself or any one else, a sentiment of the like nature." Nothing more was ever heard of making Washington a king. He had sufficiently shown his scorn for such an overture.

The apprehensions of the army, however, were by no means quieted. A memorial on the subject of their pay was prepared and transmitted to congress in December, 1782, but the resolutions that congress adopted did not satisfy their expectations. A meeting of officers was arranged, and anonymous addresses, commonly known as the Newburgh addresses, were issued, to rouse the army to resentment. Washington insisted on attending the meeting, and delivered an impressive address. Gen. Gates was in the chair, and Washington began by apologizing for having come. After reading the first paragraph of what he had prepared, he begged the indulgence of those present while he paused to put on his spectacles, saying, casually, but most touchingly, that "he had grown gray in the service of his country, and now found himself growing blind." He then proceeded to read a most forcible and noble paper, in which, after acknowledging the just claims of the army on the government, and assuring them that those claims would not be disregarded, he conjured them "to express their utmost horror and detestation of the man who wishes, under any specious pretences, to overturn the liberties of our country, and who wickedly attempts to open the floodgates of civil discord and deluge our rising empire in blood." The original autograph of this ever-memorable address, just as it came from Washington's own pen, is in the archives of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and a lithographed copy was published by them, together with the letters of eye-witnesses to the scene, as a contribution to the centennial papers of 1876. Washington retired at once from the meeting, but resolutions were forthwith unanimously adopted, on motion of Gen. Knox, seconded by Gen. Putnam, reciprocating all his affectionate expressions, and concurring entirely in the policy he had proposed. "Every doubt was dispelled," says Maj. Shaw in his journal, "and the tide of patriotism rolled again in its wonted course." The treaty of

peace was signed in Paris on 20 Jan., 1783. On 17 April following, a proclamation by congress was received by Washington for the cessation of hostilities. On 19 April, the anniversary of the shedding of the first blood at Lexington, which completed the eighth year of the war, the cessation was proclaimed at the head of every regiment of the army, after which, said Washington's general orders,

"the chaplains of the several brigades will render thanks to Almighty God for all his mercies, particularly for his overruling the wrath of man to his own glory, and causing the rage of war to cease among the nations."



On the following 8th of June, in view of the dissolution of the army, Washington addressed a letter to the governors of the

several states—a letter full of golden maxims and consummate wisdom. "The great object," he began, "for which I had the honor to hold an appointment in the service of my country being accomplished, I am now preparing to return to that domestic retirement which, it is well known, I left with the greatest reluctance—a retirement for which I have never ceased to sigh through a long and painful absence, and in which, remote from the noise and trouble of the world, I meditate to pass the remainder of my life in a state of undisturbed repose." Then, after remarking that "this is the favorable moment for giving such a tone to the Federal government as will enable it to answer the ends of its institution," he proceeded to set forth and enlarge upon the four things that he conceived to be essential to the well-being, or even the existence, of the United States as an independent power: "First, an indissoluble union of the states under one federal head; second, a sacred regard to public justice; third, the adoption of a proper peace establishment; and, fourth, the prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies, to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity, and, in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest

of the community. These are the pillars," said Washington, "on which the glorious fabric of our independency and national character must rest."

Washington took final leave of the army in general orders of 2 Nov., in accordance with a proclamation by congress of 18 Oct. He accompanied Gov. Clinton in a formal entry into New York, after its evacuation by the British, on 25 Nov. On 4 Dec., after taking affectionate leave of his principal officers at Fraunce's tavern, he set off for Annapolis, and there, on 23 Dec., 1783, he presented himself to "the United States in congress assembled," and resigned the commission that he had received on 17 June, 1775. "Having now finished," said he, "the work assigned me, I retire from the great theatre of action, and, bidding an affectionate farewell to this august body, under whose orders I have long acted, I here offer my commission, and take my leave of all the employments of public life." "You retire," replied the president of congress, "from the theatre of action with the blessings of your fellow-citizens; but the glory of your virtues will not terminate with your military command: it will continue to animate remotest ages." The very next morning, as we are informed by Irving, Washington departed from Annapolis, and "hastened to his beloved Mount Vernon, where he arrived the same day, on Christmas eve, in a frame of mind suited to enjoy the sacred and genial festival."

Once more, at the close of the fifty-second year of his age, Washington was permitted to resume his favorite occupations of a farmer and planter, and to devote himself personally to his crops and cattle. Indeed, throughout his whole military campaign, he had kept himself informed of what was going on in the way of agriculture at Mount Vernon, and had given careful directions as to the cultivation of his lands. His correspondence now engrossed not a little of his time, and he was frequently cheered by the visits of his friends. Lafayette was among his most welcome guests, and passed a fortnight with him, to his great delight. Afterward Washington made a visit to his lands on the Kanawha and Ohio rivers, travelling on horseback, with his friend and physician, Dr. Craik, nearly seven hundred miles, through a wild, mountainous country, and devising schemes of internal navigation for the advantage of Virginia and Maryland. His passion for hunting, also, was

revived, and Lafayette and others of the French officers sent him out fine hounds from their kennels.

But the condition of his country was never absent from his thoughts, and the insufficiency of the existing confederation weighed heavily on his mind. In one of his letters he writes: "The confederation appears to me little more than a shadow without the substance, and congress a migratory body." In another letter he says: "I have ever been a friend to adequate powers in congress, without which it is evident to me we shall never establish a national character. . . . We are either a united people under one head and for federal purposes, or we are thirteen independent sovereignties, eternally counteracting each other." In another letter, to John Jay, he uses still more emphatic language: "I do not conceive we can exist long as a nation without lodging somewhere a power which will pervade the whole Union in as energetic a manner as the authority of the state governments extends over the several states. . . . Retired as I am from the world, I frankly acknowledge I can not feel myself an unconcerned spectator. Yet, having happily assisted in bringing the ship into port, and having been fairly discharged, it is not my business to embark again on the sea of troubles."

Meantime the insurrection in Massachusetts, commonly known as "Shays's rebellion," added greatly to his anxiety and even anguish of mind. In a letter to Madison of 6 Nov., 1786, he exclaimed: "No morn ever dawned more favorably than ours did, and no day was ever more clouded than the present. . . . We are fast verging to anarchy and confusion." Soon afterward he poured out the bitterness of his soul to his old aide-de-camp, Gen. Humphreys, in still stronger terms: "What, gracious God! is man, that there should be such inconsistency and perfidiousness in his conduct? It was but the other day that we were shedding our blood to obtain the constitutions under which we now live—constitutions of our own choice and making—and now we are unsheathing the sword to overturn them." He was thus in full sympathy with the efforts of his friends to confer new and greater powers on the Federal Government, and he yielded to their earnest solicitations in consenting to be named at the head of the Virginia delegates to the convention in Philadelphia on 14 May, 1787. Of that ever-memorable convention he was unanimously elected presi-

attention also to such things as you shall see a fit subject for communication on the occasion, and noting them as they occur that you would be so good as to furnish me with them in time to be prepared, and engaged with others for the opening of the Session. —

With very sincere and

Affectionate regards

I am, ever Your

G. W. Chapman

James Madison Jun 20 9





dent, and on the following 17th of September he had the supreme satisfaction of addressing a letter to congress announcing the adoption of the constitution of the United States, which had been signed on that day. "In all our deliberations on this subject," he said in that letter, "we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American—the consolidation of our Union—in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, and perhaps our national existence."

This constitution having passed the ordeal of congress and been ratified and adopted by the people, through the conventions of the states, nothing remained but to organize the government in conformity with its provisions. As early as 2 July, 1788, congress had been notified that the necessary approval of nine states had been obtained, but not until 13 Sept. was a day appointed for the choice of electors of president. That day was the first Wednesday of the following January, while the beginning of proceedings under the new constitution was postponed until the first Wednesday of March, which chanced in that year to be the 4th of March. Not, however, until 1 April was there a quorum for business in the house of representatives, and not until 6 April was the senate organized. On that day, in the presence of the two houses, the votes for president and vice-president were opened and counted, when Washington, having received every vote from the ten states that took part in the election, was declared president of the United States. On 14 April he received at Mount Vernon the official announcement of his election, and on the morning of the 16th he set out for New York. "Reluctant," as he said, "in the evening of life to exchange a peaceful abode for an ocean of difficulties," he bravely added: "Be the voyage long or short, although I may be deserted by all men, integrity and firmness shall never forsake me." Well does Bancroft exclaim, after recounting these details in his "History of the Constitution": "But for him the country could not have achieved its independence; but for him it could not have formed its Union; and now but for him it could not set the government in successful motion."

Reaching New York on the 23d, after a continuous triumphal journey through Alexandria, Baltimore, Wilmington, Philadelphia, and Trenton, he was welcomed by the two houses

of congress, by the governor of the state, the magistrates of the city, and by great masses of the people. The city was illuminated in his honor. But he proceeded on foot from the barge that had brought him across the bay to the house of the president of the late confederation, which had been appointed for his residence. John Adams had been installed in the chair of the senate, as vice-president of the United States, on 21 April, but congress could not get ready for the inauguration of the president until the 30th. On that day the oath of office was administered to Washington by Robert R. Livingston, chancellor of the state of New York, in the presence of the two houses of congress, on a balcony in front of the hall in which congress held its sittings, where a statue has recently been placed. Washington then retired to the senate-chamber and delivered his inaugural address. "It would be peculiarly improper to omit," said he, "in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect—that his benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of




the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves. . . . No people can be bound to acknowledge the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of man more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency. . . . These reflections, arising out of the present crisis, have forced themselves too strongly on my mind to be suppressed. You will join with me, I trust, in thinking that there are none under the influence of which

the proceedings of a new and free government can more auspiciously commence." In accordance with those sentiments, at the close of the ceremony, Washington and both branches of congress were escorted to St. Paul's chapel, at the corner of Broadway and Fulton street, where the chaplain of the

senate read prayers suited to the occasion, after which they all attended the president to his mansion near Franklin square.

Thus began the administration of Washington, as first president of the United States, on 30 April, 1789. This is a date never to be forgotten in American history, and it would be most happy if the 30th of April could be substituted for the 4th of March as the inauguration-day of the second century of our constitutional existence.

It would add two months to the too short second session of congress, give a probability of propitious weather for the ceremony, and be a perpetual commemoration of the day on which Washington entered upon his great office, and our national government was practically organized. An amendment to the constitution making this change has twice been formally proposed and has passed the U. S. senate, but has failed of adoption in the house of



representatives. From first to last, Washington's influence in conciliating all differences of opinion in regard to the rightful interpretation and execution of the new constitution was most effective. The recently printed journal of William Maclay, a senator from Pennsylvania in the 1st congress, says, in allusion to some early controversies: "The president's amiable deportment, however, smoothes and sweetens everything." Count Moustier, the French minister, in writing home to his government, five weeks after the inauguration, says: "The opinion of Gen. Washington was of such weight that it alone contributed more than any other measure to cause the present constitution to be adopted. The extreme confidence in his patriotism, his integrity, and his intelligence, forms to-day its principal support. . . . All is hushed in presence of the trust of the people in the saviour of the country."

Washington had to confront not a few of the same perplexities that all his successors have experienced in a still greater degree in regard to appointments to office. But at the earliest moment he adopted rules and principles on this subject which

might well be commended to presidents and governors in later days. In a letter to his friend James Bowdoin, of Massachusetts, bearing date 9 May, 1789, less than six weeks after his inauguration, he used language that might fitly serve as an introduction to the civil-service reform manual of the present hour. "No part of my duty," he says, "will be more delicate, and in many instances more unpleasing, than that of nominating or appointing persons to office. It will undoubtedly often happen that there will be several candidates for the same office, whose pretensions, ability, and integrity may be nearly equal, and who will come forward so equally supported in every respect as almost to require the aid of supernatural intuition to fix upon the right. I shall, however, in all events, have the satisfaction to reflect that I entered upon my administration unconfined by a single engagement, uninfluenced by any ties of blood or friendship, and with the best intentions and fullest determination to nominate to office those persons only who, upon every consideration, were the most deserving, and who would probably execute their several functions to the interest and credit of the American Union, if such characters could be found by my exploring every avenue of information respecting their merits and pretensions that it was in my power to obtain." Appointing Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, as his secretary of state; Alexander Hamilton, of New York, as his secretary of the treasury; and Henry Knox, of Massachusetts, as his secretary of war, he gave clear indication at the outset that no sectional interests or prejudices were to control or shape his policy. Under Jefferson, the foreign affairs of the country were administered with great discretion and ability. Under Hamilton, the financial affairs of the country were extricated from the confusion and chaos into which they had fallen, and the national credit was established on a firm basis. The preamble of the very first revenue bill, signed by Washington on 4 July, 1789, was a notable expression of the views entertained in regard to the powers and duties of the new government in the regulation of trade and the laying and collecting of taxes: "Whereas, it is necessary for the support of government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufacturers, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported, Be it enacted, etc." The incorporation of a national

bank and kindred measures of the highest interest soon followed. The supreme court of the United States was organized with John Jay as its first chief justice. Important amendments to the constitution were framed and recommended to the states for adoption, and congress continued in session till the close of September.

But in the course of the summer Washington had a severe illness, and for some days his life was thought to be in danger. Confined to his bed for six weeks, it was more than twelve weeks before he was restored. With a view to the re-establishment of his health, as well as for seeing the country, he then set off on a tour to the eastern states, and visited Boston, Portsmouth, New Haven, and other places. He was welcomed everywhere with unbounded enthusiasm. No "royal progress" in any country ever equalled this tour in its demonstrations of veneration and affection. A similar tour with the same manifestations was made by him in the southern states the next year. As the four years of his first term drew to an end, he was seriously inclined to withdraw from further public service, but Jefferson and Hamilton alike, with all their respective followers, while they differed widely on so many other matters, were of one mind in earnestly remonstrating against Washington's retirement. "The confidence of the whole country," wrote Jefferson, "is centred in you. . . . North and south will hang together if they have you to hang on." "It is clear," wrote Hamilton, "that if you continue in office nothing materially mischievous is to be apprehended; if you quit, much is to be dreaded. . . . I trust, and I pray God, that you will determine to make a further sacrifice of your tranquillity and happiness to the public good." Washington could not find it in his heart to resist such appeals, and allowed himself to be again a candidate. He was chosen unanimously by the electors, and took the oath of office again on 4 March, 1793. He had but just entered on this second term of the presidency when the news reached him that France had declared war against England and Holland. He lost no time in announcing his purpose to maintain a strict neutrality toward the belligerent powers, and this policy was unanimously sustained by his cabinet. His famous proclamation of neutrality was accordingly issued on 22 April, and soon became the subject of violent partisan controversy throughout the Union. It gave

occasion to the masterly essays of Hamilton and Madison, under the signatures of "Pacificus" and "Helvidius," and contributed more than anything else, perhaps, to the original formation of the Federal and Republican parties. The wisdom of Washington was abundantly justified by the progress of events, but he did not escape the assaults of partisan bitterness. Mr. Jay, still chief justice, was sent to England as minister early in 1794, and his memorable treaty added fuel to the flame.

Meantime a tax on distilled spirits had encountered much opposition in various parts of the country, and in August, 1794, was forcibly resisted and defied by a large body of armed insurgents in the western counties of Pennsylvania. Washington issued a proclamation calling out the militia of the neighboring states, and left home to cross the mountains and lead the troops in person. But the insurrection happily succumbed at his approach, and his presence became unnecessary. The arrogant and offensive conduct of the French minister, M. Genet, irreconcilable dissensions in the cabinet, and renewed agitations and popular discontents growing out of the Jay treaty, gave Washington no little trouble in these latter years of his administration, and he looked forward with eagerness to a release from official cares. Having made up his mind unchangeably to decline another election as president, he thought it fit to announce that decision in the most formal manner. He had consulted Madison at the close of his first term in regard to an address declining a second election. He now sought the advice and counsel of Alexander Hamilton, no longer a member of the cabinet, and the farewell address was prepared and published nearly six months before his official term had expired. That immortal paper has often been printed with the date of 17 Sept., 1796, and special interest has been expressed in the coincidence of the date of the address with the date of the adoption of the constitution of the United States. But, as a matter of fact, the address bears date 19 Sept., 1796, as may be seen in the autograph original now in the Lenox library, New York. Mr. James Lenox purchased that precious original from the family of the printer Claypoole, by whom it was published in Philadelphia, and to whom the manuscript, wholly in Washington's handwriting, with all its interlineations, corrections, and erasures, was given by Washington himself.


On the following 4th of March, Washington was present at the inauguration of his successor, John Adams, and soon afterward went with his family to Mount Vernon, to resume his agricultural occupations. Serious difficulties with France were soon developed, and war became imminent. A provisional army was authorized by congress to meet the exigency, and all eyes were again turned toward Washington as its leader. President Adams wrote to him: "We must have your name, if you will permit us to use it. There will be more efficacy in it than in many an army." Hamilton urged him to make "this further, this very great sacrifice." And thus, on 3 July, 1798, Washington, yielding to the entreaty of friends and a sense



of duty to his country, was once more commissioned as "Lieutenant-General and Commander-in-chief of all the armies raised, or to be raised, in the United States." The organization and arrangement of this new army now engrossed his attention. Deeply impressed with the great responsibility that had been thrust upon him, and having selected Alexander Hamilton as his chief of staff, to the serious disappointment of his old friend Gen. Knox, he entered at once into the minutest details of the preparation for war, with all the energy and zeal of his earlier and more vigorous days.

Most happily this war with our late gallant ally was averted. Washington, however, did not live to receive the assurance of a result that he so earnestly desired. Riding over his farms, on 12 Dec., to give directions to the managers of his estate, he was overtaken by showers of rain and sleet, and returned home wet and chilled. The next day he suffered from a hoarse, sore throat, followed by an ague at night. His old physician and surgeon, Dr. Craik, who had been with him in peace and in war, was summoned from Alexandria the next morning, and two other physicians were called into consultation during the day. At four o'clock in the afternoon he requested his wife, who was constantly at his bedside, to bring him two papers from his study, one of which he gave back to her as his will. At six o'clock he said to the three physicians

around him: "I feel myself going; I thank you for your attentions, but I pray you to take no more trouble about me." He had previously said to Dr. Craik: "I die hard, but I am not afraid to go." About ten o'clock he succeeded with difficulty in giving some directions about his funeral to Mr. Lear,



his secretary, and on Mr. Lear's assuring him that he was understood, he uttered his last words: "It is well." And thus, between ten and eleven o'clock on Saturday night, 14 Dec., 1799, the end came, and his spirit returned to God who gave it.

The funeral took place on the 18th. Such troops as were in the neighborhood formed the escort of the little procession; the general's favorite horse was led behind the bier, the Freemasons performed their ceremonies, the Rev. Thomas Davis read the service and made a brief address, a schooner lying in the Potomac fired minute-guns, the relatives and friends within reach, including Lord Fairfax and the corporation of Alexandria, were in attendance, and the body was deposited in the vault at Mount Vernon. At Mount Vernon it has remained to this day. Virginia would never consent to its removal to the stately vault prepared for it beneath the capitol at Washington. Congress was in session at Philadelphia, and the startling news of Washington's death only reached there on the day of his funeral. The next morning John Marshall, then a representative from Virginia, afterward for thirty-four years chief justice of the supreme court of the United States, announced the death in the house of representatives, concluding a short but admirable tribute to his illustrious friend with resolutions prepared by Richard Henry Lee, which contained the grand words that have ever since been associated with Washington: "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his fellow-citizens." Gen. Lee pronounced a eulogy, by order of both houses of congress, on 26 Dec., in which he changed the last word of his own famous phrase to "countrymen," and it is so given in the eulogy as published by congress. Meantime congress adopted a resolution recommending to the people of



the United States to assemble on the following 22d of February, in such manner as should be convenient, to testify publicly by eulogies, orations, and discourses, or by public prayers, their grief for the death of George Washington. In conformity with this recommendation, eulogies or sermons were delivered, or exercises of some sort held, in almost every city, town, village, or hamlet, throughout the land. Such was the first observance of Washington's birthday;—thenceforth to be a national holiday. But not in our own land only was his death commemorated. Napoleon Bonaparte, then first consul, announced it to the army of France, and ordered all the standards and flags throughout the republic to be bound with crape for ten days, during which a funeral oration was pronounced in presence of the first consul and all the civil and military authorities, in what is now the Hôtel des Invalides. More striking still is the fact, mentioned by Jared Sparks, that the British fleet, consisting of nearly sixty ships of the line, which was lying at Torbay, England, under the command of Lord Bridport, lowered their flags half-mast on hearing the intelligence of Washington's death.

In later years the tributes to the memory of Washington have been such as no other man of modern or even of ancient history has commanded. He has sometimes been compared, after the manner of Plutarch, with Epaminondas, or Timoleon, or Alfred the Great of England. But an eminent living English historian has recently and justly said that the place of Washington in the history of mankind "is well-nigh without a fellow." Indeed, the general judgment of the world has given ready assent to the carefully weighed, twice repeated declaration of Lord Brougham: "It will be the duty of the historian and sage in all ages to let no occasion pass of commemorating this illustrious man; and, until time shall be no more, will a test of the progress which our race has made in wisdom and virtue be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington!" Mod-



est, disinterested, generous, just, of clean hands and a pure heart, self-denying and self-sacrificing, seeking nothing for himself, declining all remuneration beyond the reimbursement of his outlays, scrupulous to a farthing in keeping his accounts, of spotless integrity, scorning gifts, charitable to the needy, forgiving injuries and injustice, fearless, heroic with a prudence ever governing his impulses and a wisdom ever guiding his valor, true to his friends, true to his whole country, true to himself, fearing God, believing in Christ, no stranger to private devotion or public worship, or to the holiest offices of the church to which he belonged, but ever gratefully recognizing a divine aid and direction in all that he attempted and in all that he accomplished—what epithet, what attribute, could be added to that consummate character to commend it as an example above all other characters in merely human history?

Washington's most important original papers were bequeathed to his favorite nephew, Bushrod Washington, and were committed by him to Chief-Justice John Marshall, by whom an elaborate life, in five volumes, was published in 1804. Abridged editions of this great work have been published more recently. "The Writings of Washington," with a life, were published by Jared Sparks (12 vols., Boston, 1834-'7). A new edition of Washington's complete works in 14 vols., edited by Worthington C. Ford, containing many letters and papers now published for the first time, has very recently been completed (New York, 1888-'93). Biographies have also been published by Mason L. Weems, David Ramsay, James K. Paulding, Charles W. Upham, Joel T. Headley, Caroline M. Kirkland, and Edward Everett Hale. Benson J. Lossing made an interesting contribution to the illustration of the same theme by his "Mount Vernon and its Associations" in 1859. Meanwhile the genius of Washington Irving has illuminated the whole story of Washington's life, public and private, and thrown around it the charms of exquisite style and lucid narrative (5 vols., New York, 1855-'9). An abridgment and revision of Irving's work, by John Fiske (New York, 1888), and "General Washington," by Bradley T. Johnston (1894), have recently appeared. A sketch was prepared by Edward Everett, at the request of Lord Macaulay, for the eighth edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" (1853-1860), which was afterward published in a separate volume. To Edward

Everett, too, belongs the principal credit of having saved Mount Vernon from the auctioneer's hammer, and secured its preservation, under the auspices of the Ladies' Mount Vernon association, as a place of pilgrimage. He wrote fifty-two articles for the New York "Ledger," and delivered his lecture on Washington many times, contributing the proceeds to the Mount Vernon fund.

The marble statue in the capitol at Richmond, Va. (for bust of this, see page 20), by the French sculptor Houdon, from life, must be named first among the standard likenesses of Washington. Excellent portraits of him by John Trumbull, by both the Peales, and by Gilbert Stuart, are to be seen in many public galleries. Stuart's head leaves nothing to be desired in the way of dignity and grandeur. Among the numerous monuments that have been erected to his memory may be mentioned the noble column in Baltimore; the colossal statue in the Capitol grounds at Washington, by Horatio Greenough; the splendid group in Richmond, surmounted by an equestrian statue, by Thomas Crawford; the marble statue in the Massachusetts state-house, by Sir Francis Chantrey; the equestrian statue in the Boston public garden, by Thomas Ball; the equestrian statue in Union square, New York, by Henry K. Brown; and, lastly, the matchless obelisk at Washington, of which the corner-stone was laid in 1848, upon which the capstone was placed, at the height of 555 feet, in 1884, and which was dedicated by congress on 21 Feb., 1885, as Washington's birthday that year fell on Sunday. See vignette (page 27), and also illustration of his birthplace by Charles C. Perkins (page 3); a drawing of the locality by Gen. William T. Sherman (page 4), the church at Pohick (page 11), the Newburgh headquarters (page 16), Mount Vernon (page 32), Washington's tomb, (page 26), a portrait of him in youth (page 7); also the pictures by Trumbull (page 13), Wertmüller (page 21), and Du Simitière (page 25). The steel engraving, which appears as a frontispiece to this volume, is from Stuart's original in the Boston Athenæum. The vignette which follows of Mrs. Washington, is from the portrait by the same distinguished artist.

His wife, MARTHA, born in New Kent county, Va., in May, 1732; died at Mount Vernon, Va., 22 May, 1802, was the daughter of Col. John Dandridge, a planter in New Kent

county. Martha was fairly educated by private tutors, and became an expert performer on the spinet. She was introduced to the vice-regal court, during the administration of Sir William Gooch, at fifteen years of age, and in June, 1749, married Daniel Parke Custis, a wealthy planter, with whom she removed to his residence, the White House, on Pamunkey river. They had four children, two of whom died in infancy, and in 1757 Mr. Custis also died, leaving his widow one of the wealthiest women in Virginia. About a year after her husband's death she met Col. Washington, who was visiting at the house of Maj. William Chamberlayne, where she too was a



*Mrs. Washington*


guest. In May, 1758, they became engaged, but the marriage was delayed by Col. Washington's northern campaign, and it was not till January, 1759, that it was solemnized, at St. Peter's church, New Kent county, the Rev. John Mossum performing the ceremony. The wedding was one of the most brilliant that had ever been seen in a church in Virginia. The bridegroom wore a suit of blue cloth, the coat lined with red silk, and ornamented with silver trimmings; his waistcoat was em-

broidered white satin, his knee-buckles were of gold, and his hair was powdered. The bride was attired in a white satin quilted petticoat, a heavily corded white silk over-dress, diamond buckles, and pearl ornaments. The governor, many members of the legislature, British officers, and the neighboring gentry were present in full court dress. Washington's body-servant, Bishop, a tall negro, to whom he was much attached and who had accompanied him on all his military campaigns, stood in the porch, clothed in the scarlet uniform of a soldier of the royal army in the time of George II. The bride and her three attendants drove back to the White House in a coach drawn by six horses led by liveried postilions, Col. Washington and an escort of cavaliers riding by its side. Mrs. Washington's life at Mount Vernon for the subsequent seventeen years partook much of the style of the English aristocracy. She was a thorough housekeeper, and entertained constantly. Her daughter,

Martha Parke Custis, who died in the seventeenth year of her age, was known as the "dark lady," on account of her brunette complexion, and was greatly loved by the neighboring poor, to whom she frequently ministered. On her well preserved portrait, painted by Charles Wilson Peale, is inscribed "A Virginia Beauty."

Mrs. Washington ardently sympathized with her husband in his patriotic measures. To a kinswoman, who deprecated what she called "his folly," Mrs. Washington wrote in 1774: "Yes, I foresee consequences—dark days, domestic happiness suspended, social enjoyments abandoned, and eternal separations on earth possible. But my mind is made up, my heart is in the cause. George is right; he is always right. God has promised to protect the righteous, and I will trust him." Patrick Henry and Edmund Pendleton spent a day and night at Mount Vernon in August, 1774, on their way to congress. Pendleton afterward wrote to a friend: "Mrs. Washington talked like a Spartan to her son on his going to battle. 'I hope you will all stand firm,' she said; 'I know George will.'" After her husband became commander-in-chief she was burdened with many cares. He visited Mount Vernon only twice during the war. She joined him at Cambridge, Mass., in 1775, subsequently accompanying Gen. Washington to New York and Philadelphia, and whenever it was possible joined him in camp. During the winter at Valley Forge she suffered every privation in common with the officers, and "was busy from morning till night providing comforts for the sick soldiers." Although previous to the war she had paid much attention to her attire, as became her wealth and station, while it continued she dressed only in garments that were spun and woven by her servants at Mount Vernon. At a ball in New Jersey that was given in her honor she wore one of these simple gowns and a white kerchief, "as an example of economy to the women of the Revolution." Her last surviving child, John Parke Custis, died in November, 1781, leaving four children. The two younger, Eleanor Parke Custis and George Washington Parke Custis, Gen. Washington at once adopted. After Mrs. Washington left headquarters at Newburgh in 1782, she did not again return to camp life. She was residing at Mount Vernon (see illustration) at the time Washington was chosen president of the United States. When she assumed the duties of mistress of the executive mansion in

New York she was fifty-seven years old, but still retained traces of beauty, and bore herself with great personal dignity. She instituted levees, that she ever afterward continued, on Friday evening of each week from eight to nine o'clock.



“None were admitted but those who had a right of entrance by official station or established character,” and full dress was required. During the second term of the president they resided in Philadelphia, where their

public receptions were conducted as those in New York had been. An English gentleman, describing her at her own table in 1794, says: “Mrs. Washington struck me as being older than the president. She was extremely simple in dress, and wore her gray hair turned up under a very plain cap.” She greatly disliked official life, and rejoiced when her husband refused a third term in 1796. She resided at Mount Vernon during the remainder of her life, occupied with her domestic duties, of which she was fond, and in entertaining the numerous guests that visited her husband. She survived him two and a half years. Before her death she destroyed her entire correspondence with Gen. Washington. “Thus,” says her grandson and biographer, George Washington Parke Custis, “proving her love for him, for she would not permit that the confidence they had shared together should be made public.” See “Memoirs of the Mother and Wife of Washington,” by Margaret C. Conkling (Auburn, N. Y., 1851), “Mary and Martha,” by Benson J. Lossing (New York, 1887), and “The Story of Mary Washington,” by Marion Harland (Boston, 1892).

His adopted son, GEORGE WASHINGTON PARKE CUSTIS, author, born at Mount Airy, Md., 30 April, 1781; died at Arlington House, Fairfax co., Va., 10 Oct., 1857. His father, Col. John Parke Custis, the son of Mrs. Washington by her first husband, was aide-de-camp to Washington at the siege of Yorktown, and died 5 Nov., 1781, aged twenty-eight. The

son had his early home at Mount Vernon, pursued his classical studies at St. John's College and at Princeton, and remained a member of Washington's family until the death of Mrs. Washington in 1802, when he built Arlington House on an estate of 1,000 acres near Washington, which he had inherited from his father. After the death in 1852 of his sister, Eleanor Parke Custis, wife of Major Lawrence Lewis, he was the sole surviving member of Washington's family, and his residence was for many years a favorite resort, owing to the interesting relics of that family which it contained. Mr. Custis married in early life Mary Lee Fitzhugh, of Virginia, and left a daughter, who married Robert E. Lee. The Arlington estate was confiscated during the civil war, and is now held as national property and is the site of a national soldiers' cemetery. The house is represented in the accompanying illustration. Mr. Custis was in

his early days an eloquent and effective speaker. He wrote orations and plays, and during his latter years executed a number of large paintings of Revolutionary battles. His "Recollections of Washington," originally



contributed to the "National Intelligencer," was published in book-form, with a memoir by his daughter and numerous notes by Benson J. Lossing (New York, 1860).

Washington's brother-in-law, FIELDING LEWIS, patriot, born in Spottsylvania county, Va., in 1726; died in Fredericksburg, Va., in December, 1781. He was the proprietor of half the town of Fredericksburg, Va., of which he was the first mayor, and of much of the adjoining territory, and during the Revolution he was an ardent patriot, superintending a large manufactory of arms in that neighborhood; the site of this establishment is still known as "Gunny Green." He was a magistrate and a member of the Virginia legislature for many years. He married Elizabeth, sister of George Washington, and built for her a mansion that is still standing, called Ken-

more House, which was handsomely constructed and ornamented with carvings that were brought from England for the purpose. His wife was majestic in person and lovely in mental and moral attributes. Later in life she so much resembled her brother George that, by putting on his long military coat and his hat, she could easily have been mistaken for the general. Mary, the mother of Washington, died on Mr. Lewis's farm and is buried there. Of their sons, GEORGE was a captain in Washington's life-guard, ROBERT one of his private secretaries, and ANDREW was aide to Gen. Daniel Morgan in suppressing the whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania. Another son, LAWRENCE, was Washington's favorite nephew.

His wife, ELEANOR PARKE CUSTIS, born at Abingdon, Fairfax co., Va., in March, 1779; died at Audley, Clarke co., Va., 15 July, 1852, was the daughter of John Parke Custis, the son



*E. Lewis*

of Martha Washington. At the death of her father, in 1781, she, with her brother George, was adopted by Gen. Washington, and lived at Mount Vernon. Eleanor was regarded as the most brilliant and beautiful young woman of her day, the pride of her grandmother, and the favorite of Washington, who was the playmate of her childhood and the confidant of her girlhood. However abstracted, she could always command his attention, and he would put aside the most important matter to attend to her demands. She was accomplished in drawing, and a good musician. Washington presented her with a

harpichord at the cost of a thousand dollars. Irving relates an anecdote that illustrates their relations: "She was romantic, and fond of wandering in the moonlight alone in the woods. Mrs. Washington thought this unsafe, and forced from her a promise that she would not visit the woods again *unaccompanied*, but she was brought one evening into the drawing-room where her grandmother, seated in her arm-chair, began in the presence of the general a severe reproof. Poor Nellie was reminded of her promise, and taxed with her delinquency. She




admitted her fault and essayed no excuse, moving to retire from the room. She was just closing the door when she overheard Washington attempting in a low voice to intercede in her behalf. 'My dear,' he observed, 'I would say no more—perhaps she was not alone.' His intercession stopped Miss Nellie in her retreat. She reopened the door and advanced up to the general with a firm step. 'Sir,' said she, 'you brought me up to speak the truth, and, when I told grandmamma I was alone, I hope you believe I was alone.' Washington made one of his most magnanimous bows. 'My child,' he replied, 'I beg your pardon.'" In February, 1799, she married his nephew, Lawrence Lewis, the son of his sister Elizabeth. Young Lewis, after Washington's retirement from public life, had resided at Mount Vernon, and after their marriage they continued there till the death of Mrs. Washington in May, 1802. The portrait of Mrs. Lewis is from the picture by Gilbert Stuart, and is now in the possession of her descendant, Edwin A. Stevens Lewis, who is also the owner of the valuable silver service presented to her by Gen. Washington.

Their grandson, EDWARD PARKE CUSTIS LEWIS, diplomatist, born in Audley, Clarke co., Va., 7 Feb., 1837; died in Hoboken, N. J., 3 Sept., 1892. He was educated at the University of Virginia, and studied law, but subsequently became a planter. He served throughout the War of the Rebellion in the Confederate army, rising to the rank of colonel, and for fifteen months was a prisoner of war. He settled in Hoboken, in 1875, having previously married Mrs. Mary Garnett, eldest daughter of Edwin A. Stevens, of New Jersey, and widow of Muscoe R. H. Garnett, Member of Congress from Virginia, served in the New Jersey legislature in 1877, was a delegate to the Democratic national convention in 1880, and in 1885 was appointed by President Cleveland United States minister to Portugal.


## JOHN ADAMS.

JOHN ADAMS, second president of the United States, born in that part of the town of Braintree, Mass., which has since been set off as the town of Quincy, 31 Oct., 1735; died there, 4 July, 1826. His great-grandfather, Henry Adams, received a grant of about 40 acres of land in Braintree in 1636, and soon afterward emigrated from Devonshire, England, with his eight sons. John Adams, the subject of this sketch, was the eldest son of John Adams and Susanna Boylston, daughter of Peter Boylston, of Brookline. His father, one of the selectmen of Braintree and a deacon of the church, was a thrifty farmer, and at his death in 1760 his estate was appraised at £1,330 9s. 6d.,



which in those days might have been regarded as a moderate competence. It was the custom of the family to send the eldest son to college, and accordingly John was graduated at Harvard in 1755. Previous to 1773 the graduates

of Harvard were arranged in lists, not alphabetically or in order of merit, but according to the social standing of their parents. In a class of twenty-four members John thus stood fourteenth. One of his classmates was John Wentworth, afterward royal governor of New Hampshire, and then of Nova Scotia. After taking his degree and while waiting to make his choice of a profession, Adams took charge of the grammar school at Worcester. It was the year of Braddock's defeat, when the smouldering fires of a century of rivalry between France and



Painted by G. Stuart

H. B. Hall Jr.

*John Adams*



England broke out in a blaze of war which was forever to settle the question of the primacy of the English race in the modern world. Adams took an intense interest in the struggle, and predicted that if we could only drive out "these turbulent Gallics," our numbers would in another century exceed those of the British, and all Europe would be unable to subdue us. In sending him to college his family seem to have hoped that he would become a clergyman; but he soon found himself too much of a free thinker to feel at home in the pulpit of that day. When accused of Arminianism, he cheerfully admitted the charge. Later in life he was sometimes called a Unitarian, but of dogmatic Christianity he seems to have had as little as Franklin or Jefferson. "Where do we find," he asks, "a precept in the gospel requiring ecclesiastical synods, convocations, councils, decrees, creeds, confessions, oaths, subscriptions, and whole cart-loads of other trumpery that we find religion encumbered with in these days?" In this mood he turned from the ministry and began the study of law at Worcester. There was then a strong prejudice against lawyers in New England, but the profession throve lustily nevertheless, so litigious were the people. In 1758 Adams began the practice of his profession in Suffolk co., having his residence in Braintree. In 1764 he was married to Abigail Smith, of Weymouth, a lady of social position higher than his own and endowed with most rare and admirable qualities of head and heart. In this same year the agitation over the proposed stamp act was begun, and on the burning questions raised by this ill-considered measure Adams had already taken sides. When James Otis in 1761 delivered his memorable argument against writs of assistance, John Adams was present in the court-room, and the fiery eloquence of Otis wrought a wonderful effect upon him. As his son afterward said, "it was like the oath of Hamilcar administered to Hannibal." In his old age John Adams wrote, with reference to this scene, "Every man of an immense crowded audience appeared to me to go away, as I did, ready to take arms against writs of assistance. Then and there was the first scene of the first act of opposition to the arbitrary claims of Great Britain. Then and there the child Independence was born." When the stamp act was passed, in 1765, Adams took a prominent part in a town-meeting at Braintree, where he presented resolutions which were adopted word for word by more than forty towns

in Massachusetts. The people refused to make use of stamps, and the business of the inferior courts was carried on without them, judges and lawyers agreeing to connive at the absence of the stamps. In the supreme court, however, where Thomas Hutchinson was chief justice, the judges refused to transact



John Adams

any business without stamps. This threatened serious interruption to business, and the town of Boston addressed a memorial to the governor and council, praying that the supreme court might overlook the absence of stamps. John Adams was unexpectedly chosen, along with Jeremiah Gridley and James Otis, as counsel for the town, to argue the case in favor of the memorial. Adams delivered the opening argument, and took the decisive ground that the stamp act was *ipso facto* null and void, since it was a measure of taxation which the peo-

ple of the colony had taken no share in passing. No such measure, he declared, could be held as binding in America, and parliament had no right to tax the colonies. The governor and council refused to act in the matter, but presently the repeal of the stamp act put an end to the disturbance for a while. About this time Mr. Adams began writing articles for the Boston "Gazette." Four of these articles, dealing with the constitutional rights of the people of New England, were afterward republished under the somewhat curious title of "An Essay on the Canon and Feudal Law." After ten years of practice, Mr. Adams's business had become quite extensive, and in 1768 he moved into Boston. The attorney-general of Massachusetts, Jonathan Sewall, now offered him the lucrative office of advocate-general in the court of admiralty. This was intended to operate as an indirect bribe by putting Mr. Adams into a position in which he could not feel free to oppose the policy of the crown; such insidious methods were systematically pursued by Gov. Bernard, and after him by Hutchinson. But Mr. Adams was too wary to swallow the bait, and he stubbornly refused the pressing offer.

In 1770 came the first in the series of great acts that made Mr. Adams's career illustrious. In the midst of the terrible excitement aroused by the "Boston Massacre" he served as counsel for Capt. Preston and his seven soldiers when they were tried for murder. His friend and kinsman, Josiah Quincy, assisted him in this invidious task. The trial was judiciously postponed for seven months until the popular fury had abated. Preston and five soldiers were acquitted; the other two soldiers were found guilty of manslaughter, and were barbarously branded on the hand with a hot iron. The verdict seems to have been strictly just according to the evidence presented. For his services to his eight clients Mr. Adams received a fee of nineteen guineas, but never got so much as a word of thanks from the churlish Preston. An ordinary American politician would have shrunk from the task of defending these men, for fear of losing favor with the people. The course pursued by Mr. Adams showed great moral courage; and the people of Boston proved themselves able to appreciate true manliness by electing him as representative to the legislature. This was in June, 1770, after he had undertaken the case of the soldiers, but before the trial. Mr. Adams now speedily became the principal legal adviser of the patriot party, and among its foremost leaders was only less conspicuous than Samuel Adams, Hancock, and Warren. In all matters of legal controversy between these leaders and Gov. Hutchinson his advice proved invaluable. During the next two years there was something of a lull in the political excitement; Mr. Adams resigned his place in the legislature and moved his residence to Braintree, still keeping his office in Boston. In the summer of 1772 the British government ventured upon an act that went further than anything which had yet occurred toward driving the colonies into rebellion. It was ordered that all the Massachusetts judges holding their places during the king's pleasure should henceforth have their salaries paid by the crown and not by the colony. This act, which aimed directly at the independence of the judiciary, aroused intense indignation, not only in Massachusetts, but in the other colonies, which felt their liberties threatened by such a measure. It called forth from Mr. Adams a series of powerful articles, which have been republished in the 3d volume of his collected works. About this time he was chosen member of the council, but he at

choice was negatived by Gov. Hutchinson. The five acts of parliament in April, 1774, including the regulating act and the Boston port bill, led to the calling of the first continental congress, to which Mr. Adams was chosen as one of the five delegates from Massachusetts. The resolutions passed by this congress on the subject of colonial rights were drafted by him, and his diary and letters contain a vivid account of some of the proceedings. On his return to Braintree he was chosen a member of the revolutionary provincial congress of Massachusetts, then assembled at Concord. This revolutionary body had already seized the revenues of the colony, appointed a committee of safety, and begun to organize an army and collect arms and ammunition. During the following winter the views of the loyalist party were set forth with great ability and eloquence in a series of newspaper articles by Daniel Leonard, under the signature of "Massachusettensis." He was answered most effectively by Mr. Adams, whose articles, signed "Novanglus," appeared weekly in the Boston "Gazette" until the battle of Lexington. The last of these articles, which was actually in type in that wild week, was not published. The series, which has been reprinted in the 4th volume of Mr. Adams's works, contains a valuable review of the policy of Bernard and Hutchinson, and a powerful statement of the rights of the colonies.

In the second continental congress, which assembled May 10th, Mr. Adams played a very important part. Of all the delegates present he was probably the only one, except his cousin, Samuel Adams, who was convinced that matters had gone too far for any reconciliation with the mother country, and that there was no use in sending any more petitions to the king. As there was a strong prejudice against Massachusetts on the part of the middle and southern colonies, it was desirable that her delegates should avoid all appearance of undue haste in precipitating an armed conflict. Nevertheless, the circumstances under which an army of 16,000 New England men had been gathered to besiege the British in Boston were such as to make it seem advisable for the congress to adopt it as a continental army; and here John Adams did the second notable deed of his career. He proposed Washington for the chief command of this army, and thus, by putting Virginia in the foreground, succeeded in committing that great colony to



a course of action calculated to end in independence. This move not only put the army in charge of the only commander capable of winning independence for the American people in the field, but its political importance was great and obvious. Afterward in some dark moments of the revolutionary war, Mr. Adams seems almost to have regretted his part in this selection of a commander. He understood little or nothing of military affairs, and was incapable of appreciating General Washington's transcendent ability. The results of the war, however, justified in every respect his action in the second continental congress.

During the summer recess taken by congress Mr. Adams sat as a member of the Massachusetts council, which declared the office of governor vacant and assumed executive authority. Under the new provisional government of Massachusetts, Mr. Adams was made chief justice, but never took his seat, as continental affairs more pressingly demanded his attention. He was always loquacious, often too ready to express his opinions, whether with tongue or pen, and this trait got him more than once into trouble, especially as he was inclined to be sharp and censorious. For John Dickinson, the leader of the moderate and temporizing party in congress, who had just prevailed upon that body to send another petition to the king, he seems to have entertained at this time no very high regard, and he gave vent to some contemptuous expressions in a confidential letter, which was captured by the British and published. This led to a quarrel with Dickinson, and made Mr. Adams very unpopular in Philadelphia. When congress reassembled in the autumn, Mr. Adams, as member of a committee for fitting out cruisers, drew up a body of regulations, which came to form the basis of the American naval code. The royal governor, Sir John Wentworth, fled from New Hampshire about this time, and the people sought the advice of congress as to the form of government which it should seem most advisable to adopt. Similar applications presently came from South Carolina and Virginia. Mr. Adams prevailed upon congress to recommend to these colonies to form for themselves new governments based entirely upon popular suffrage; and about the same time he published a pamphlet entitled "Thoughts on Government, Applicable to the Present State of the American Colonies." By the spring of 1776 the popular

feeling had become so strongly inclined toward independence that, on the 15th of May, Mr. Adams was able to carry through congress a resolution that all the colonies should be invited to form independent governments. In the preamble to this resolution it was declared that the American people could no longer conscientiously take oath to support any government deriving its authority from the crown; all such governments must now be suppressed, since the king had withdrawn his protection from the inhabitants of the united colonies. Like the famous preamble to Townshend's act of 1767, this Adams preamble contained within itself the gist of the whole matter. To adopt it was to cross the Rubicon, and it gave rise to a hot debate in congress. Against the opposition of most of the delegates from the middle states the resolution was finally carried; "and now," exclaimed Mr. Adams, "the Gordian knot is cut." Events came quickly to maturity. On the 7th of June the declaration of independence was moved by Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, and seconded by John Adams. The motion was allowed to lie on the table for three weeks, in order to hear from the colonies of Connecticut, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and New York, which had not yet declared their position with regard to independence. Meanwhile three committees were appointed, one on a declaration of independence, a second on confederation, and a third on foreign relations; and Mr. Adams was a member of the first and third of these committees. On the 1st of July Mr. Lee's motion was taken up by congress sitting as a committee of the whole; and as Mr. Lee was absent, the task of defending it devolved upon Mr. Adams, who, as usual, was opposed by Dickinson. Adams's speech on that occasion was probably the finest he ever delivered. Jefferson called him "the colossus of that debate"; and indeed his labors in bringing about the declaration of independence must be considered as the third signal event of his career.

On the 12th of June congress established a board of war and ordnance, with Mr. Adams for its chairman, and he discharged the arduous duties of this office until after the surrender of Burgoyne. After the battle of Long Island, Lord Howe sent the captured Gen. Sullivan to Philadelphia, soliciting a conference with some of the members of the congress. Adams opposed the conference, and with characteristic petu-

lance alluded to the unfortunate Sullivan as a decoy duck who had much better have been shot in the battle than sent on such a business. Congress, however, consented to the conference, and Adams was chosen as a commissioner, along with Franklin and Rutledge. Toward the end of the year 1777 Mr. Adams was appointed to supersede Silas Deane as commissioner to France. He sailed 12 Feb., 1778, in the frigate "Boston," and after a stormy passage, in which he ran no little risk of capture by British cruisers, he landed at Bordeaux, and reached Paris on the 8th of April. Long before his arrival the alliance with France had been consummated. He found a wretched state of things in Paris, our three commissioners there at loggerheads, one of them dabbling in the British funds and making a fortune by privateering, while the public accounts were kept in the laxest manner. All sorts of agents were drawing bills upon the United States, and commanders of war vessels were setting up their claims for expenses and supplies that had never been ordered. Mr. Adams, whose habits of business were extremely strict and methodical, was shocked at this confusion, and he took hold of the matter with such vigor as to put an end to it. He also recommended that the representation of the United States at the French court should be intrusted to a single minister instead of three commissioners. As a result of this advice, Franklin was retained at Paris, Arthur Lee was sent to Madrid, and Adams, being left without any instructions, returned to America, reaching Boston 2 Aug., 1779. He came home with a curious theory of the decadence of Great Britain, which he had learned in France, and which serves well to illustrate the mood in which France had undertaken to assist the United States. England, he said, "loses every day her consideration, and runs toward her ruin. Her riches, in which her power consisted, she has lost with us and never can regain. She resembles the melancholy spectacle of a great, wide-spreading tree that has been girdled at the root." Such absurd notions were quite commonly entertained at that time on the continent of Europe, and such calamities were seriously dreaded by many Englishmen in the event of the success of the Americans.

Immediately on reaching home Mr. Adams was chosen delegate from Braintree to the convention for framing a new constitution for Massachusetts; but before the work of the

convention was finished he was appointed commissioner to treat for peace with Great Britain, and sailed for France in the same French frigate in which he had come home. But Lord North's government was not ready to make peace, and, moreover, Count Vergennes contrived to prevent Adams from making any official communication to Great Britain of the extent of his powers. During Adams's stay in Paris a mutual dislike and distrust grew up between himself and Vergennes. The latter feared that if negotiations were to begin between the British government and the United States, they might lead to a reconciliation and reunion of the two branches of the English race, and thus ward off that decadence of England for which France was so eagerly hoping. On the other hand, Adams quite correctly believed that it was the intention of Vergennes to sacrifice the interests of the Americans, especially as concerned with the Newfoundland fisheries and the territory between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, in favor of Spain, with which country France was then in close alliance. Americans must always owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Adams for the clear-sightedness with which he thus read the designs of Vergennes and estimated at its true value the purely selfish intervention of France in behalf of the United States. This clearness of insight was soon to bear good fruit in the management of the treaty of 1783. For the present, Adams found himself uncomfortable in Paris, as his too ready tongue wrought unpleasantness both with Vergennes and with Franklin, who was too much under the French minister's influence. On his first arrival in Paris, society there had been greatly excited about him, as it was supposed that he was "the famous Mr. Adams" who had ordered the British troops out of Boston in March, 1770, and had thrown down the glove of defiance to George III. on the great day of the Boston tea-party. When he explained that he was only a cousin of that grand and picturesque personage, he found that fashionable society thenceforth took less interest in him.

In the summer of 1780 Mr. Adams was charged by congress with the business of negotiating a Dutch loan. In order to give the good people of Holland some correct ideas as to American affairs, he published a number of articles in the Leyden "Gazette" and in a magazine entitled "La politique hollandaise"; also "Twenty-six Letters upon Interesting Sub-

jects respecting the Revolution in America," now reprinted in the 7th volume of his works. Soon after Adams's arrival in Holland, England declared war against the Dutch, ostensibly because of a proposed treaty of commerce with the United States in which the burgomaster of Amsterdam was implicated with Henry Laurens, but really because Holland had joined the league headed by the empress Catharine of Russia, designed to protect the commerce of neutral nations and known as the armed neutrality. Laurens had been sent out by congress as minister to Holland; but, as he had been captured by a British cruiser and taken to the tower of London, Mr. Adams was appointed minister in his place. His first duty was to sign, as representing the United States, the articles of the armed neutrality. Before he had got any further, indeed before he had been recognized as minister by the Dutch government, he was called back to Paris, in July, 1781, in order to be ready to enter upon negotiations for peace with the British government. Russia and Austria had volunteered their services as mediators between George III. and the Americans; but Lord North's government rejected the offer, so that Mr. Adams had his journey for nothing, and presently went back to Holland. His first and most arduous task was to persuade the Dutch government to recognize him as minister from the independent United States. In this he was covertly opposed by Vergennes, who wished the Americans to feel exclusively dependent upon France, and to have no other friendships or alliances. From first to last the aid extended by France to the Americans in the revolutionary war was purely selfish. That despotic government wished no good to a people struggling to preserve the immemorial principles of English liberty, and the policy of Vergennes was to extend just enough aid to us to enable us to prolong the war, so that colonies and mother country might alike be weakened. When he pretended to be the disinterested friend of the Americans, he professed to be under the influence of sentiments that he did not really feel; and he thus succeeded in winning from congress a confidence to which he was in no wise entitled. But he could not hoodwink John Adams, who wrote home that the duke de la Vauguyon, the French ambassador at the Hague, was doing everything in his power to obstruct the progress of the negotiations; and in this, Adams correctly inferred, he was acting under

secret instructions from Vergennes. As a diplomatist Adams was in a certain sense Napoleonic; he introduced new and strange methods of warfare, which disconcerted the perfidious intriguers of the old school, of which Vergennes and Talleyrand were typical examples. Instead of beating about the bush and seeking to foil trickery by trickery (a business in which the wily Frenchman would doubtless have proved more than his match), he went straight to the duke de la Vauguyon and bluntly told him that he saw plainly what he was up to, and that it was of no use, since "no advice of his or of the count de Vergennes, nor even a requisition from the king, should restrain me." The duke saw that Adams meant exactly what he said, and, finding that it was useless to oppose the negotiations, "fell in with me, in order to give the air of French influence" to them. Events worked steadily and rapidly in Adams's favor. The plunder of St. Eustatius early in 1781 had raised the wrath of the Dutch against Great Britain to fever heat.

In November came tidings of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. By this time Adams had published so many articles as to have given the Dutch some idea as to what sort of people the Americans were. He had some months before presented a petition to the states general, asking them to recognize him as minister from an independent nation. With his wonted boldness he now demanded a plain and unambiguous answer to this petition, and followed up the demand by visiting the representatives of the several cities in person and arguing his case. As the reward of this persistent energy, Mr. Adams had the pleasure of seeing the independence of the United States formally recognized by Holland on the 19th of April, 1782. This success was vigorously followed up. A Dutch loan of \$2,000,000 was soon negotiated, and on the 7th of October a treaty of amity and commerce, the second which was ratified with the United States as an independent nation, was signed at the Hague. This work in Holland was the fourth signal event in John Adams's career, and, in view of the many obstacles overcome, he was himself in the habit of referring to it as the greatest triumph of his life. "One thing, thank God! is certain," he wrote; "I have planted the American standard at the Hague. There let it wave and fly in triumph over Sir Joseph Yorke and British pride. I shall look down upon the flag-staff with pleasure from the other world."

Mr. Adams had hardly time to finish this work when his presence was required in Paris. Negotiations for peace with Great Britain had begun some time before in conversations between Franklin and Richard Oswald, a gentleman whom Lord Shelburne had sent to Paris for the purpose. One British ministry had already been wrecked through these negotiations, and affairs had dragged along slowly amid endless difficulties. The situation was one of the most complicated in the history of diplomacy. France was in alliance at once with Spain and with the United States, and her treaty obligations to the one were in some respects inconsistent with her treaty obligations to the other. The feeling of Spain toward the United States was intensely hostile, and the French government was much more in sympathy with the former than with the latter. On the other hand, the new British government was not ill-disposed toward the Americans, and was extremely ready to make liberal concessions to them for the sake of thwarting the schemes of France. In the background stood George III., surly and irreconcilable, hoping that the negotiations would fail; and amid these difficulties they doubtless would have failed had not all the parties by this time had a surfeit of bloodshed. The designs of the French government were first suspected by John Jay, soon after his arrival in Paris. He found that Vergennes was sending a secret emissary to Lord Shelburne under an assumed name; he ascertained that the right of the United States to the Mississippi valley was to be denied; and he got hold of a despatch from Marbois, the French secretary of legation at Philadelphia, to Vergennes, opposing the American claim to the Newfoundland fisheries. As soon as Jay learned these facts he proceeded, without the knowledge of Franklin, to take steps toward a separate negotiation between Great Britain and the United States. When Adams arrived in Paris, Oct. 26th, he coincided with Jay's views, and the two together overruled Franklin. Mr. Adams's behavior at this time was quite characteristic. It is said that he left Vergennes to learn of his arrival through the newspapers. It was certainly some time before he called upon him, and he took occasion, besides, to express his opinions about republics and monarchies in terms that courtly Frenchman thought very rude. Adams agreed with Jay that Vergennes should be kept as far as possible in the dark until everything

was completed, and so the negotiation with Great Britain went on separately. The annals of modern diplomacy have afforded few stranger spectacles. With the indispensable aid of France we had just got the better of England in fight, and now we proceeded amicably to divide territory and commercial privileges with the enemy, and to make arrangements in which our not too friendly ally was virtually ignored. In this way the United States secured the Mississippi valley, and a share in the Newfoundland fisheries, not as a privilege but as a right, the latter result being mainly due to the persistence of Mr. Adams. The point upon which the British Commissioners most strongly insisted was the compensation of the American loyalists for the hardships they had suffered during the war; but this the American commissioners resolutely refused. The most they could be prevailed upon to allow was the insertion in the treaty of a clause to the effect that congress should recommend to the several state governments to reconsider their laws against the tories and to give these unfortunate persons a chance to recover their property. In the treaty, as finally arranged, all the disputed points were settled in favor of the Americans; and, the United States being thus virtually detached from the alliance, the British government was enabled to turn a deaf ear to the demands of France and Spain for the surrender of Gibraltar. Vergennes was outgeneralled at every turn. On the part of the Americans the treaty of 1783 deserves to be ranked as one of the most brilliant triumphs of modern diplomacy. Its success was about equally due to Adams and to Jay, whose courage in the affair was equal to their skill, for they took it upon themselves to disregard the explicit instructions of congress. Ever since March, 1781, Vergennes had been intriguing with congress through his minister at Philadelphia, the chevalier de la Luzerne. First he had tried to get Mr. Adams recalled to America. Failing in this, he had played his part with such dexterous persistence as to prevail upon congress to send most pusillanimous instructions to its peace commissioners. They were instructed to undertake nothing whatever in the negotiations without the knowledge and concurrence of "the ministers of our generous ally, the king of France," that is to say, of the count de Vergennes; and they were to govern themselves entirely by his advice and opinion. Franklin would have followed these instructions;



Adams and Jay deliberately disobeyed them, and earned the gratitude of their countrymen for all coming time. For Adams's share in this grand achievement it must certainly be cited as the fifth signal event in his career.

By this time he had become excessively home-sick, and as soon as the treaty was arranged he asked leave to resign his commissions and return to America. He declared he would rather be "carting street-dust and marsh-mud" than waiting where he was. But business would not let him go. In September, 1783, he was commissioned, along with Franklin and Jay, to negotiate a commercial treaty with Great Britain. A sudden and violent fever prostrated him for several weeks, after which he visited London and Bath. Before he had fully recovered his health he learned that his presence was required in Holland. In those days, when we lived under the articles of confederation, and congress found it impossible to raise money enough to meet its current expenses, it was by no means unusual for the superintendent of finance to draw upon our foreign ministers and then sell the drafts for cash. This was done again and again, when there was not the smallest ground for supposing that the minister upon whom the draft was made would have any funds wherewith to meet it. It was part of his duty as envoy to go and beg the money. Early in the winter Mr. Adams learned that drafts upon him had been presented to his bankers in Amsterdam to the amount of more than a million florins. Less than half a million florins were on hand to meet these demands, and, unless something were done at once, the greater part of this paper would go back to America protested. Mr. Adams lost not a moment in starting for Holland, but he was delayed by a succession of terrible storms on the German ocean, and it was only after fifty-four days of difficulty and danger that he reached Amsterdam. The bankers had contrived to keep the drafts from going to protest, but news of the bickerings between the thirteen states had reached Holland. It was believed that the new nation was going to pieces, and the regency of Amsterdam had no money to lend it. The promise of the American government was not regarded as valid security for a sum equivalent to about \$300,000. Adams was obliged to apply to professional usurers, from whom, after more humiliating perplexity, he succeeded in obtaining a loan at exorbitant interest. In the meantime he had

been appointed commissioner, along with Franklin and Jefferson, for the general purpose of negotiating commercial treaties with foreign powers. As his return to America was thus indefinitely postponed, he sent for his wife, with their only daughter and youngest son, to come and join him in France, where the two elder sons were already with him. In the summer of 1784 the family was thus re-united, and began house-keeping at Auteuil, near Paris. A treaty was successfully negotiated with Prussia, but, before it was ready to be signed, Mr. Adams was appointed minister to the court of St. James, and arrived in London in May, 1785. He was at first politely received by George III., upon whom his bluff and fearless dignity of manner made a considerable impression. His stay in England was, however, far from pleasant. The king came to treat him with coldness, sometimes with rudeness, and the royal example was followed by fashionable society. The American government was losing credit at home and abroad. It was unable to fulfill its treaty engagements as to the payment of private debts due to British creditors, and as to the protection of the loyalists. The British Government, in retaliation, refused to surrender the western posts of Ogdensburg, Oswego, Niagara, Erie, Sandusky, Detroit, and Mackinaw, which by the treaty were to be promptly given up to the United States. Still more, it refused to make any treaty of commerce with the United States, and neglected to send any minister to represent Great Britain in this country. It was generally supposed in Europe that the American government would presently come to an end in general anarchy and bloodshed; and it was believed by George III. and the narrow-minded politicians, such as Lord Sheffield, upon whose coöperation he relied, that, if sufficient obstacles could be thrown in the way of American commerce to cause serious distress in this country, the United States would repent of their independence and come straggling back, one after another, to their old allegiance. Under such circumstances it was impossible for Mr. Adams to accomplish much as minister in England. During his stay there he wrote his "Defence of the American Constitutions," a work which afterward subjected him at home to ridiculous charges of monarchical and anti-republican sympathies. The object of the book was to set forth the advantages of a division of the powers of government, and especially of the legislative body, as opposed

to the scheme of a single legislative chamber, which was advocated by many writers on the continent of Europe. The argument is encumbered by needlessly long and sometimes hardly relevant discussions on the history of the Italian republics.

Finding the British government utterly stubborn and impracticable, Mr. Adams asked to be recalled, and his request was granted in February, 1788. For the "patriotism, perseverance, integrity, and diligence" displayed in his ten years of service abroad he received the public thanks of congress. He had no sooner reached home than he was elected a delegate from Massachusetts to the moribund continental congress, but that body expired before he had taken his seat in it. During the summer the ratification of the new constitution was so far completed that it could be put into operation, and public attention was absorbed in the work of organizing the new government. As Washington was unanimously selected for the office of president, it was natural that the vice-president should be taken from Massachusetts. The candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency were voted for without any separate specification, the second office falling to the candidate who obtained the second highest number of votes in the electoral college. Of the 69 electoral votes, all were registered for Washington, 34 for John Adams, who stood second on the list; the other 35 votes were scattered among a number of candidates. Adams was somewhat chagrined at this marked preference shown for Washington. His chief foible was enormous personal vanity, besides which he was much better fitted by temperament and training to appreciate the kind of work that he had himself done than the military work by which Washington had won independence for the United States. He never could quite understand how or why the services rendered by Washington were so much more important than his own. The office of vice-president was then more highly esteemed than it afterward came to be, but it was hardly suited to a man of Mr. Adams's vigorous and aggressive temper. In one respect, however, he performed a more important part while holding that office than any of his successors. In the earlier sessions of the senate there was hot debate over the vigorous measures by which Washington's administration was seeking to reëstablish American credit and enlist the conservative interests of the wealthier citizens in behalf of the stability of the government. These measures were

for the most part opposed by the persons who were rapidly becoming organized under Jefferson's leadership into the republican party, the opposition being mainly due to dread of the possible evil consequences that might flow from too great an increase of power in the federal government. In these debates the senate was very evenly divided, and Mr. Adams, as presiding officer of that body, was often enabled to decide the question by his casting vote. In the first congress he gave as many as twenty casting votes upon questions of most vital importance to the whole subsequent history of the American people, and on all these occasions he supported President Washington's policy.

During Washington's administration grew up the division into the two great parties which have remained to this day in American politics—the one known as federalist, afterward as whig, then as republican; the other known at first as republican and afterward as democratic. John Adams was by his mental and moral constitution a federalist. He believed in strong government. To the opposite party he seemed much less a democrat than an aristocrat. In one of his essays he provoked great popular wrath by using the phrase "the well-born." He knew very well that in point of hereditary capacity and advantages men are not equal and never will be. His notion of democratic equality meant that all men should have equal rights in the eye of the law. There was nothing of the communist or leveller about him. He believed in the rightful existence of a governing class, which ought to be kept at the head of affairs; and he was supposed, probably with some truth, to have a predilection for etiquette, titles, gentlemen-in-waiting, and such things. Such views did not make him an aristocrat in the true sense of the word, for in nowise did he believe that the right to a place in the governing class should be heritable; it was something to be won by personal merit, and should not be withheld by any artificial enactments from the lowliest of men, to whom the chance of an illustrious career ought to be just as much open as to "the well-born." At the same time John Adams differed from Jefferson and from his cousin, Samuel Adams, in distrusting the masses. All the federalist leaders shared this feeling more or less, and it presently became the chief source of weakness to the party. The disagreement between John Adams and Jefferson was first brought

into prominence by the breaking out of the French revolution. Mr. Adams expected little or no good from this movement, which was like the American movement in no respect whatever except in being called a revolution. He set forth his views on this subject in his "Discourses on Davila," which were published in a Philadelphia newspaper. Taking as his text Davila's history of the civil wars in France in the 16th century, he argued powerfully that a pure democracy was not the best form of government, but that a certain mixture of the aristocratic and monarchical elements was necessary to the permanent maintenance of free government. Such a mixture really exists in the constitution of the United States, and, in the opinion of many able thinkers, constitutes its peculiar excellence and the best guarantee of its stability. These views gave great umbrage to the extreme democrats, and in the election of 1792 they set up George Clinton, of New York, as a rival candidate for the vice-presidency; but when the votes were counted Adams had 77, Clinton 50, Jefferson 4, and Aaron Burr 1. During this administration Adams, by his casting vote, defeated the attempt of the republicans to balk Jay's mission to England in advance by a resolution entirely prohibiting trade with that country. For a time Adams quite forgot his jealousy of Washington in admiration for the heroic strength of purpose with which he pursued his policy of neutrality amid the furious efforts of political partisans to drag the United States into a rash and desperate armed struggle in support either of France or of England.

In 1796, as Washington refused to serve for a third term, John Adams seemed clearly marked out as federalist candidate for the succession. Hamilton and Jay were in a certain sense his rivals; but Jay was for the moment unpopular because of the famous treaty that he had lately negotiated with England, and Hamilton, although the ablest man in the federalist party, was still not so conspicuous in the eyes of the masses of voters as Adams, who besides was surer than any one else of the indispensable New England vote. Having decided upon Adams as first candidate, it seemed desirable to take the other from a southern state, and the choice fell upon Thomas Pinckney, of South Carolina, a younger brother of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney. Hamilton now began to scheme against Mr. Adams in a manner not at all to his credit. He had always been jealous

of Adams because of his stubborn and independent character, which made it impossible for him to be subservient to a leader. There was not room enough in one political party for two such positive and aggressive characters. Already in the election of 1788 Hamilton had contrived to diminish Adams's vote by persuading some electors of the possible danger of a unanimous and therefore equal vote for him and Washington. Such advice could not have been candid, for there was never the smallest possibility of a unanimous vote for Mr. Adams. Now in 1796 he resorted to a similar stratagem. The federalists were likely to win the election, but had not many votes to spare; the contest was evidently going to be close. Hamilton accordingly urged the federalist electors, especially in New England, to cast all their votes alike for Adams and Pinckney, lest the loss of a single vote by either one should give the victory to Jefferson, upon whom the opposite party was clearly united. Should Adams and Pinckney receive an exactly equal number of votes, it would remain for a federalist congress to decide which should be president. The result of the election showed 71 votes for John Adams, 68 for Jefferson, 59 for Pinckney, 30 for Burr, 15 for Samuel Adams, and the rest scattering. Two electors obstinately persisted in voting for Washington. When it appeared that Adams had only three more votes than Jefferson, who secured the second place instead of Pinckney, it seemed on the surface as if Hamilton's advice had been sound. But from the outset it had been clear (and no one knew it better than Hamilton) that several southern federalists would withhold their votes from Adams in order to give the presidency to Pinckney, always supposing that the New England electors could be depended upon to vote equally for both. The purpose of Hamilton's advice was to make Pinckney president and Adams vice-president, in opposition to the wishes of their party. This purpose was suspected in New England, and while some of the southern federalists voted for Pinckney and Jefferson, eighteen New Englanders, in voting for Adams, withheld their votes from Pinckney. The result was the election of a federalist president with a republican vice-president. In case of the death, disability, or removal of the president, the administration would fall into the hands of the opposite party. Clearly a mode of election that presented such temptations to intrigue, and left so much to accident, was



Philadelphia Decr 15. 1794

Dear Sir

Mr Robert Denison an English Gentleman from Nottingham in England proposes to visit the City of Washington. If you can shew him the City, or any other Attentions you will oblige me. He belongs to a wealthy and worthy Family of Dissenters, who have it in contemplation to fly from Persecution He is recommended to be by one of the most benevolent Men in England. I am, my

Dear Sir Sincerely yours

John Adams

William French Esqr



vicious and could not last long. These proceedings gave rise to a violent feud between John Adams and Alexander Hamilton, which ended in breaking up the federalist party, and has left a legacy of bitter feelings to the many descendants of those two illustrious men.

The presidency of John Adams was stormy. We were entering upon that period when our party strife was determined rather by foreign than by American political issues, when England and France, engaged in a warfare of Titans, took every occasion to browbeat and insult us because we were supposed to be too feeble to resent such treatment. The revolutionary government of France had claimed that, in accordance with our treaty with that country, we were bound to support her against Great Britain, at least so far as concerned the defence of the French West Indies. The republican party went almost far enough in their sympathy with the French to concede these claims, which, if admitted by our government, would immediately have got us into war with England. On the other hand, the hatred felt toward France by the extreme federalists was so bitter that any insult from that power was enough to incline them to advocate war against her and in behalf of England. Washington, in defiance of all popular clamor, adhered to a policy of strict neutrality, and in this he was resolutely followed by Adams. The American government was thus obliged carefully and with infinite difficulty to steer between Scylla and Charybdis until the overthrow of Napoleon and our naval victories over England in 1812-'14 put an end to this humiliating state of things. Under Washington's administration Gouverneur Morris had been for some time minister to France, but he was greatly disliked by the anarchical group that then misruled that country. To avoid giving offence to the French republic, Washington had recalled Morris and sent James Monroe in his place, with instructions to try to reconcile the French to Jay's mission to England. Instead of doing this, Monroe encouraged the French to hope that Jay's treaty would not be ratified, and Washington accordingly recalled him and sent Cotesworth Pinckney in his place. Enraged at the ratification of Jay's treaty, the French government not only gave a brilliant ovation to Monroe, but refused to receive Pinckney, and would not even allow him to stay in Paris. At the same time, decrees were passed discriminating against American

commerce. Mr. Adams was no sooner inaugurated as president than he called an extra session of congress, to consider how war with France should be avoided. It was decided to send a special commission to France, consisting of Cotesworth Pinckney, John Marshall, and Elbridge Gerry. The directory would not acknowledge these commissioners and treat with them openly; but Talleyrand, who was then secretary for foreign affairs, sent some of his creatures to intrigue with them behind the scenes. It was proposed that the envoys should pay large sums of money to Talleyrand and two or three of the directors, as bribes, for dealing politely with the United States and refraining from locking up American ships and stealing American goods. When the envoys scornfully rejected this proposal, a new decree was forthwith issued against American commerce. The envoys drew up an indignant remonstrance, which Gerry hesitated to sign. Wearied with their fruitless efforts, Marshall and Pinckney left Paris. But, as Gerry was a republican, Talleyrand thought it worth while to persuade him to stay, hoping that he might prove more compliant than his colleagues. In March, 1798, Mr. Adams announced to congress the failure of the mission, and advised that the preparations already begun should be kept up in view of the war that now seemed almost inevitable. A furious debate ensued, which was interrupted by a motion from the federalist side, calling on the president for full copies of the despatches. Nothing could have suited Mr. Adams better. He immediately sent in copies complete in everything except that the letters X., Y., and Z. were substituted for the names of Talleyrand's emissaries. Hence these papers have ever since been known as the "X. Y. Z. despatches." On the 8th of April the senate voted to publish these despatches, and they aroused great excitement both in Europe and in America. The British government scattered them broadcast over Europe, to stir up indignation against France. In America a great storm of wrath seemed for the moment to have wrecked the republican party. Those who were not converted to federalism were for the moment silenced. From all quarters came up the war-cry, "Millions for defence; not one cent for tribute." A few excellent frigates were built, the nucleus of the gallant little navy that was by and by to win such triumphs over England. An army was raised, and Washington was placed in command,

with the rank of lieutenant-general. Gerry was recalled from France, and the press roundly berated him for showing less firmness than his colleagues, though indeed he had not done anything dishonorable. During this excitement the song of "Hail Columbia" was published and became popular. On the 4th of July the effigy of Talleyrand, who had once been bishop of Autun, was arrayed in a surplice and burned at the stake. The president was authorized to issue letters of marque and reprisal, and for a time war with France actually existed, though it was never declared. In February, 1799, Capt. Truxtun, in the frigate "Constellation," defeated and captured the French frigate "L'Insurgente" near the island of St. Christopher. In February, 1800, the same gallant officer in a desperate battle destroyed the frigate "La Vengeance," which was much his superior in strength of armament. When the directory found that their silly and infamous policy was likely to drive the United States into alliance with Great Britain, they began to change their tactics. Talleyrand tried to crawl out by disavowing his emissaries X. Y. Z., and pretending that the American envoys had been imposed upon by irresponsible adventurers. He made overtures to Vans Murray, the American minister at the Hague, tending toward reconciliation. Mr. Adams, while sharing the federalist indignation at the behavior of France, was too clear-headed not to see that the only safe policy for the United States was one of strict neutrality. He was resolutely determined to avoid war if possible, and to meet France half-way the moment she should show symptoms of a return to reason. His cabinet were so far under Hamilton's influence that he could not rely upon them; indeed, he had good reason to suspect them of working against him. Accordingly, without consulting his cabinet, on 18 Feb., 1799, he sent to the senate the nomination of Vans Murray as minister to France. This bold step precipitated the quarrel between Mr. Adams and his party, and during the year it grew fiercer and fiercer. He joined Ellsworth, of Connecticut, and Davie, of North Carolina, to Vans Murray as commissioners, and awaited the assurance of Talleyrand that they would be properly received at Paris. On receiving this assurance, though it was couched in rather insolent language by the baffled Frenchman, the commissioners sailed Nov. 5. On reaching Paris, they found the directory overturned by Napoleon, with whom as

first consul they succeeded in adjusting the difficulties. This French mission completed the split in the federalist party, and made Mr. Adams's re-election impossible. The quarrel with the Hamiltonians had been further embittered by Adams's foolish attempt to prevent Hamilton's obtaining the rank of senior major-general, for which Washington had designated him, and it rose to fever-heat in the spring of 1800, when Mr. Adams dismissed his cabinet and selected a new one.

Another affair contributed largely to the downfall of the federalist party. In 1798, during the height of the popular fury against France, the federalists in congress presumed too much upon their strength, and passed the famous alien and sedition acts. By the first of these acts, aliens were rendered liable to summary banishment from the United States at the sole discretion of the president; and any alien who should venture to return from such banishment was liable to imprisonment at hard labor for life. By the sedition act, any scandalous or malicious writing against the president or either house of congress was liable to be dealt with in the United States courts and punished by fine and imprisonment. This act contravened the constitutional amendment that forbids all infringement of freedom of speech and of the press, and both acts aroused more widespread indignation than any others that have ever passed in congress. They called forth from the southern republicans the famous Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798-'99, which assert, though in language open to some latitude of interpretation, the right of a state to "nullify" or impede the execution of a law deemed unconstitutional.

In the election of 1800 the federalist votes were given to John Adams and Cotesworth Pinckney, and the republican votes to Jefferson and Burr. The count showed 65 votes for Adams, 64 for Pinckney, and 1 for Jay, while Jefferson and Burr had each 73, and the election was thus thrown into the house of representatives. Mr. Adams took no part in the intrigues that followed. His last considerable public act, in appointing John Marshall to the chief justiceship of the United States, turned out to be of inestimable value to the country, and was a worthy end to a great public career. Very different, and quite unworthy of such a man as John Adams, was the silly and puerile fit of rage in which he got up before daybreak of the 4th of March and started in his coach for Massachusetts,

instead of waiting to see the inauguration of his successful rival. On several occasions John Adams's career shows us striking examples of the demoralizing effects of stupendous personal vanity, but on no occasion more strikingly than this. He went home with a feeling that he had been disgraced by his failure to secure a re-election. Yet in estimating his character we must not forget that in his resolute insistence upon the French mission of 1799 he did not stop for a moment to weigh the probable effect of his action upon his chances for reëlection. He acted as a true patriot, ready to sacrifice himself for the welfare of his country, never regretted the act, and always maintained that it was the most meritorious of his life. "I desire," he said, "no other inscription over my grave-stone than this: Here lies John Adams, who took upon himself the responsibility of the peace with France in the year 1800." He was entirely right, as all disinterested writers now agree.

After so long and brilliant a career, he now passed a quarter of a century in his home at Quincy (as that part of Braintree was now called) in peaceful and happy seclusion, devoting himself to literary work relating to the history of his times. In 1820 the aged statesman was chosen delegate to the convention for revising the constitution of Massachusetts, and labored unsuccessfully to obtain an acknowledgment of the equal rights, political and religious, of others than so-called Christians. His friendship with Jefferson, which had been broken off by their political differences, was resumed in his old age, and an interesting correspondence was kept up between the two. As a writer of English, John Adams in many respects surpassed all his American contemporaries; his style was crisp, pungent, and vivacious. In person he was of middle height, vigorous, florid, and somewhat corpulent, quite like the typical John Bull. He was always truthful and outspoken, often vehement and brusque. Vanity and loquacity, as he freely admitted, were his chief foibles. Without being quarrelsome, he had little or none of the tact that avoids quarrels; but he harbored no malice, and his anger, though violent, was short-lived. Among American public men there has been none more upright and honorable. He lived to see his son president of the United States, and died on the fiftieth anniversary of the declaration of independence and in the ninety-first year of his age. His last words were, "Thomas

Jefferson still survives." But by a remarkable coincidence, Jefferson had died a few hours earlier the same day. See "Life and Works of John Adams," by Charles Francis Adams (10 vols., Boston, 1850-'56); "Life of John Adams," by J. Q. and C. F. Adams (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1871); and "John Adams," by J. T. Morse, Jr. (Boston, 1885).

The portrait that accompanies this article is copied from a painting by Gilbert Stuart, which was executed while Mr. Adams was president, and is now in the possession of a great-grandson. The one on page 38 was taken when he was a youth. The houses represented on page 36 are those in which John Adams and his son John Quincy Adams were born.

ABIGAIL ADAMS (SMITH), wife of John Adams, born in Weymouth, Mass., 23 Nov., 1744; died in Quincy, Mass., 28 Oct., 1818. Her father, the Rev. William Smith, was for more than forty years minister of the Congregational church in Weymouth. Her mother, Elizabeth Quincy, was a great-great-granddaughter of the eminent Puritan divine, Thomas Shepard, of Cambridge, and great-grandniece of the Rev. John Norton, of Boston. She was among the most remarkable women of the revolutionary period. Her education, so far as books were concerned, was but scanty. Of delicate and nervous organization, she was so frequently ill during childhood and youth that she was never sent to any school; but her loss in this respect was not so great as



*A Adams*

might appear; for, while the New England clergymen at that time were usually men of great learning, the education of their daughters seldom went further than writing or arithmetic, with now and then a smattering of what passed current as music. In the course of her long life she became extensively acquainted with the best English literature, and she wrote in a terse, vigorous, and often elegant style. Her case may well be cited by those who protest against the exaggerated value commonly ascribed to the routine of a school education. Her early years were spent in seclusion, but among

people of learning and political sagacity. On 25 Oct., 1764, she was married to John Adams, then a young lawyer practising in Boston, and for the next ten years her life was quiet and happy, though she shared the intense interest of her husband in the fierce disputes that were so soon to culminate in war. During this period she became the mother of a daughter and three sons. Ten years of doubt and anxiety followed during which Mrs. Adams was left at home in Braintree, while her husband was absent, first as a delegate to the continental congress, afterward on diplomatic business in Europe. In the zeal and determination with which John Adams urged on the declaration of independence he was staunchly supported by his brave wife, a circumstance that used sometimes to be jocosely alleged in explanation of his superiority in boldness to John Dickinson, the women of whose household were perpetually conjuring up visions of the headsman's block. In 1784 Mrs. Adams joined her husband in France, and early in the following year she accompanied him to London. With the recent loss of the American colonies rankling in the minds of George III. and his queen, it was hardly to be expected that much courtesy would be shown to the first minister from the United States or to his wife. Mrs. Adams was treated with rudeness, which she seems to have remembered vindictively. "Humiliation for Charlotte," she wrote some years later, "is no sorrow for me." From 1789 to 1801 her residence was at the seat of our federal government. The remainder of her life was passed in Braintree (in the part called Quincy), and her lively interest in public affairs was kept up till the day of her death. Mrs. Adams was a woman of sunny disposition, and great keenness and sagacity. Her letters are extremely valuable for the light they throw upon the life of the times. See "Familiar Letters of John Adams and his Wife, Abigail Adams, during the Revolution," with a memoir by Charles Francis Adams (New York, 1876).

## THOMAS JEFFERSON.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, third president of the United States, born in Shadwell, Albemarle co., Va., 2 April, 1743; died at Monticello, in the same county, 4 July, 1826. His father was Peter Jefferson, who, with the aid of thirty slaves, tilled a tobacco and wheat farm of 1,900 acres; a man physically strong, a good mathematician, skilled in surveying, fond of standard literature, and in politics a British Whig. Like his fathers before him, Peter Jefferson was a justice of the peace, a vestryman of his parish, and a member of the colonial legislature. The first of the Virginia Jeffersons, who were of Welsh extraction, was a member of the Virginia legislature of 1619, noted as the first legislative body ever convened on the western continent. Peter married in 1738 Jane, daughter of Isham Randolph, a wealthy and conspicuous member of the family of that name. Of their ten children, Thomas was the third, born in a plain, spacious farm-house, traces of which still exist. He inherited a full measure of his father's bodily strength and stature, both having been esteemed in their prime the strongest men of their county. He inherited also his father's inclination to liberal politics, his taste for literature, and his aptitude for mathematics. Peter Jefferson died in 1757, when his son Thomas was fourteen years of age. On his death-bed he left an injunction that the education of his son, already well advanced in a preparatory school, should be completed at the College of William and Mary, a circumstance which his son always remembered with gratitude, saying that if he had to choose between the education and the estate his father left him, he would choose the education. His school-mates reported that at school he was noted for good scholarship, industry, and shyness. Without leaving his father's land he could shoot turkeys, deer, foxes, and other game. His father in his last hours had specially charged his mother not to





Engr'd by A.B. Hall, New-York

*Th. Jefferson*



permit him to neglect the exercise requisite for health and strength; but the admonition was scarcely necessary, for the youth was a keen hunter and had been taught by his father to swim his horse over the Rivanna, a tributary of the James, which flowed by the estate. The Jeffersons were a musical family; the girls sang the songs of the time, and Thomas, practising the violin assiduously from boyhood, became an excellent performer. At seventeen, when he entered the College of William and Mary, he was tall, raw-boned, freckled, and sandy-haired, with large feet and hands, thick wrists, and prominent cheek-bones and chin. His comrades described him as far from handsome, a fresh, healthy-looking youth, very erect, agile, and strong, with something of rusticity in his air and demeanor. The college was not then efficient nor well equipped, but there was one true educator connected with it, Dr. William Small, of Scotland, professor of mathematics. Jefferson gratefully remembered him as an ardent student of science, who possessed a happy talent for communicating knowledge, a man of agreeable manners and enlightened mind. He goes so far as to say in his autobiography that his coming under the influence of Dr. Small "probably fixed the destinies of my life." The learned and genial professor became attached to his receptive pupil, made him the daily companion of his walks, and gave him those views of the connection of the sciences and of the system of things of which man is a part which then prevailed in the advanced scientific circles of Europe. Prof. Small was a friend of the poet Erasmus Darwin, progenitor of an illustrious line of learned men. Jefferson was a hard student in college, and at times forgot his father's dying injunction as to exercise. He kept horses at Williamsburg, but as his love of knowledge increased his rides became shorter and less frequent, and even his beloved violin was neglected. There was a time, as he remembered, when he studied fifteen hours a day. Once a week the lieutenant-governor, Francis Fauquier, had a musical party at the "palace," to which the guests, in the good old style of that century, brought their instruments. Jefferson was always present at these parties with his violin, and participated in the concert, the governor himself being also a performer. From Fauquier, a man of the world of the period, he learned much of the social, political, and parliamentary life of the Old World. George Wythe,

afterward chancellor, was then a young lawyer of Williamsburg. He was one of the highly gifted men that frequented the governor's table, and contributed essentially to the forming of Jefferson's mind.

On his graduation, Jefferson entered upon the study of law, under the guidance of George Wythe. As his father's estate was charged with the maintenance of a large family, a profession was necessary to the student, and he entered upon his preparation for the bar with all his energy and resolution. On coming of age, in April, 1764, he assumed the management of the estate, and was appointed to two of his father's offices—justice of the peace and vestryman. He gave much attention to the cultivation of his lands, and remained always an attentive, zealous, and improving farmer. He attached importance all his life to the fact that his legal training was based upon the works of Lord Coke, of whom he said that "a sounder Whig never wrote, nor one of profounder learning in the orthodox doctrines of the British constitution, or in what were called British liberties." It was his settled conviction that the early drill of the colonial lawyers in "Coke upon Lyttleton" prepared them for the part they took in resisting the unconstitutional acts of the British government. Lawyers formed by Coke, he would say, were all good Whigs; but from the time that Blackstone became the leading text-book "the profession began to slide into Toryism." His own study of Coke led him to extend his researches into the origins of British law, and led him also to the rejection of the maxim of Sir Matthew Hale, that Christianity is parcel of the laws of England. His youthful treatise on this complex and difficult point shows us at once the minuteness and the extent of his legal studies. While he was a student of law, he was an eye-witness of those memorable scenes in the Virginia legislature which followed the passage of the stamp-act. He was present as a spectator in the house when Patrick Henry read his five resolutions, written upon a blank leaf torn from a "Coke upon Lyttleton," enunciating the principle that Englishmen living in America had all the rights of Englishmen living in England, the chief of which was, that they could only be taxed by their own representatives. When he was an old man, seated at his table at Monticello, he loved to speak of that great day, and to describe the thrill and ecstasy of the moment when the wonderful

orator, interrupted by cries of "Treason," uttered the well-known words of defiance: "If this be treason, make the most of it!" Early in 1767, about his twenty-fourth birthday, Jefferson was admitted to the bar of Virginia, and entered at once upon the practice of his profession. Connected through his father with the yeomen of the western counties, and through his mother with the wealthier planters of the eastern, he had not long to wait for business. His first account-book, which still exists, shows that in the first year of his practice he was employed in sixty-eight cases before the general court of the province, besides county and office business. He was an accurate, painstaking, and laborious practitioner, and his business increased until he was employed in nearly five hundred cases in a single year, which yielded an average profit of about one pound sterling each. He was not a fluent nor a forcible speaker, and his voice soon became husky as he proceeded; but James Madison, who heard him try a cause, reports that he acquitted himself well, and spoke fluently enough for his purpose. He loved the erudition of the law, and attached great importance to the laws of a country as the best source of its history. It was he who suggested and promoted the collection of Virginia laws known as "Henning's Statutes at Large," to which he contributed the most rare and valuable part of the contents. He practised law for nearly eight years, until the Revolutionary contest summoned him to other labors.

His public life began 11 May, 1769, when he took his seat as a member of the Virginia house of burgesses, Washington being also a member. Jefferson was then twenty-six years old. On becoming a public man he made a resolution "never to engage, while in public office, in any kind of enterprise for the improvement of my fortune, nor to wear any other character than that of a farmer." At the close of his public career of nearly half a century he could say that he had kept this resolution, and he often found the benefit of it in being able to consider public questions free from the bias of self-interest. This session of the burgesses was short. On the third day were introduced the famous four resolutions, to the effect that the colonies could not be lawfully taxed by a body in which they were not represented, and that they might concur, coöperate, and practically unite in seeking a redress of grievances. On the fifth day of the session the royal governor, Lord Botetourt,

dissolved the house; but the members speedily reassembled in the great room of the Raleigh tavern, where similar resolutions, with others more pointed, were passed. The decency and firmness of these proceedings had their effect. Before many months had passed the governor summoned the assembly and greeted them with the news that parliament had abandoned the system of taxing the colonies—a delusive statement, which he, however, fully believed himself authorized to make. Amid the joy—too brief—of this supposed change of policy, Jefferson made his first important speech in the house, in which he advocated the repeal of the law that obliged a master who wished to free his slaves to send them out of the colony. The motion was promptly rejected, and the mover, Mr. Bland, was denounced as an enemy to his country.

On 1 Jan., 1772, Jefferson married Mrs. Martha Skelton, a beautiful and childless young widow, daughter of John Wayles, a lawyer in large practice at the Williamsburg bar. His new house at Monticello, a view of which is given on page 72, was then just habitable, and he took his wife home to it a few days after the ceremony. Next year the death of his wife's father brought them a great increase of fortune—40,000 acres of land and 135 slaves, which, when the encumbrances were discharged, doubled Jefferson's estate. He was now a fortunate man indeed; opulent in his circumstances, happily married, and soon a father. We see him busied in the most pleasing kinds of agriculture, laying out gardens, introducing new products, arranging his farms, completing and furnishing his house, and making every effort to convert his little mountain, covered with primeval forest, into an agreeable and accessible park. After numerous experiments he domesticated almost every tree and shrub, native and foreign, that could survive the severe Virginia winter.

The contest with the king was soon renewed, and the decisive year, 1774, opened. It found Thomas Jefferson a thriving and busy young lawyer and farmer, not known beyond Virginia; but when it closed he was a person of note among the patriots of America, and was proscribed in England. It was he who prepared the "Draught of Instructions" for Virginia's Delegation to the Congress which met at Philadelphia in September. That congress, he thought, should unite in a solemn address to the king; but they should speak to him in a

frank and manly way, informing him, as the chief magistrate of an empire governed by many legislatures, that one of those legislatures—namely, the British parliament—had encroached upon the rights of thirteen others. They were also to say to the king that he was no more than the chief officer of the people, appointed by the laws and circumscribed with definite powers. He also spoke, in this very radical draught, of “the late deposition of his majesty, King Charles, by the Commonwealth of England” as a thing obviously right. He maintained that the parliament of Virginia had as much right to pass laws for the government of the people of England as the British legislature had to pass laws for the government of the people of Virginia. “Can any one reason be assigned,” he asked, “why a hundred and sixty thousand electors in the island of Great Britain should give law to four millions in the states of America?” The draught, indeed, was so radical on every point that it seemed to the ruling British mind of that day mere insolent burlesque. It was written, however, by Jefferson in the most modest and earnest spirit, showing that, at the age of thirty-one, his radical opinions were fully formed, and their expression was wholly unqualified by a knowledge of the world beyond the sea. This draught, though not accepted by the convention, was published in a pamphlet, copies of which were sent to England, where Edmund Burke caused it to be republished with emendations and additions of his own. It procured for the author, to use his own language, “the honor of having his name inserted in a long list of proscriptions enrolled in a bill of attainder.” The whole truth of the controversy was given in this pamphlet, without any politic reserves.

In March, 1775, Jefferson, who had been kept at Monticello for some time by illness, was in Richmond as a member of the convention which assembled in the parish church of St. John to consider what course Virginia should take in the crisis. It was as a member of this body that Patrick Henry, to an audience of 150 persons, spoke the prophetic words in solemn tones as the key to the enigma: “We must fight! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms.” These sentences, spoken twenty-seven days before the affair of Lexington, convinced the convention, and it was agreed that Virginia should arm. A committee of thirteen was appointed to arrange a plan, among the members

of which were Patrick Henry, George Washington, Richard Henry Lee, Benjamin Harrison, the speaker, Edmund Pendleton, and Thomas Jefferson. The plan they agreed upon was this: The populous counties to raise and drill infantry companies; the other counties horsemen, and both to wear the hunting-shirt, which Col. Washington told them was the best field uniform he knew of. The last act of this convention was to appoint that, in case a vacancy should occur in the delegation of Virginia to congress, Thomas Jefferson should supply the place. A vacancy occurred, and on 20 June, 1775, the day on which Washington received his commission as commander-in-chief, Jefferson reached Philadelphia, and took his seat the next morning in congress. Before the sun set that day congress received news of the stirring battle of Bunker Hill.

Jefferson was an earnest, diligent, and useful member of the congress. John Adams, his fellow-member, describes him as "so prompt, frank, explicit, and decisive upon committees and in conversation that he soon seized upon my heart." His readiness in composition, his profound knowledge of British law, and his innate love of freedom and justice, gave him solid standing in the body. On his return to Virginia he was re-elected by a majority that placed him third in the list of seven members. After ten days' vacation at home, where he then had a house undergoing enlargement, and a household of thirty-four whites and eighty-three blacks, with farms in three counties to superintend, he returned to congress to take his part in the events that led to the complete and formal separation of the colonies from the mother-country. In May, 1776, the news reached congress that the Virginia convention were unanimous for independence, and on 7 June Richard Henry Lee obeyed the instructions of the Virginia legislature by moving that independence should be declared. On 10 June a committee of five was appointed to prepare a draught of the Declaration—Jefferson, Franklin, John Adams, Roger Sherman, and Robert R. Livingston. Mr. Jefferson, being the chairman of the committee, was naturally asked to write the document. He then lived near what is now the corner of Market and Seventh streets. The paper was written in a room of the second floor, upon a little writing-desk three inches high, of his own contriving, which still exists. Congress subjected his draught to a severe and prolonged revision, making many suppressions, ad-



ditions, and alterations, most of which were improvements. One passage was suppressed in which he gave expression to the wounded feelings of the American people in being so unworthily treated by brethren and fellow-citizens. The document was debated in congress on 2, 3, and 4 July. Thursday, the 4th, was a warm day, and the members in the afternoon became weary and impatient with the long strain upon their nerves. Jefferson used to relate with much merriment that the final vote upon the Declaration was hastened by swarms of flies, which came from a neighboring stable, and added to the discomfort of the members. A few days afterward he was one of a committee to devise a seal for the new-born power. Among their suggestions (and this was the only one accepted by congress) was the best legend ever appropriated, *E pluribus unum*, a phrase that had served as a motto on the cover of the "Gentleman's Magazine" for many years. It was originally borrowed from a humorous poem of Virgil's.

Having thus linked his name imperishably with the birthday of the nation, Jefferson resigned his seat in congress, on the ground that the health of his wife and the condition of his household made his presence in Virginia indispensable. He had also been again elected a member of the Virginia legislature, and his heart was set upon the work of purging the statute-books of unsuitable laws, and bringing up Virginia to the level of the Declaration. He had formed a high conception of the excellence of the New England governments, and wished to introduce into his native state the local institutions that had enabled those states to act with such efficiency during the war. After some stay at home he entered upon this work at Williamsburg, where, 8 Oct., 1776, a messenger from congress informed him that he had been elected joint commissioner, with Franklin and Deane, to represent the United States at Paris. After three days of consideration, he resisted the temptation to go abroad, feeling that his obligations to his family and his state made it his duty to remain at home. In reorganizing Virginia, Jefferson and his friends struck first at the system of entail, which, after three weeks' earnest debate, was totally destroyed, so that all property in Virginia was held in fee simple and could be sold for debt. He next attempted, by a short and simple enactment, to abolish the connection between church and state. He was able to accomplish but a small portion of this reform at that

session, but the work was begun, and nine years later the law drawn by Jefferson, entitled "An Act for establishing Religious Freedom," completed the severance. This triumph of equal rights over ancient prejudices and restriction Jefferson always regarded as one of his most important contributions to the happiness of his country. Some of his utterances on this subject have passed into familiar proverbs: "Government has nothing to do with opinion," "Compulsion makes hypocrites, not converts," "It is error alone which needs the support of government; truth can stand by itself." It was he who drew the bill for establishing courts of law in the state, and for prescribing their powers and methods. It was he also who caused the removal of the capital to Richmond. He carried the bill extirpating the principle of primogeniture. It was the committee of which he was chairman that abolished the cruel penalties of the ancient code, and he made a most earnest attempt to establish a system of public education in the state. During two years he and his colleagues, Hamilton, Wythe, Mason, and Francis Lightfoot Lee, toiled at the reconstruction of Virginia law, during which they accomplished all that was then possible, besides proposing many measures that were passed at a later day. He could write to Dr. Franklin in 1777 that the people of Virginia had "laid aside the monarchical and taken up the republican government with as much ease as would have attended their throwing off an old and putting on a new suit of clothes." It was Jefferson and his friends who wrought this salutary change, and they were able to effect it because, during the first three years of the war, Virginia was almost exempt from disturbance. In the spring of 1779, when Burgoyne's army, as prisoners of war, were encamped near Monticello, Jefferson was assiduous in friendly attentions both to the British and the Hessians, throwing open his house and grounds to them, and arranging many agreeable concerts for their entertainment. A British captain, himself a good violinist, who played duets with Jefferson at this time, told the late Gen. John A. Dix, of New York, that Thomas Jefferson was the best amateur he had ever heard.

In January, 1779, the Virginia legislature elected Jefferson governor of the state, to succeed Patrick Henry, whose third term ended on 1 June. The two years of his governorship proved to be the severest trial of his life. With slender and

fast diminishing resources, he had to keep up the Virginia regiments in the army of Washington, and at the same time to send all possible supplies to the support of Gen. Gates in his southern campaign. The western Indians were a source of constant solicitude, and they were held in check by that brave and energetic neighbor of Gov. Jefferson, George Rogers Clarke. The British and Hessian prisoners also had to be supplied and guarded. In the midst of his first anxieties he began the reorganization that he had long desired of the College of William and Mary. Soon, however, his attention was wholly absorbed by the events of the war. On 16 Aug., 1780, occurred the disastrous defeat of Gates at Camden, which destroyed in a day all that Jefferson had toiled to accumulate in warlike material during eight agonizing weeks. On the last day of 1780, Arnold's fleet of twenty-seven sail anchored in Chesapeake bay, and Arnold, with nine hundred men, penetrated as far as Richmond; but Jefferson had acted with so much promptitude, and was so ably seconded by the county militia, that the traitor held Richmond but twenty-three hours, and escaped total destruction only through a timely change in the wind, which bore him down the river with extraordinary swiftness. In five days from the first summons twenty-five hundred militia were in pursuit of Arnold, and hundreds more were coming in every hour. For eighty-four hours Gov. Jefferson was almost continuously in the saddle; and for many months after Arnold's first repulse, not only the governor, but all that Virginia had left of manhood, resources, and credit were absorbed in the contest. Four times in the spring of 1781 the legislature of Virginia was obliged to adjourn and fly before the approach or the threat of an enemy. Monticello was captured by a troop of horse, and Jefferson himself narrowly escaped. Cornwallis lived for ten days in the governor's house at Elk Hill, a hundred miles down the James, where he destroyed all the growing crops, burned the barns, carried off the horses, killed the colts, and took away twenty-seven slaves. During the public disasters of that time there was the usual disposition among a portion of the people to cast the blame upon the administration, and Jefferson himself was of the opinion that, in such a desperate crisis, it was best that the civil and the military power should be intrusted to the same hand. He therefore declined a re-election to a third term, and induced his friends to support


Gen. Thomas Nelson, commander-in-chief of the militia, who was elected. The capture of Cornwallis in November, 1781, atoned for all the previous suffering and disaster. A month later Jefferson rose in his place in the legislature and declared his readiness to answer any charges that might be brought against his administration of the government; but no one responded. After a pause, a member offered a resolution thanking him for his impartial, upright, and attentive discharge of his duty, which was passed without a dissenting voice.

On 6 Sept., 1782, Jefferson's wife died, to his unspeakable and lasting sorrow, leaving three daughters, the youngest four months old. During the stupor caused by this event he was elected by a unanimous vote of congress, and, as Madison reports, "without a single adverse remark," plenipotentiary to France, to treat for peace. He gladly accepted; but, before he sailed, the joyful news came that preliminaries of peace had been agreed to, and he returned to Monticello. In June, 1783, he was elected to congress, and in November took his seat at Annapolis. Here, as chairman of a committee on the currency,

he assisted to give us the decimal currency now in use. The happy idea originated with Gouverneur Morris, of New York, but with details too cumbrous for common use Jefferson proposed our present system of dollars and cents,

with dimes, half-dimes, and a great gold coin of ten dollars, with subdivisions, such as we have now. Jefferson strongly desired also to apply the decimal system to all measures. When he travelled he carried with him an odometer, which divided the miles into hundredths, which he called cents. "I find," said he, "that every one comprehends a distance readily when stated to him in miles and cents; so he would in feet and cents, pounds and cents."

On 7 May, 1784, congress elected Jefferson for a third time plenipotentiary to France, to join Franklin and Adams in nego-



tiating commercial treaties with foreign powers. On 5 July he sailed from Boston upon this mission, and thirty-two days later took up his abode in Paris. On 2 May, 1785, he received from Mr. Jay his commission appointing him sole minister plenipotentiary to the king of France for three years from 10 March, 1785. "You replace Dr. Franklin," said the Count de Vergennes to him, when he announced his appointment. Jefferson replied: "I succeed; no one can replace him." The impression that France made upon Jefferson's mind was painful in the extreme. While enjoying the treasures of art that Paris presented, and particularly its music, fond of the people, too, relishing their amiable manners, their habits and tastes, he was nevertheless appalled at the cruel oppression of the ancient system of government. "The people," said he, "are ground to powder by the vices of the form of government," and he wrote to Madison that government by hereditary rulers was a "government of wolves over sheep, or kites over pigeons." Beaumarchais's "Marriage of Figaro" was in its first run when Jefferson settled in Paris, and the universal topic of conversation was the defects of the established *régime*. Upon the whole, he enjoyed and assiduously improved his five years' residence in Europe. His official labors were arduous and constant. He strove, though in vain, to procure the release of American captives in Algiers without paying the enormous ransom demanded by the dey. With little more success, he endeavored to break into the French protective system, which kept from the kingdom the cheap food that America could supply, and for want of which the people were perishing and the monarchy was in peril. He kept the American colleges advised of the new inventions, discoveries, and books of Europe. He was particularly zealous in sending home seeds, roots, and nuts for trial in American soil. During his journey to Italy he procured a quantity of the choicest rice for the planters of South Carolina, and he supplied Buffon with American skins, skeletons, horns, and similar objects for his collection. In Paris he published his "Notes on Virginia," both in French and English, a work full of information concerning its main subject, and at the same time surcharged with the republican sentiment then so grateful to the people of France. In 1786, when at length the Virginia legislature passed his "Act for Freedom of Religion," he had copies of it printed for distribu-

tion, and it was received with rapture by the advanced Liberals. It was his custom while travelling in France to enter the houses of the peasants and converse with them upon their affairs and condition. He would contrive to sit upon the bed, in order to ascertain what it was made of, and get a look into the boiling pot, to see what was to be the family dinner. He strongly advised Lafayette to do the same, saying: "You must ferret the people out of their hovels as I have done, look into their kettles, eat their bread, loll on their beds, on pretence of resting yourself, but in fact to find if they are soft." His letters are full of this subject. He returns again and again to the frightful inequalities of condition, the vulgarity and incapacity of the hereditary rulers, and the hopeless destiny of nineteen twentieths of the people. His compassion for the people of France was the more intense from his strong appreciation of their excellent qualities. Having received a leave of absence for six months, he returned with his daughters to Virginia, landing at Norfolk, 18 Nov., 1789. His reception was most cordial. The legislature appointed a committee of thirteen, with Patrick Henry at their head, to congratulate him on his return, and on the day of his landing he read in a newspaper that President Washington, in settling the new government, had assigned to Thomas Jefferson the office of secretary of state. "I made light of it," he wrote soon afterward, "supposing I had only to say no, and there would be an end of it." On receiving the official notification of his appointment, he told the president that he preferred to retain the office he held. "But," he added, "it is not for an individual to choose his post. You are to marshal us as may be best for the public good." He finally accepted the appointment, and after witnessing at Monticello, 23 Feb., 1790, the marriage of his eldest daughter, Martha, to Thomas Mann Randolph, he began his journey to New York. During his absence in France, his youngest daughter, Lucy, had died, leaving him Martha and Maria. On Sunday, 21 March, 1790, he reached New York, to enter upon the duties of his new office. He hired a house at No. 57 Maiden Lane, the city then containing a population of 35,000. His colleagues in the cabinet were Alexander Hamilton, secretary of the treasury; Henry Knox, secretary of war; and Edmund Randolph, attorney-general. Jefferson's salary was only \$3,500, and that of the other three mem-

bers of the cabinet but \$3,000, a compensation that proved painfully inadequate.

He soon found himself ill at ease in his place. He had left Paris when the fall of the Bastille was a recent event, and when the revolutionary movement still promised to hopeful spirits the greatest good to France and to Europe. He had been consulted at every stage of its progress by Lafayette and the other Republican leaders, with whom he was in the deepest sympathy. He left his native land a Whig of the Revolution; he returned to it a Republican-Democrat. In his reply to the congratulations of his old constituents, he had spoken of the "sufficiency of human reason for the care of human affairs." He declared "the will of the majority to be the natural law of every society, and the only sure guardian of the rights of man." He added these important words, which contain the most material article of his political creed: "Perhaps even this may sometimes err; but its errors are honest, solitary, and short-lived. Let us, then, forever bow down to the general reason of society. We are safe with that, even in its deviations, for it soon returns again to the right way." To other addresses of welcome he replied in a similar tone. He brought to New York a settled conviction that the republican is the only form of government that is not robbery and violence organized. Feeling thus, he was grieved and astonished to find a distrust of republican government prevalent in society, and to hear a preference for the monarchical form frequently expressed. In the cabinet itself, where Hamilton dominated and Knox echoed his opinions, the republic was accepted rather as a temporary expedient than as a final good. Jefferson and Hamilton, representing diverse and incompatible tendencies, soon found themselves in ill-accord, and their discussions in the cabinet became vehement. They differed in some degree upon almost every measure of the administration, and on several of the most vital their differences became passionate and distressing. In May, 1791, by openly accepting and eulogizing Thomas Paine's "Rights of Man," a spirited reply to Burke's "Reflections on the Revolution in France," Jefferson placed himself at the head of the Republican party in the United States. The difference between the two chief members of the cabinet rapidly developed into a personal antipathy, and both of them ardently desired to withdraw. Both, however, could have borne these

disagreeable dissensions, and we see in their later letters that the real cause of their longing to resign was the insufficiency of their salaries. Jefferson's estate, much diminished by the war, was of little profit to him in the absence of the master's eye. Gen. Washington, who did equal justice to the merits of both these able men, used all his influence and tact to induce them to remain, and, yielding to the president's persuasions, both made an honest attempt at external agreement. But in truth their feelings, as well as their opinions, were naturally irreconcilable. Their attitude toward the French revolution proves this. Hamilton continually and openly expressed an indiscriminating abhorrence of it, while Jefferson deliberately wrote that if the movement "had isolated half the earth," the evil would have been less than the continuance of the ancient system. Writing to an old friend he went farther even than this: "Were there but an Adam and an Eve left in every country, and left free, it would be better than as it now is." On every point of difficulty created by the French revolution the disagreement between the two secretaries was extreme. On other subjects there was little real concord, and it was a happy moment for both when, on 1 Jan., 1794, President Washington accepted Jefferson's resignation. He left office at a fortunate time for his reputation, since his correspondence with the English plenipotentiary, George Hammond, and the French plenipotentiary, Edmond Genet, had just been published in a large pamphlet. Jefferson's letters to those gentlemen were so moderate, so just, and so conciliatory as to extort the approval of his opponents. Chief-Justice Marshall, an extreme Federalist, remarks, in his "Life of Washington," that this correspondence lessened the hostility of Jefferson's opponents without diminishing the attachment of his friends. Five days after his release from office he set out for home, having been secretary of state three years and ten months.

All his interest in the cultivation of the soil now returned to him, and he supposed his public life ended forever. In September, 1794, after the retirement of Hamilton from the cabinet, Washington invited Jefferson to go abroad as special envoy to Spain; but he declined, declaring that "no circumstances would evermore tempt him to engage in anything public." Nevertheless, in 1796, Washington having refused to serve a third term in the presidency, he allowed his name to be



used as that of a candidate for the succession. The contest was embittered by the unpopularity of the Jay treaty with Great Britain. Jefferson had desired the rejection of the treaty, and he remained always of the opinion that by its rejection the government of the United States might at length have secured "a respect for our neutral rights" without a war. Jefferson had a narrow escape from being elected to the presidency in 1796. John Adams received seventy-one electoral votes, and Jefferson sixty-eight, a result that, as the law then stood, gave him the vice-presidency. In view of the duties about to devolve upon him, he began to prepare, chiefly for his own guidance in the chair of the senate, his "Manual of Parliamentary Practice," a code that still substantially governs all our deliberative bodies. He deeply felt the importance of such rules, believing that when strictly enforced they operated as a check on the majority, and gave "shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power." Jefferson much enjoyed the office of vice-president, partly from the interest he took in the art of legislation and partly because his presidency of the Philosophical society brought him into agreeable relations with the most able minds of the country. He took no part whatever in the administration of the government, as Mr. Adams ceased to consult him on political measures almost immediately after his inauguration. The administration of Adams, so turbulent and eventful, inflamed party spirit to an extreme degree. The reactionary policy of Hamilton and his friends had full scope, as is shown by the passage of the alien and sedition laws, and by the warlike preparations against France. During the first three years Jefferson endeavored in various ways to influence the public mind, and thus to neutralize in some degree the active and aggressive spirit of Hamilton. He was clearly of opinion that the alien and sedition laws were not merely unconstitutional, but were so subversive of fundamental human rights as to justify a nullification of them. The Kentucky resolutions of 1798, in which his abhorrence of those laws was expressed, were originally drawn by him at the request of James



Madison and Col. W. C. Nicholas. "These gentlemen," Jefferson once wrote, "pressed me strongly to sketch resolutions against the constitutionality of those laws." In consequence he drew and delivered them to Col. Nicholas, who introduced them into the legislature of Kentucky, and kept the secret of their authorship. These resolutions, read in the light of the events of 1798, will not now be disapproved by any person of republican convictions; they remain, and will long remain, one of the most interesting and valuable contributions to the science of free government. It is fortunate that this commentary upon the alien and sedition laws was written by a man so firm and so moderate, who possessed at once the erudition, the wisdom, and the feeling that the subject demanded.

Happily the presidential election of 1800 freed the country from those laws without a convulsion. Through the unskilful politics of Hamilton and the adroit management of the New York election by Aaron Burr, Mr. Adams was defeated for reelection, the electoral vote resulting thus: Jefferson, 73; Burr, 73; Adams, 65; Charles C. Pinckney, 64; Jay, 1. This strange result threw the election into the house of representatives, where the Federalists endeavored to elect Burr to the first office—an unworthy intrigue, which Hamilton honorably opposed. After a period of excitement, which seemed at times fraught with peril to the Union, the election was decided as the people meant it should be: Thomas Jefferson became president of the United States and Aaron Burr vice-president. The inauguration was celebrated throughout the country as a national holiday; soldiers paraded, church-bells rang, orations were delivered, and in some of the newspapers the Declaration of Independence was printed at length. Jefferson's first thought on coming to the presidency was to assuage the violence of party spirit, and he composed his fine inaugural address with that view. He reminded his fellow-citizens that a difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. "We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." He may have had Hamilton in mind in writing this sentence, and, in truth, his inaugural was the briefest and strongest summary he could pen of his

argument against Hamilton when both were in Washington's cabinet. "Some honest men," said he, "fear that a republican government cannot be strong—that this government is not strong enough. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern." Among the first acts of President Jefferson was his pardoning every man who was in durance under the sedition law, which he said he considered to be "a nullity as absolute and palpable as if congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image." To the chief victims of the alien law, such as Kosciuszko and Volney, he addressed friendly, consoling letters. Dr. Priestley, menaced with expulsion under the alien law, he invited to the White House. He wrote a noble letter to the venerable Samuel Adams, of Massachusetts, who had been avoided and insulted during the recent contest. He gave Thomas Paine, outlawed in England and living on sufferance in Paris, a passage home in a national ship. He appointed as his cabinet James Madison, secretary of state; Albert Gallatin, secretary of the treasury; Henry Dearborn, secretary of war; Robert Smith, secretary of the navy; Gideon Granger, postmaster-general; Levi Lincoln, attorney-general—all of whom were men of liberal education. With his cabinet he lived during the whole of his two terms in perfect harmony, and at the end he declared that if he had to choose again he would select the same individuals. With regard to appointments and removals the new president found himself in an embarrassing position, as all our presidents have done. Most of the offices were held by Federalists, and many of his own partisans expected removals enough to establish an equality. Jefferson resisted the demand. He made a few removals for strong and obvious reasons; but he acted uniformly on the principle that a difference of politics was not a reason for the removal of a competent and faithful subordinate. The few removals that he made were either for official misconduct, or, to use his own language, "active and bitter opposition to the order of things which the public will has established." He abolished at once the weekly levee at the White House, as well as the system of precedence that had been copied from the court etiquette of Europe. When congress assembled he sent

them a message, instead of delivering to them a speech, which had the effect of preventing, as he remarked, "the bloody conflict to which the making an answer would have committed them." He abolished also all the usages that savored of royalty, such as the conveyance of ministers in national vessels, the celebration of his own birthday by a public ball, the appointment of fasts and thanksgiving-days, the making of public tours and official visits. He refused to receive, while traveling, any mark of attention that would not have been paid to him as a private citizen, his object being both to republicanize and secularize the government completely. He declined also to use the pardoning power unless the judges who had tried the criminal signed the petition. He refused also to notice in any way the abuse of hostile newspapers, desiring, as he said, to give the world a proof that "an administration which has nothing to conceal from the press has nothing to fear from it."

A few of the acts of Mr. Jefferson's administration, which includes a great part of the history of the United States for eight years, stand out boldly and brilliantly. That navy which had been created by the previous administration against France, Jefferson at once reduced by putting all but six of its vessels out of commission. He despatched four of the remaining six to the Mediterranean to overawe the Barbary pirates, who had been preying upon American commerce for twenty years; and Decatur and his heroic comrades executed their task with a gallantry and success which the American people have not forgotten. The purchase of Louisiana was a happy result of the president's tact and promptitude in availing himself of a golden chance. Bonaparte, in pursuit of his early policy of undoing the work of the seven-years' war, had acquired the vast unknown territory west of the Mississippi, then vaguely called Louisiana. This policy he had avowed, and he was preparing an expedition to hold New Orleans and settle the adjacent country. At the same time, the people of Kentucky, who, through the obstinate folly of the Spanish governor, were practically denied access to the ocean, were inflamed with discontent. At this juncture, in the spring of 1803, hostilities were renewed between France and England, which compelled Bonaparte to abandon the expedition which was ready to sail, and he determined to raise money by selling Louisiana to the United States. At the happiest possible moment for a



W. Jefferson returns to Mrs Smith the two little volumes  
of poems with the thanks of the family of Monticello for the com-  
munication of them. he is also charged with an apology for the  
soiling of the pages of Dr Drake & his patient, which one of the  
little ones was required by her Mama to get by heart as an  
useful lesson for her. he salutes Mrs Smith with friendships  
& respect.

Oct. 19. 07.

successful negotiation, Mr. Jefferson's special envoy, James Monroe, arrived in Paris, charged with full powers, and alive to the new and pressing importance of the transfer, and a few hours of friendly parleying sufficed to secure to the United States this superb domain, one of the most valuable on the face of the globe. Bonaparte demanded fifty millions of francs. Marbois, his negotiator, asked a hundred millions, but dropped to sixty, with the condition that the United States should assume all just claims upon the territory. Thus, for the trivial sum of little more than \$15,000,000, the United States secured the most important acquisition of territory that was ever made by purchase. Both parties were satisfied with the bargain. "This accession," said the first consul, "strengthens forever the power of the United States, and I have just given to England a maritime rival that will sooner or later humble her pride." The popularity of the administration soon became such that the opposition was reduced to insignificance, and the president was re-elected by a greatly increased majority. In the house of representatives the Federalists shrank at length to a little band of twenty-seven, and in the senate to five. Jefferson seriously feared that there would not be sufficient opposition to furnish the close and ceaseless criticism that the public good required. His second term was less peaceful and less fortunate. During the long contest between Bonaparte and the allied powers the infractions of neutral rights were so frequent and so exasperating that perhaps Jefferson alone, aided by his fine temper and detestation of war, could have kept the infant republic out of the brawl. When the English ship "Leopard," within hearing of Old Point Comfort, poured broadsides into the American frigate "Chesapeake," all unprepared and unsuspecting, killing three men and wounding eighteen, parties ceased to exist in the United States, and every voice that was audible clamored for bloody reprisals. "I had only to open my hand," wrote Jefferson once, "and let havoc loose." There was a period in 1807 when he expected war both with Spain and Great Britain, and his confidential correspondence with Madison shows that he meant to make the contest self-compensating. He meditated a scheme for removing the Spanish flag to a more comfortable distance by the annexation of Florida, Mexico, and Cuba, and thus obtaining late redress for twenty-five years of intrigue and

injury. A partial reparation by Great Britain postponed the contest. Yet the offences were repeated; no American ship was safe from violation, and no American sailor from impressment. This state of things induced Jefferson to recommend congress to suspend commercial intercourse with the belligerents, his object being "to introduce between nations another umpire than arms." The embargo of 1807, which continued to the end of his second term, imposed upon the commercial states a test too severe for human nature patiently to endure. It was frequently violated, and did not accomplish the object proposed. To the end of his life Jefferson was of opinion that, if the whole people had risen to the height of his endeavor, if the merchants had strictly observed the embargo, and the educated class given it a cordial support, it would have saved the country the second war of 1812, and extorted, what that war did not give us, a formal and explicit concession of neutral rights.

On 4 March, 1809, after a nearly continuous public service of forty-four years, Jefferson retired to private life, so seriously impoverished that he was not sure of being allowed to leave Washington without arrest by his creditors. The embargo, by preventing the exportation of tobacco, had reduced his private income two thirds, and, in the peculiar circumstances of Washington, his official salary was insufficient. Since I have become sensible of this deficit," he wrote, "I have been under an agony of mortification." A timely loan from a Richmond bank relieved him temporarily from his distress, but he remained to the end of his days more or less embarrassed in his circumstances. Leaving the presidency in the hands of James Madison, with whom he was in the most complete sympathy and with whom he continued to be in active correspondence, he was still a power in the nation. Madison and Monroe were his neighbors and friends, and both of them administered the government on principles that he cordially approved. As has been frequently remarked, they were three men and one system. On retiring to Monticello in 1809, Jefferson was sixty-six years of age, and had seventeen years to live. His daughter Martha and her husband resided with him, they and their numerous brood of children, six daughters and five sons, to whom was now added Francis Eppes, the son of his daughter Maria, who had died in 1804. Surrounded thus by children



and grandchildren, he spent the leisure of his declining years in endeavoring to establish in Virginia a system of education to embrace all the children of his native state. In this he was most zealously and ably assisted by his friend, Joseph C. Cabell, a member of the Virginia senate. What he planned in the study, Cabell supported in the legislature; and then in turn Jefferson would advocate Cabell's bill by one of his ingenious and exhaustive letters, which would go the rounds of the Virginia press. The correspondence of these two patriots on the subject of education in Virginia was afterward published in an octavo of 528 pages, a noble monument to the character of both. Jefferson appealed to every motive, including self-interest, urging his scheme upon the voter as a "provision for his family to the remotest posterity." He did not live long enough to see his system of common schools established in Virginia, but the university, which was to crown that system, a darling dream of his heart for forty years, he beheld in successful operation. His friend Cabell, with infinite difficulty, induced the legislature to expend \$300,000 in the work of construction, and to appropriate \$15,000 a year toward the support of the institution. Jefferson personally superintended every detail of the construction. He engaged workmen, bought bricks, and selected the trees to be felled for timber. In March, 1825, the institution was opened with forty students, a number which was increased to 177 at the beginning of the second year. The institution has continued its beneficent work to the present day, and still bears the imprint of Jefferson's mind. It has no president, except that one of the professors is elected chairman of the faculty. The university bestows no rewards and no honors, and attendance upon all religious services is voluntary. His intention was to hold every student to his responsibility as a man and a citizen, and to permit him to enjoy all the liberty of other citizens in the same community. Toward the close of his life Jefferson became distressingly embarrassed in his circumstances. In 1814 he sold his library to congress for \$23,000—about one fourth of its value. A few years afterward he endorsed a twenty-thousand-dollar note for a friend and neighbor whom he could not refuse, and who soon became bankrupt. This loss, which added \$1,200 a year to his expenses, completed his ruin, and he was in danger of being compelled to surrender Monticello and seek shelter for his last

days in another abode. Philip Hone, mayor of New York, raised for him, in 1826, \$8,500, to which Philadelphia added \$5,000 and Baltimore \$3,000. He was deeply touched by the spontaneous generosity of his countrymen. "No cent of this," he wrote, "is wrung from the tax-payer. It is the pure and unsolicited offering of love." He retained his health nearly to his last days, and had the happiness of living to the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. He died at twenty minutes to one P. M., 4 July, 1826. John Adams died a few hours later on the same day, saying, just before he breathed his last, "Thomas Jefferson still lives." He was buried in his



own grave-yard at Monticello, beneath a stone upon which was engraved an inscription prepared by his own hand: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and Father of the University of Virginia." He died solvent, for the sale of his estate discharged his debts to the uttermost farthing. His daughter and her children lost their home

and had no means of support. Their circumstances becoming known, the legislature of South Carolina and Virginia each voted her a gift of \$10,000, which gave peace and dignity to the remainder of her life. She died in 1836, aged sixty-three, leaving numerous descendants.

The writings of Thomas Jefferson were published by order of Congress in 1853, under the editorial supervision of Henry A. Washington 9 vols., 8vo. (Washington, D. C., 1853). This publication, which leaves much to be desired by the student of American history, includes his autobiography, treatises, essays, selections from his correspondence, official reports, messages, and addresses. Two score years later Prof. Washington's work was superseded by "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, comprising his Public Papers and his Private Correspondence, including Numerous Letters and Documents, now for the First Time Printed," edited by Paul L. Ford, 10 vols., 8vo. (vols. I-IV. New York, 1894). The most extensive biography of Jefferson is that of Henry S. Randall (3 vols., New York, 1858). See also the excellent work of Prof.

George Tucker, of the University of Virginia, "The Life of Thomas Jefferson" (2 vols., Philadelphia and London, 1837); "The Life of Thomas Jefferson," by James Parton (Boston, 1874); and "Thomas Jefferson," by John T. Morse, Jr., "American Statesmen" series (Boston, 1883). A work of singular interest is "The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson," by his great-granddaughter, Sarah N. Randolph (New York, 1871). Jefferson's "Manual of Parliamentary Practice" has been repeatedly republished; the Washington edition of 1871 is among the most recent. Consult also the "Memoirs, Correspondence, and Miscellanies of Thomas Jefferson," by Thomas J. Randolph (4 vols., Boston, 1830), and the "History of the United States, by Henry Adams, Vols. I to IV, Jefferson's Administration, 1801-1809" (New York, 1889, 1890). The lovers of detail must not overlook "Jefferson at Monticello," compiled by Rev. Hamilton W. Pierson, D. D., of Kentucky, from conversations with Edmund Bacon, who was for twenty years Jefferson's steward and overseer. The correspondence between Jefferson and Cabell upon education in Virginia is very rare. An impression of President Jefferson's seal, shown in the illustration on page 77, from which the vignette is copied, was in the possession of the late historian George Bancroft.

The portraits of Jefferson, which were as numerous in his own time as those of a reigning monarch usually are, may well baffle the inquirer who would know the express image of his face and person. They differ greatly from one another, as in truth he changed remarkably in appearance as he advanced in life, being in youth raw-boned, freckled, and somewhat ungainly, in early manhood better looking, and in later life becoming almost handsome—in friendly eyes. The portrait by Rembrandt Peale, taken in 1803, which now hangs in the library of the New York historical society, is perhaps the most pleasing of the later pictures of him now accessible. The portrait by Matthew Brown, painted for John Adams in 1786, and engraved for this work, has the merit of presenting him in the prime of his years. Daniel Webster's minute description of his countenance and figure at fourscore was not accepted by Mr. Jefferson's grandchildren as conveying the true impression of the man. "Never in my life," wrote one of them, "did I see his countenance distorted by a single bad passion or un-

worthy feeling. I have seen the expression of suffering, bodily and mental, of grief, pain, sadness, just indignation, disappointment, disagreeable surprise, and displeasure, but never of anger, impatience, peevishness, discontent, to say nothing of worse or more ignoble emotions. To the contrary, it was impossible to look on his face without being struck with its benevolent, intelligent, cheerful, and placid expression. It was at once intellectual, good, kind, and pleasant, whilst his tall, spare figure spoke of health, activity, and that *helpfulness*, that power and will, 'never to trouble another for what he could do himself,' which marked his character."

His wife, MARTHA WAYLES, born in Charles City county, Va., 19 Oct., 1748; died at Monticello, near Charlottesville, Va., 6 Sept., 1782, was the daughter of John Wayles, a wealthy lawyer, from whom she inherited a large property. Her first husband, Bathurst Skelton, died before she was twenty years of age, and Mr. Jefferson was one of her many suitors. She is described as very beautiful, a little above middle height, auburn-haired, and of a dignified carriage. She was well educated for her day, and a constant reader. Previous to her second marriage, while her mind seemed still undecided as to which of her many lovers would be accepted, two of them met accidentally in the hall of her father's house. They were about to enter the drawing-room when the sound of music caught their ear. The voices of Jefferson and Mrs. Skelton, accompanied by her harpsichord and his violin, were recognized, and the disconcerted lovers, after exchanging a glance, took their hats and departed. She married Mr. Jefferson in 1772. He retained a romantic devotion for her throughout his life, and because of her failing health refused foreign appointments in 1776, and again in 1781, having promised that he would accept no public office that would involve their separation. For four months previous to her death he was never out of calling, and he was insensible for several hours after that event. Two of their children died in infancy, Martha, Mary, and Lucy Elizabeth surviving, the latter dying in early girlhood.

MARTHA, born at Monticello in September, 1772; died in Albemarle county, Va., 27 Sept., 1836, after the death of her mother accompanied her father to Europe in 1784 and re-

mained several years in a convent, until her desire to adopt a religious life induced her father to remove her from the school. In the autumn of the same year (1789) she married her cousin, Thomas Mann Randolph, afterward governor of Virginia, and, being engrossed with the cares of her large family, passed only a portion of her time in the White House, which she visited with her husband and children in 1802, with her sister in 1803, and during the winter of 1805-'6. After the retirement of Mr. Jefferson she devoted much of her life to his declining years. He describes her as the "cherished companion of his youth and the nurse of his old age," and shortly before his death remarked that the "last pang of life was parting with her." After the business reverses and

the death of her father and husband, she contemplated establishing a school, but was relieved from the necessity by a donation of \$10,000 each from South Carolina and Virginia. She left a large family of sons and daughters, whom she carefully educated. The accompanying portrait represents Mrs. Randolph. There is no known portrait of Mrs. Jefferson.—Her sister, MARY, born at Monticello, 1 Aug., 1778; died in Albemarle county, Va., 17 April, 1804, was also educated in the convent at Panthemont, France, and is described, in a letter of




*Mrs Randolph*

Mrs. Abigail Adams, "as one of the most beautiful and remarkable children she had ever known." She married her cousin, John Wayles Eppes, early in life, but was prevented by delicate health from the enjoyment of social life. She spent the second winter of Mr. Jefferson's first term with her sister as mistress of the White House. She left two children, one of whom, Francis, survived.—Jefferson's last surviving granddaughter, Mrs. Septima Randolph Meikleham, died in Washington, D. C., on 16 Sept., 1887. See "The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson," by Miss Sarah N. Randolph (New York, 1871).

## JAMES MADISON.

JAMES MADISON, fourth president of the United States, born in Port Conway, Va., 16 March, 1751; died at Montpelier, Orange co., Va., 28 June, 1836. His earliest paternal ancestor in Virginia seems to have been John Madison, who, in 1653, took out a patent for land between the North and York rivers on Chesapeake bay. There was a Capt. Isaac Madison in Virginia in 1623-'5, but his relationship to John Madison is matter of doubt. John's son, named also John, was father of Ambrose Madison, who married, 24 Aug., 1721, Frances, daughter of James Taylor, of Orange county, Va. Frances had four brothers, one of whom, Zachary, was grandfather of Zachary Taylor, twelfth president of the United States. The eldest child of Ambrose and Frances was James Madison, born 27 March, 1723, who married, 15 Sept., 1749, Nelly Conway, of Port Conway. The eldest child of James and Nelly was James, the subject of this article, who was the first of twelve children. His ancestors, as he says himself in a note furnished to Dr. Lyman C. Draper in 1834, "were not among the most wealthy of the country, but in independent and comfortable circumstances." James's education was begun at an excellent school kept by a Scotchman named Donald Robertson, and his studies, preparatory for college, were completed at home under the care of the Rev. Thomas Martin, clergyman of the parish. He was graduated at Princeton in 1772, and remained there another year, devoting himself to the study of Hebrew. On returning home, he occupied himself with history, law, and theology, while teaching his brothers and sisters. Of the details of his youthful studies little is known, but his industry must have been very great; for, in spite of the early age at which he became absorbed in the duties of public life, the range and solidity of his acquirements were extraordinary. For minute and thorough knowledge of ancient and modern



*James Madison*





history and of constitutional law he was unequalled among the Americans of the Revolutionary period; only Hamilton, and perhaps Ellsworth and Marshall, approached him in this regard. For precocity of mental development he resembled Hamilton and the younger Pitt, and, like Washington, he was distinguished in youth for soundness of judgment, keenness of perception, and rare capacity for work. Along with these admirable qualities, his lofty integrity and his warm interest in public affairs were well known to the people of Orange, so that when, in the autumn of 1774, it was thought necessary to appoint a committee of safety, Madison was its youngest member. Early in 1776 he was chosen a delegate to the State convention, which met at Williamsburg in May. The first business of the convention was to instruct the Virginia delegation in the Continental congress with regard to an immediate declaration of independence. Next came the work of making a constitution for the state, and Madison was one of the special committee appointed to deal with this problem. Here one of his first acts was highly characteristic. Religious liberty was a matter that strongly enlisted his feelings. When it was proposed that, under the new constitution, "all men should enjoy the fullest toleration in the exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience," Madison pointed out that this provision did not go to the root of the matter. The free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, is something which every man may demand as a right, not something for which he must ask as a privilege. To grant to the state the power of tolerating is implicitly to grant to it the power of prohibiting, whereas Madison would deny to it any jurisdiction whatever in the matter of religion. The clause in the bill of rights, as finally adopted at his suggestion, accordingly declares that "all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience." The incident illustrates not only Madison's liberality of spirit, but also his precision and forethought in so drawing up an instrument as to make it mean all that it was intended to mean. In his later career these qualities were especially brilliant and useful. Madison was elected a member of the first legislature under the new state constitution, but he failed of re-election because he refused to solicit votes or to furnish whiskey for thirsty voters. The new legislature then elected him a mem-

ber of the governor's council, and in 1780 he was sent as delegate to the Continental congress. The high consideration in which he was held showed itself in the number of important committees to which he was appointed. As chairman of a committee for drawing up instructions for John Jay, then minister at the court of Madrid, he insisted that, in making a treaty with Spain, our right to the free navigation of the Mississippi river should on no account be surrendered. Mr. Jay was instructed accordingly, but toward the end of 1780 the pressure of the war upon the southern states increased the desire for an alliance with Spain to such a point that they seemed ready to purchase it at any price. Virginia, therefore, proposed that the surrender of our rights upon the Mississippi should be offered to Spain as the condition of an offensive and defensive alliance. Such a proposal was no doubt ill-advised. Since Spain was already, on her own account and to the best of her ability, waging war upon Great Britain in the West Indies and Florida, to say nothing of Gibraltar, it is doubtful if she could have done much more for the United States, even if we had offered her the whole Mississippi valley. The offer of a permanent and invaluable right in exchange for a temporary and questionable advantage seemed to Mr. Madison very unwise; but as it was then generally held that in such matters representatives must be bound by the wishes of their constituents, he yielded, though under protest. But hardly had the fresh instructions been despatched to Mr. Jay when the overthrow of Cornwallis again turned the scale, and Spain was informed that, as concerned the Mississippi question, congress was immovable. The foresight and sound judgment shown by Mr. Madison in this discussion added much to his reputation.

His next prominent action related to the impost law proposed in 1783. This was, in some respects, the most important question of the day. The chief source of the weakness of the United States during the Revolutionary war had been the impossibility of raising money by means of Federal taxation. As long as money could be raised only through requisitions upon the state governments, and the different states could not be brought to agree upon any method of enforcing the requisitions, the state governments were sure to prove delinquent. Finding it impossible to obtain money for carrying on the war, congress had resorted to the issue of large quantities of incon-

vertible paper, with the natural results. There had been a rapid inflation of values, followed by sudden bankruptcy and the prostration of national credit. In 1783 it had become difficult to obtain foreign loans, and at home the government could not raise nearly enough money to defray its current expenses. To remedy the evil a tariff of five per cent. upon sundry imports, with a specific duty upon others, was proposed in congress and offered to the several states for approval. To weaken as much as possible the objections to such a law, its operation was limited to twenty-five years. Even in this mild form, however, it was impossible to persuade the several states to submit to Federal taxation. Virginia at first assented to the impost law, but afterward revoked her action. On this occasion Mr. Madison, feeling that the very existence of the nation was at stake, refused to be controlled by the action of his constituents. He persisted in urging the necessity of such an impost law, and eventually had the satisfaction of seeing Virginia adopt his view of the matter.

The discussion of the impost law in congress revealed the antagonism that existed between the slave-states and those states which had emancipated their slaves. In endeavoring to apportion equitably the quotas of revenue to be required of the several states, it was observed that, if taxation were to be distributed according to population, it made a great difference whether or not slaves were to be counted as population. If slaves were to be counted, the southern states would have to pay more than their equitable share into the treasury of the general government; if slaves were not to be counted, it was argued at the north that they would be paying less than their equitable share. Consequently at that time the northern states were inclined to maintain that the slaves were population, while the south preferred to regard them as chattels. The question was settled by a compromise that was proposed by Mr. Madison; according to this arrangement the slaves were rated as population, but in such wise that five of them were counted as three persons.

In 1784 Mr. Madison was again elected to the Virginia legislature, an office then scarcely inferior in dignity, and superior in influence, to that of delegate to the Continental congress. His efforts were steadfastly devoted to the preparation and advocacy of measures that were calculated to increase the

strength of the Federal government. He supported the proposed amendment to the articles of confederation, giving to congress control over the foreign trade of the states; and, pending the adoption of such a measure, he secured in that body the passage of a port bill restricting the entry of foreign ships to certain specified ports. The purpose of this was to facilitate the collection of revenue, but it was partially defeated in its operation by successive amendments increasing the number of ports. While the weakness of the general government and the need for strengthening it were daily growing more apparent, the question of religious liberty was the subject of earnest discussion in the Virginia legislature. An attempt was made to lay a tax upon all the people of that state "for the support of teachers of the Christian religion." At first Madison was almost the only one to see clearly the serious danger lurking in such a tax; that it would be likely to erect a state church and curtail men's freedom of belief and worship. Mr. Madison's position here well illustrated the remark that intelligent persistence is capable of making one person a majority. His energetic opposition resulted at first in postponing the measure. Then he wrote a "Memorial and Remonstrance," setting forth its dangerous character with wonderful clearness and cogency. He sent this paper all over the state for signatures, and in the course of a twelvemonth had so educated the people that, in the election of 1785, the question of religious freedom was made a test question, and in the ensuing session the dangerous bill was defeated, and in place thereof it was enacted "that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess and, by argument, maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities." In thus abolishing religious tests Virginia came to the front among all the American states, as Massachusetts had come to the front in the abolition of negro slavery. Nearly all the states still imposed religious tests upon civil office-holders, from simply declaring a general belief in the infallibleness of the Bible, to accepting the doctrine of the Trinity. Madison's "Religious Freedom Act" was

translated into French and Italian, and was widely read and commented upon in Europe. In our own history it set a most valuable precedent for other states to follow.

The attitude of Mr. Madison with regard to paper money was also very important. The several states had then the power of issuing promissory notes and making them a legal tender, and many of them shamefully abused this power. The year 1786 witnessed perhaps the most virulent craze for paper money that has ever attacked the American people. In Virginia the masterly reasoning and the resolute attitude of a few great political leaders saved the state from yielding to the delusion, and among these leaders Mr. Madison was foremost. But his most important work in the Virginia legislature was that which led directly to the Annapolis convention, and thus ultimately to the framing of the constitution of the United States. The source from which such vast results were to flow was the necessity of an agreement between Maryland and Virginia with regard to the navigation of the Potomac river, and the collection of duties at ports on its banks. Commissioners appointed by the two states to discuss this question, met early in 1785 and recommended that a uniform tariff should be adopted and enforced upon both banks. But a further question, also closely connected with the navigation of the Potomac, now came up for discussion. The tide of westward migration had for some time been pouring over the Alleghanies, and, owing to complications with the Spanish power in the Mississippi valley, there was some danger that the United States might not be able to keep its hold upon the new settlements. It was necessary to strengthen the commercial ties between east and west, and to this end the Potomac company was formed for the purpose of improving the navigation of the upper waters of the Potomac and connecting them by good roads and canals with the upper waters of the Ohio at Pittsburg—an enterprise which, in due course of time, resulted in the Chesapeake and Ohio canal.

The first president of the Potomac company was George Washington, who well understood that the undertaking was quite as important in its political as in its commercial bearings. At the same time it was proposed to connect the Potomac and Delaware rivers with a canal, and a company was organized for this purpose. This made it desirable that the four states—

Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania—should agree upon the laws for regulating interstate traffic through this system of water-ways. But from this it was but a short step to the conclusion that, since the whole commercial system of the United States confessedly needed overhauling, it might perhaps be as well for all the thirteen states to hold a convention for considering the matter. When such a suggestion was communicated from the legislature of Maryland to that of Virginia, it afforded Mr. Madison the opportunity for which he had been eagerly waiting. Some time before he had prepared a resolution for the appointment of commissioners to confer with commissioners from the other states concerning the trade of the country and the advisableness of intrusting its regulation to the Federal government. This resolution Mr. Madison left to be offered to the assembly by some one less conspicuously identified with federalist opinions than himself; and it was accordingly presented by Mr. Tyler, father of the future president of that name. The motion was unfavorably received and was laid upon the table, but when the message came from Maryland the matter was reconsidered and the resolution passed. Annapolis was selected as the place for the convention, which assembled on 11 Sept., 1786. Only five states—Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York—were represented at the meeting. Maryland, which had first suggested the convention, had seen the appointed time arrive without even taking the trouble to select commissioners. As the representation was so inadequate, the convention thought it best to defer action, and accordingly adjourned after adopting an address to the states, which was prepared by Alexander Hamilton. The address incorporated a suggestion from New Jersey, which indefinitely enlarged the business to be treated by such a convention; it was to deal not only with the regulation of commerce, but with “other important matters.” Acting upon this cautious hint, the address recommended the calling of a second convention, to be held at Philadelphia on the second Monday of May, 1787. Mr. Madison was one of the commissioners at Annapolis, and was very soon appointed a delegate to the new convention, along with Washington, Randolph, Mason, and others. The avowed purpose of the new convention was to “devise such provisions as shall appear necessary to render the constitution of the Federal govern-

ment adequate to the exigencies of the Union, and to report to congress such an act as, when agreed to by them and confirmed by the legislatures of every state, would effectually provide for the same." The report of the Annapolis commissioners was brought before congress in October, in the hope that congress would earnestly recommend to the several states the course of action therein suggested. At first the objections to the plan prevailed in congress, but the events of the winter went far toward persuading men in all parts of the country that the only hope of escaping anarchy lay in a thorough revision of the imperfect scheme of government under which we were then living. The paper-money craze in so many of the states, the violent proceedings in the Rhode Island legislature, the riots in Vermont and New Hampshire, the Shays rebellion in Massachusetts, the dispute with Spain about the navigation of the Mississippi, and the consequent imminent danger of separation between north and south, had all come together; and now the last ounce was laid upon the camel's back in the failure of the impost amendment. In February, 1787, just as Mr. Madison, who had been chosen a delegate to congress, arrived in New York, the legislature of that state refused its assent to the amendment, which was thus defeated. Thus, only three months before the time designated for the meeting of the Philadelphia convention, congress was decisively informed that it would not be allowed to take any effectual measures for raising a revenue. This accumulation of difficulties made congress more ready to listen to the arguments of Mr. Madison, and presently congress itself proposed a convention at Philadelphia identical with the one recommended by the Annapolis commissioners, and thus in its own way sanctioned their action.

The assembling of the convention at Philadelphia was an event to which Mr. Madison, by persistent energy and skill, had contributed more than any other man in the country, with the possible exception of Alexander Hamilton. For the noble political structure reared by the convention, it was Madison that furnished the basis. Before the convention met he laid before his colleagues of the Virginia delegation the outlines of the scheme that was presented to the convention as the "Virginia plan." Of the delegates, Edmund Randolph was then governor of Virginia, and it was he that presented the plan,

and made the opening speech in defence of it, but its chief author was Madison. This "Virginia plan" struck directly at the root of the evils from which our Federal government had suffered under the articles of confederation. The weakness of that government had consisted in the fact that it operated only upon states and not upon individuals. Only states, not individuals, were represented in the Continental congress, which accordingly resembled a European congress rather than an English parliament. The delegates to the Continental congress were more like envoys from sovereign states than like members of a legislative body. They might deliberate and advise, but had no means of enforcing their will upon the several state governments; and hence they could neither raise a revenue nor preserve order. In forming the new government, this fundamental difficulty was met first by the creation of a legislative body representing population instead of states, and secondly by the creation of a Federal executive and a Federal judiciary. Thus arose that peculiar state of things so familiar to Americans, but so strange to Europeans that they find it hard to comprehend it: the state of things in which every individual lives under two complete and well-rounded systems of laws—the state law and the Federal law—each with its legislature, its executive, and its judiciary, moving one within the other. It was one of the longest reaches of constructive statesmanship ever known in the world, and the credit of it is due to Madison more than to any other one man. To him we chiefly owe the luminous conception of the two co-existing and harmonious spheres of government, although the constitution, as actually framed, was the result of skilful compromises by which the Virginia plan was modified and improved in many important points. In its original shape that plan went further toward national consolidation than the constitution as adopted. It contemplated a national legislature to be composed of two houses, but both the upper and the lower house were to represent population instead of states. Here it encountered fierce opposition from the smaller states, under the lead of New Jersey, until the matter was settled by the famous Connecticut compromise, according to which the upper house was to represent states, while the lower house represented population. Madison's original scheme, moreover, would have allowed the national legislature to set aside at dis-



cretion such state laws as it might deem unconstitutional. It seems strange to find Madison, who afterward drafted the Virginia resolutions of 1798, now suggesting and defending a provision so destructive of state rights. It shows how strongly he was influenced at the time by the desire to put an end to the prevailing anarchy. The discussion of this matter in the convention, as we read it to-day, brings out in a very strong light the excellence of the arrangement finally adopted, by which the constitutionality of state laws is left to be determined through the decisions of the Federal supreme court.

In all the discussions in the Federal convention Mr. Madison naturally took a leading part. Besides the work of cardinal importance which he achieved as principal author of the Virginia plan, especial mention must be made of the famous compromise that adjusted the distribution of representatives between the northern and the southern states. We have seen that in the congress of 1783, when it was a question of taxation, the south was inclined to regard slaves as chattels, while the north preferred to regard them as population. Now, when it had come to be a question of the apportionment of representation, the case was reversed: it was the south that wished to count slaves as population, while the north insisted that they should be classed as chattels. Here Mr. Madison proposed the same compromise that had succeeded in congress four years before; and Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina, who had supported him on the former occasion, could hardly do otherwise than come again to his side. It was agreed that in counting population, whether for direct taxation or for representation in the lower house of congress, five slaves should be reckoned as three individuals. In the history of the formation of our Federal Union this compromise was of cardinal importance. Without it the Union would undoubtedly have gone to pieces at the outset, and it was for this reason that the northern abolitionists, Gouverneur Morris and Rufus King, joined with Washington and Madison and with the pro-slavery Pinckneys in subscribing to it. Some of the evils resulting from this compromise have led historians, writing from the abolitionist point of view, to condemn it utterly. Nothing can be clearer, however, than that, in order to secure the adoption of the constitution, it was absolutely necessary to satisfy South Carolina. This was proved by the course of events in 1788,

when there was a strong party in Virginia in favor of a separate confederacy of southern states. By South Carolina's prompt ratification of the constitution this scheme was completely defeated, and a most formidable obstacle to the formation of a more perfect union was removed. Of all the compromises in American history, this of the so-called "three-fifths rule" was probably the most important: until the beginning of the civil war there was hardly a political movement of any consequence not affected by it.

Mr. Madison's services in connection with the founding of our Federal government were thus, up to this point, of the most transcendent kind. We have seen that he played a leading part in the difficult work of getting a convention to assemble; the merit of this he shares with other eminent men, and notably with Washington and Hamilton. Then, he was chief author of the most fundamental features in the constitution, those which transformed our government from a loose confederacy of states into a Federal nation; and to him is due the principal credit for the compromise that made the adoption of



*James Madison*

the constitution possible for all the states. After the adjournment of the convention his services did not cease. Among those whose influence in bringing about the ratification of the constitution was felt all over the country, he shares with Hamilton the foremost place. The "Federalist," their joint production, is probably the greatest treatise on political science that has ever appeared in the world, at once the most practical and the most profound. The evenness with which the merits of this work are shared between Madison and Hamilton is well illustrated

by the fact that it is not always easy to distinguish between the two, so that there has been considerable controversy as to the number of papers contributed by each. According to Madison's own memorandum, he was the author of twenty-nine of the papers, while fifty-one were written by Hamilton, and five by Jay. The question is not of great importance. Very probably Mr. Madison would have had a larger share in the work had he not been obliged, in March,

1788, to return to Virginia, in order to take part in the State convention for deciding upon the ratification of the constitution. The opposition in Virginia was strong and well organized, and had for leaders such eminent patriots as Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee. The debates in the convention lasted nearly a month, and for a considerable part of this time the outlook was not promising. The discussion was conducted mainly between Madison and Henry, the former being chiefly assisted by Marshall, Wythe, Randolph, Pendleton, and Henry Lee, the latter by Mason, Monroe, Harrison, and Tyler. To Mr. Madison, more than to any one else, it was due that the constitution was at length ratified, while the narrowness of the majority—89 to 79—bore witness to the severity of the contest. It did not appear that the people of Virginia were even yet convinced by the arguments that had prevailed in the convention. The assembly that met in the following October showed a heavy majority of anti-Federalists, and under Henry's leadership it called upon congress for a second National convention to reconsider the work done by the first. Senators were now to be chosen for the first U. S. senate, and Henry, in naming Richard Henry Lee and William Grayson, both anti-Federalists, as the two men who ought to be chosen, took pains to mention James Madison as the one man who on no account whatever ought to be elected senator. Henry was successful in carrying this point. The next thing was to keep Mr. Madison out of congress, and Henry's friends sought to accomplish this by means of the device afterward known as "gerrymandering"; but the attempt failed, and Madison was elected to the first national house of representatives. His great knowledge, and the part he had played in building up the framework of the government, made him from the outset the leading member of the house. His first motion was one for raising a revenue by tariff and tonnage duties. He offered the resolutions for creating the executive departments of foreign affairs, of the treasury, and of war. He proposed twelve amendments to the constitution, in order to meet the objection, urged in many quarters, that that instrument did not contain a bill of rights. The first ten of these amendments were adopted and became part of the constitution in the year 1791.

The first division of political parties under the constitution

began to show itself in the debates upon Hamilton's financial measures as secretary of the treasury, and in this division we see Madison acting as leader of the opposition. By many writers this has been regarded as indicating a radical change of attitude on his part, and sundry explanations have been offered to account for the presumed inconsistency. He has been supposed to have succumbed to the personal influence of Jefferson, and to have yielded his own convictions to the desires and prejudices of his constituents. Such explanations are hardly borne out by what we know of Mr. Madison's career up to this point; and, moreover, they are uncalled for. If we consider carefully the circumstances of the time, the presumed inconsistency in his conduct disappears. The new Republican party, of which he soon became one of the leaders, was something quite different in its attitude from the anti-Federalist party of 1787-'90. There was ample room in it for men who in these critical years had been stanch Federalists, and as time passed this came to be more and more the case, until after a quarter of a century the entire Federalist party, with the exception of a few inflexible men in New England, had been absorbed by the Republican party. In 1790, since the Federal constitution had been actually adopted, and was going into operation, and since the extent of power that it granted to the general government must be gradually tested by the discussion of specific measures, it followed that the only natural and healthful division of parties must be the division between strict and loose constructionists. It was to be expected that anti-Federalists would become strict constructionists, and so most of them did, though examples were not wanting of such men swinging to the opposite extreme of politics, and advocating an extension of the powers of the Federal government. But there was no reason in the world why a Federalist of 1787-'90 must thereafter, in order to preserve his consistency, become a loose constructionist. It was entirely consistent for a statesman to advocate the adoption of the constitution, while convinced that the powers specifically granted therein to the general government were ample, and that great care should be taken not to add indefinitely to such powers through rash and loose methods of interpretation. Not only is such an attitude perfectly reasonable in itself, but it is, in particular, the one that a principal author of the constitution would have been very likely to take;

J. M. to Mrs M. H. S

Fearing that the delay may do me in-  
-justice, I must in explanation remark, that  
your letter found me in a bad state of health,  
and that before I could avail myself of its im-  
-provement, to dispose of accumulated arrears  
of pressing sorts, the illness of Mrs. M. drew  
off my attention from every other consideration.  
I ought perhaps to have another fear, that of  
being charged with affectation in the microscopic  
hand in which I write. But the explanation is  
easy: the fingers, stiffened by age, make small-  
-er strokes, as the feet, from the same cause, take  
shorter steps. I hope delay on will lend to verify my  
sincerely.

Sept. 21. 1830



and no doubt it was just this attitude that Mr. Madison took in the early sessions of congress. The occasions on which he assumed it were, moreover, eminently proper, and afford an admirable illustration of the difference in temper and mental habit between himself and Hamilton. The latter had always more faith in the heroic treatment of political questions than Madison. The restoration of American credit in 1790 was a task that demanded heroic measures, and it was fortunate that we had such a man as Hamilton to undertake it. But undoubtedly the assumption of state debts by the Federal government, however admirably it met the emergency of the moment, was such a measure as might easily create a dangerous precedent, and there was certainly nothing strange or inconsistent in Madison's opposition to it. A similar explanation will cover his opposition to Hamilton's national bank; and indeed, with the considerations here given as a clew, there is little or nothing in Mr. Madison's career in congress that is not thoroughly intelligible. At the time, however, the Federalists, disappointed at losing a man of so much power, misunderstood his acts and misrepresented his motives, and the old friendship between him and Hamilton gave way to mutual distrust and dislike. Mr. Madison sympathized with the French revolutionists, though he did not go so far in this direction as Jefferson. In the debates upon Jay's treaty with Great Britain he led the opposition, and supported the resolution asking President Washington to submit to the house of representatives copies of the papers relating to the negotiation. The resolution was passed, but Washington refused on the ground that the making of treaties was intrusted by the constitution to the president and the senate, and that the lower house was not entitled to meddle with their work.

At the close of Washington's second administration Mr. Madison retired for a brief season from public life. During this difficult period the country had been fortunate in having, as leader of the opposition in congress, a man so wise in counsel, so temperate in spirit, and so courteous in demeanor. Whatever else might be said of Madison's conduct in opposition, it could never be called factious; it was calm, generous, and disinterested. About two years before the close of his career in congress he married Mrs. Dolly Payne Todd, a beautiful widow, much younger than himself; and about this time he seems to

have built the house at Montpelier, which was to be his home during his later years. But retirement from public life, in any real sense of the phrase, was not yet possible for such a man. The wrath of the French government over Jay's treaty led to depredations upon American shipping, to the sending of commissioners to Paris, and to the blackmailing attempts of Tal-



leyrand, as shown up in the X. Y. Z. despatches. In the fierce outbursts of indignation that in America greeted these disclosures, in the sudden desire for war with France, which went so far as to vent itself in ac-

tual fighting on the sea, though war was never declared, the Federalist party believed itself to be so strong that it proceeded at once to make one of the greatest blunders ever made by a political party, in passing the alien and sedition acts. This high-handed legislation caused a sudden revulsion of feeling in favor of the Republicans, and called forth vigorous remonstrance. Party feeling has, perhaps, never in this country been so bitter, except just before the civil war. A series of resolutions, drawn up by Mr. Madison, was adopted in 1798 by the legislature of Virginia, while a similar series, still more pronounced, drawn up by Mr. Jefferson, was adopted in the same year by the legislature of Kentucky. The Virginia resolutions asserted with truth that, in adopting the Federal constitution, the states had surrendered only a limited portion of their powers; and went on to declare that, whenever the Federal government should exceed its constitutional authority, it was the business of the state governments to interfere and pronounce such action unconstitutional. Accordingly, Virginia declared the alien and sedition laws unconstitutional, and invited the other states to join in the declaration. Not meeting with a favorable response, Virginia renewed these resolutions the next year. There was nothing necessarily seditious, or tending toward secession, in the Virginia resolutions; but the attitude assumed in them was uncalled for on the part of any state, inasmuch as there existed,



in the Federal supreme court, a tribunal competent to decide upon the constitutionality of acts of congress. The Kentucky resolutions went further. They declared that our Federal constitution was a compact, to which the several states were the one party and the Federal government was the other, and each party must decide for itself as to when the compact was infringed, and as to the proper remedy to be adopted. When the resolutions were repeated in 1799, a clause was added, which went still further and mentioned "nullification" as the suitable remedy, and one that any state might employ. In the Virginia resolutions there was neither mention nor intention of nullification as a remedy. Mr. Madison lived to witness South Carolina's attempt at nullification in 1832, and in a very able paper, written in the last year of his life, he conclusively refuted the idea that his resolutions of 1798 afforded any justification for such an attempt, and showed that what they really contemplated was a protest on the part of all the state governments in common. Doubtless such a remedy was clumsy and impracticable, and the suggestion of it does not deserve to be ranked along with Mr. Madison's best work in constructive statesmanship; but it certainly contained no logical basis for what its author unsparingly denounced as the "twin heresies" of nullification and secession.

In 1799 Mr. Madison was again elected a member of the Virginia assembly, and in 1801, at Mr. Jefferson's urgent desire, he became secretary of state. In accepting this appointment, he entered upon a new career, in many respects different from that which he had hitherto followed. His work as a constructive statesman, which was so great as to place him in the foremost rank among the men that have built up nations, was by this time substantially completed. During the next few years the constitutional questions that had hitherto occupied him played a part subordinate to that played by questions of foreign policy, and in this new sphere Mr. Madison was not, by nature or training, fitted to exercise such a controlling influence as he had formerly brought to bear in the framing of our Federal government. As secretary of state, he was an able lieutenant to Mr. Jefferson, but his genius was not that of an executive officer so much as that of a law-giver. He brought his great historical and legal learning to bear in a paper entitled "An Examination of the British Doctrine which subjects to Capture a Neutral Trade not open in the Time of Peace." But the

troubled period that followed the rupture of the treaty of Amiens was not one in which legal arguments, however masterly, counted for much in bringing angry and insolent combatants to terms. In the gigantic struggle between England and Napoleon the commerce of the United States was ground to pieces as between the upper and the nether millstone, and in some respects there is no chapter in American history more painful for an American citizen to read. The outrageous affair of the "Leopard" and the "Chesapeake" was but the most flagrant of a series of wrongs and insults, against which Jefferson's embargo was doubtless an absurd and feeble protest, but perhaps at the same time pardonable as the only weapon left us in that period of national weakness.

Affairs were drawing slowly toward some kind of crisis when, at the expiration of Jefferson's second term, Mr. Madison was elected president of the United States by 122 electoral votes against 47 for Cotesworth Pinckney, and 6 for George Clinton, who received 113 votes for the vice-presidency, and was elected to that office. The opposition of the New England states to the embargo had by this time brought about its repeal, and the substitution for it of the act declaring non-intercourse with England and France. By this time many of the most intelligent Federalists, including John Quincy Adams, had gone over to the Republicans. In 1810 congress repealed the non-intercourse act, which, as a measure of intimidation, had proved ineffectual. Congress now sought to use the threat of non-intercourse as a kind of bribe, and informed England and France that if either nation would repeal its obnoxious edicts, the non-intercourse act would be revived against the other. Napoleon took prompt advantage of this, and informed Mr. Madison's government that he had revoked his Berlin and Milan decrees as far as American ships were concerned; but at the same time he gave secret orders by which the decrees were to be practically enforced as harshly as ever. The lie served its purpose, and congress revived the non-intercourse act as against Great Britain alone. In 1811 hostilities began on sea and land, in the affair of Tippecanoe and of the "President" and "Little Belt." The growing desire for war was shown in the choice of Henry Clay for speaker of the house of representatives, and Mr. Madison was nominated for a second term, on condition of adopting the war policy. On 18 June, 1812, war was declared,

and before the autumn election a series of remarkable naval victories had made it popular. Mr. Madison was re-elected by 128 electoral votes against 89 for DeWitt Clinton, of New York. The one absorbing event, which filled the greater part of his second term, was the war with Great Britain, which was marked by some brilliant victories and some grave disasters, including the capture of Washington by British troops, and the flight of the government from the national capital. Whatever opinion may be held as to the character of the war and its results, there is a general agreement that its management, on the part of the United States, was feeble. Mr. Madison was essentially a man of peace, and as the manager of a great war he was conspicuously out of his element. The history of that war plays a great part in the biographies of the military and naval heroes that figured in it; it is a cardinal event in the career of Andrew Jackson or Isaac Hull. In the biography of Madison it is an episode which may be passed over briefly. The greatest part of his career was finished before he held the highest offices; his renown will rest chiefly or entirely upon what he did before the beginning of the 19th century.

After the close of his second term in 1817, Mr. Madison retired to his estate at Montpelier, where he spent nearly twenty happy years with books and friends. This sweet and tranquil old age he had well earned by services to his fellow-creatures such as it is given to but few men to render. Among the founders of our nation, his place is beside that of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Marshall; but his part was peculiar. He was pre-eminently the scholar, the profound, constructive thinker, and his limitations were such as belong to that character. He was modest, quiet, and reserved in manner, small in stature, neat and refined, courteous and amiable. In rough party strife there were many who could for the moment outshine him. He was not the sort of hero for whom people throw up their caps and shout themselves hoarse, like Andrew Jackson, for example; but his work was of a kind that will be powerful for good in the world long after the work of the men of Jackson's type shall have been forgotten. The portrait on steel is from a painting by Gilbert Stuart, and the vignette is copied from a drawing by Longacre made at Montpelier in July, 1833, when Mr. Madison was in his eighty-third year. The view on page 102 represents his residence.

A satisfactory biography of Madison and a complete edition of his writings are things still to be desired. His interesting account of the Federal convention is published in Elliot's "Debates on the State Conventions" (4 vols., 8vo., Philadelphia, 1861). See also the "Madison Papers" (3 vols., Washington, 1840), and the "History of the United States by Henry Adams. Vols. V to IX, Madison's Administration, 1809-1817" (New York, 1890, 1891). For biographies there is the cumbrous work of William C. Rives (3 vols., Boston, 1859-'68) and the sketch by Sydney Howard Gay in the "American Statesmen" series (Boston, 1884).


His wife, DOROTHY PAYNE, born in North Carolina, 20 May, 1772; died in Washington, D. C., 12 July, 1849, was a granddaughter of John Payne, an English gentleman who migrated to Virginia early in the 18th century. He married Anna Fleming, granddaughter of Sir Thomas Fleming, one of the early settlers of Jamestown. His son, the second John Payne, Dorothy's father, married Mary Coles, first cousin to Patrick Henry. Dorothy was brought up as a Quaker, and at the age of nineteen married John Todd, a Pennsylvania lawyer and member of the Society of Friends. Mr. Todd died in the dreadful yellow-fever pestilence at Philadelphia in 1793. Some time in 1794 Mrs. Todd met Mr. Madison, and



*D. P. Madison*

in September of that year they were married, to the delight of President Washington and his wife, who felt a keen interest in both. Their married life of forty-two years was one of unclouded happiness. Mrs. Madison was a lady of extraordinary beauty and rare accomplishments. Her "Memoirs and Letters" (Boston, 1887) make a very interesting book.






*James Monroe*

## JAMES MONROE

JAMES MONROE, fifth president of the United States, was born in Westmoreland county, Va., 28 April, 1758, and died in New York city, 4 July, 1831. Although the attempts to trace his ancestry have not been successful, it appears probable that the Monroe family came to Virginia as early as 1630, and that they were of Scottish origin. James Monroe's father was George Monroe, and his mother was Eliza, daughter of Judge George James, once a delegate from Virginia to the Continental Congress. The boyhood of the future president was passed in a quiet and uneventful neighborhood famous for its early manifestations of religious fervor. His earliest recollections must have been connected with public remonstrances against the stamp act, and with the reception (in 1766) of a portrait of King George III, which was sent to the gentlemen of Westmoreland county, London, by one of their correspondents, Edmund Jennings, of the colon's Inn. To the College of William and Mary, a quiet and prosperous, James Monroe was sent; but when the student life began it was interrupted by the Revolutionary war. Three members of the faculty and two of the college students, Monroe among them, entered the army. He joined the army in 1776 at the headquarters of the British in New York, as a lieutenant in the 3d Virginia Continental Dragoon Col. Hugh Mercer. He was with the British at the battle of White Plains, and at Trenton, where, as a member of the British guard, he was wounded in the shoulder. During the war he served as a volunteer aide, with the rank of lieutenant, in the army of the Earl of Stirling, and took part in the battles of the Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth. For his services he was commended by Washington, but he did not remain in the state troops of Virginia, but returned to his home. He acquired the acquaintance of Gov. Jefferson, and was sent by him to



*James Monroe*



## JAMES MONROE.

JAMES MONROE, fifth president of the United States, born in Westmoreland county, Va., 28 April, 1758; died in New York city, 4 July, 1831. Although the attempts to trace his pedigree have not been successful, it appears certain that the Monroe family came to Virginia as early as 1650, and that they were of Scottish origin. James Monroe's father was Spence Monroe, and his mother was Eliza, sister of Judge Joseph Jones, twice a delegate from Virginia to the Continental congress. The boyhood of the future president was passed in his native county, a neighborhood famous for early manifestations of patriotic fervor. His earliest recollections must have been associated with public remonstrances against the stamp-act (in 1766), and with the reception (in 1769) of a portrait of Lord Chatham, which was sent to the gentlemen of Westmoreland, from London, by one of their correspondents, Edmund Jennings, of Lincoln's Inn. To the College of William and Mary, then rich and prosperous, James Monroe was sent; but soon after his student life began it was interrupted by the Revolutionary war. Three members of the faculty and twenty-five or thirty students, Monroe among them, entered the military service. He joined the army in 1776 at the headquarters of Washington in New York, as a lieutenant in the 3d Virginia regiment under Col. Hugh Mercer. He was with the troops at Harlem, at White Plains, and at Trenton, where, in leading the advance guard, he was wounded in the shoulder. During 1777-'8 he served as a volunteer aide, with the rank of major, on the staff of the Earl of Stirling, and took part in the battles of the Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth. After these services he was commended by Washington for a commission in the state troops of Virginia, but without success. He formed the acquaintance of Gov. Jefferson, and was sent by him as a

military commissioner to collect information in regard to the condition and prospects of the southern army. He thus attained the rank of lieutenant-colonel; but his services in the field were completely interrupted, to his disappointment and chagrin. His uncle, Judge Jones, at all times a trusted and intimate counsellor, then wrote to him: "You do well to cultivate the friendship of Mr. Jefferson . . . and while you continue to deserve his esteem, he will not withdraw his countenance." The future proved the sagacity of this advice, for Monroe's intimacy with Jefferson, which was then established, continued through life, and was the key to his early advancement, and perhaps his ultimate success. The civil life of Monroe began on his election in 1782 to a seat in the assembly of Virginia, and his appointment as a member of the executive council. He was next a delegate to the 4th, 5th, and 6th congresses of the confederation, where, notwithstanding his youth, he was active and influential. Bancroft says of him that when Jefferson embarked for France, Monroe remained "not the ablest but the most conspicuous representative of Virginia on the floor of congress. He sought the friendship of nearly every leading statesman of his commonwealth, and every one seemed glad to call him a friend." On 1 March, 1784, the Virginia delegates presented to congress a deed that ceded to the United States Virginia's claim to the northwest territory, and soon afterward Jefferson presented his memorable plan for the temporary government of all the western possessions of the United States from the southern boundary (lat. 31° N.) to the Lake of the Woods. From that time until its settlement by the ordinance of 13 July, 1787, this question was of paramount importance. Twice within a few months Monroe crossed the Alleghanies for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the actual condition of the country. One of the fruits of his western observations was a memoir, written in 1786, to prove the rights of the people of the west to the free navigation of the Mississippi. Toward the close of 1784 Monroe was selected as one of nine judges to decide the boundary dispute between Massachusetts and New York. He resigned this place in May, 1786, in consequence of an acrimonious controversy in which he became involved. Both the states that were at difference with each other were at variance with Monroe in respect to the right to navigate the Mississippi, and he thought himself

thus debarred from being acceptable as an umpire to either of the contending parties to whom he owed his appointment.

In the congress of 1785 Monroe was interested in the regulation of commerce by the confederation, and he certainly desired to secure that result; but he was also jealous of the rights of the southern states, and afraid that their interests would be overbalanced by those of the north. His policy was therefore timid and dilatory. A report upon the subject by the committee, of which he was chairman, was presented to congress, 28 March, 1785, and led to a long discussion, but nothing came of it. The weakness of the confederacy grew more and more obvious, and the country was drifting toward a stronger government. But the measures proposed by Monroe were not entirely abortive. Says John Q. Adams: "They led first to the partial convention of delegates from five states at Annapolis in September, 1786, and then to the general convention at Philadelphia in 1787, which prepared and proposed the constitution of the United States. Whoever contributed to that event is justly entitled to the gratitude of the present age as a public benefactor, and among them the name of Monroe should be conspicuously enrolled."

According to the principle of rotation then in force, Monroe's congressional service expired in 1786, at the end of a three years' term. He then intended to make his home in Fredericksburg, and to practise law, though he said he should be happy to keep clear of the bar if possible. But it was not long before he was again called into public life. He was chosen at once a delegate to the assembly, and soon afterward became a member of the Virginia convention to consider the ratification of the proposed constitution of the United States, which assembled at Richmond in 1788. In this convention the friends of the new constitution were led by James Madison, John Marshall, and Edmund Randolph. Patrick Henry was their chief opponent, and James Monroe was by his side, in company with William Grayson and George Mason.

In one of his speeches, Monroe made an elaborate historical argument, based on the experience of Greece, Germany, Switzerland, and New England, against too firm consolidation, and he predicted conflict between the state and national authorities, and the possibility that a president once elected might be elected for life. In another speech he endeavored to show

that the rights of the western territory would be less secure under the new constitution than they were under the confederation. He finally assented to the ratification on condition that certain amendments should be adopted. As late as 1816 he recurred to the fears of a monarchy, which he had entertained in 1788, and endeavored to show that they were not unreasonable. Under the new constitution the first choice of Virginia for senators fell upon Richard Henry Lee and William Grayson. The latter died soon afterward, and Monroe was selected by the legislature to fill the vacant place. He took his seat in the senate, 6 Dec., 1790, and held the office until May, 1794, when he was sent as envoy to France. Among the Anti-Federalists he took a prominent stand, and was one of the most determined opponents of the administration of Washington. To Hamilton he was especially hostile. The appointment of Gouverneur Morris to be minister to France, and of John Jay to be minister



to England, seemed to him most objectionable. Indeed, he met all the Federalist attempts to organize a strong and efficient government with incredulity or with adverse criticism. It was therefore a great surprise to him, as well as

to the public, that, while still a senator, he was designated the successor of Morris as minister to France. For this difficult place he was not the first choice of the president, nor the second; but he was known to be favorably disposed toward the French government, and it was thought that he might lead to the establishment of friendly relations with that power, and, besides, there is no room to doubt that Washington desired, as John Quincy Adams has said, to hold the balance between the parties at home by appointing Jay, the Federalist, to the English mission, and Monroe, the Republican, to the French mission. It was the intent of the United States to avoid a collision with any foreign power, but neutrality was in danger of being considered an offence by either France or England at any moment. Monroe arrived in Paris just after the fall of Robespierre, and

in the excitement of the day he did not at once receive recognition from the committee of public safety. He therefore sent a letter to the president of the convention, and arrangements were made for his official reception, 15 Aug., 1794. At that time he addressed the convention in terms of great cordiality, but his enthusiasm led him beyond his discretion. He transcended the authority that had been given to him, and when his report reached the government at home Randolph sent him a despatch, "in the frankness of friendship," criticising severely the course that the plenipotentiary had pursued. A little later the secretary took a more conciliatory tone, and Monroe believed he never would have spoken so severely if all the despatches from Paris had reached the United States in due order. The residence of Monroe in France was a period of anxious responsibility, during which he did not succeed in recovering the confidence of the authorities at home. When Pickering succeeded Randolph in the department of state, Monroe was informed that he was superseded by the appointment of Charles C. Pinckney. The letter of recall was dated 22 Aug., 1796. On his return he published a pamphlet of 500 pages, entitled "A View of the Conduct of the Executive" (Philadelphia, 1797), in which he printed his instructions, correspondence with the French and United States governments, speeches, and letters received from American residents in Paris. This publication made a great stir. Washington, who had then retired from public life, appears to have remained quiet under the provocation, but he wrote upon his copy of the "View" animadversions that have since been published. Party feeling, already excited, became fiercer when Monroe's book appeared, and personalities that have now lost their force were freely uttered on both sides. Under these circumstances Monroe became the hero of the Anti-Federalists, and was at once elected governor of Virginia. He held the office from 1799 till 1802. The most noteworthy occurrence during his administration was the suppression of a servile insurrection by which the city of Richmond was threatened. Monroe's star continued in the ascendant. After Thomas Jefferson's election to the presidency in 1801, an opportunity occurred for returning Mr. Monroe to the French mission, from which he had been recalled a few years previously. There were many reasons for believing that the United States could secure possession of the territory

beyond the Mississippi belonging to France. The American minister in Paris, Robert R. Livingston, had already opened the negotiations, and Monroe was sent as an additional plenipotentiary to second, with his enthusiasm and energy, the effort that had been begun. By their joint efforts it came to pass that in the spring of 1803 a treaty was signed by which France gave up to the United States for a pecuniary consideration the vast region then known as Louisiana. Livingston remarked to the plenipotentiaries after the treaty was signed: "We have lived long, but this is the noblest work of our lives." The story of the negotiations that terminated in this sale is full of romance. Bonaparte, Talleyrand, and Marbois were the representatives of France; Jefferson, Livingston, and Monroe guided the interests of the United States. The French were in need of money and the Americans could afford to pay well for the control of the entrance to the Mississippi. England stood ready to seize the coveted prize. The moment was opportune; the negotiators on both sides were eager for the transfer. It did not take long to agree upon the consideration of 80,000,000 francs as the purchase-money, and the assent of Bonaparte was secured. "I have given to England," he said, exultingly, "a maritime rival that will sooner or later humble her pride." It is evident that the history of the United States has been largely influenced by this transaction, which virtually extended the national domain from the mouth of the Mississippi river to the mouth of the Columbia. Monroe went from Paris to London, where he was accredited to the court of St. James, and subsequently went to Spain in order to negotiate for the cession of Florida to the United States. But he was not successful in this, and returned to London, where, with the aid of William Pinckney, who was sent to re-enforce his efforts, he concluded a treaty with Great Britain after long negotiations frequently interrupted. This treaty failed to meet the expectations of the United States in two important particulars—it made no provisions against the impressment of seamen, and it secured no indemnity for loss that Americans had incurred in the seizure of their goods and vessels. Jefferson was so dissatisfied that he would not send the treaty to the senate. Monroe returned home in 1807 and at once drew up an elaborate defence of his political conduct. Matters were evidently drifting toward war between Great Britain and the United States. Again the dis-



The enclosed proposition for the sale of 3000 rifles to the Commonwealth was lately received from Mr. Leonard Schuman. As the Executive has no power to purchase that species of arms, it did not undertake to deliberate on the propriety of accepting or rejecting the proposal. But as it is connected with a subject now under legislative consideration, and of great importance to the publick, it is thought proper to communicate it to the general Assembly. With great respect and esteem I have the honor to be  
yr. most obt. servant

Jas. Mordaunt



appointed and discredited diplomatist received a token of popular approbation. He was for the third time elected to the assembly, and in 1811 was chosen for the second time governor of Virginia. He remained in this office but a short time, for he was soon called by Madison to the office of secretary of state. He held the portfolio during the next six years, from 1811 to 1817. In 1814-'15 he also acted as secretary of war. While he was a member of the cabinet of Madison, hostilities were begun between the United States and England. The public buildings in Washington were burned, and it was only by the most strenuous measures that the progress of the British was interrupted. Monroe gained much popularity by the measures that he took for the protection of the capital, and for the enthusiasm with which he prosecuted the war measures of the government.

Monroe had now held almost every important station except that of president to which a politician could aspire. He had served in the legislature of Virginia, in the Continental congress, and in the senate of the United States. He had been a member of the convention that considered the ratification of the constitution, twice he had served as governor, twice he had been sent abroad as a minister, and he had been accredited to three great powers. He had held two places in the cabinet of Madison. With the traditions of those days, which regarded experience in political affairs a qualification for an exalted station, it was most natural that Monroe should become a candidate for the presidency. Eight years previously his fitness for the office had been often discussed. Now, in 1816, at the age of fifty-nine years, almost exactly the age at which Jefferson and Madison attained the same position, he was elected president of the United States, receiving 183 votes in the electoral college against 34 that were given for Rufus King, the candidate of the Federalists. He continued in this office until 1825. His second election in 1821 was made with almost complete unanimity, but one electoral vote being given against him. Daniel D. Tompkins was vice-president during both presidential terms. John Quincy Adams, John C. Calhoun, William H. Crawford, and William Wirt, were members of the cabinet during his entire administration. The principal subjects that engaged the attention of the president were the defences of the Atlantic seaboard, the promotion of internal improvements, the conduct of the Seminole war, the acquisition

of Florida, the Missouri compromise, and the resistance to foreign interference in American affairs, formulated in a declaration that is called the "Monroe doctrine." Two social events marked the beginning and the end of his administration: first, his ceremonious visit to the principal cities of the north and south; and second, the national reception of the Marquis de Lafayette, who came to this country as the nation's guest. The purchase of the Floridas was brought to a successful issue, 22 Feb., 1819, by a treaty with Spain, concluded at Washington, and thus the control of the entire Atlantic and Gulf seaboard, from the St. Croix to the Sabine, was secured to the United States. Monroe's influence in the controversies that preceded the Missouri compromise does not appear to have been very strong. He showed none of the boldness which Jefferson would have exhibited under similar circumstances. He took more interest in guiding the national policy with respect to internal improvements and the defence of the seaboard. He vetoed the Cumberland road bill, 4 May, 1822, on the ground that congress had no right to execute a system of internal improvement; but he held that if such powers could be secured by constitutional amendment good results would follow. Even then he held that the general government should undertake only works of national significance, and should leave all minor improvements to the separate states. There is no measure with which the name of Monroe is connected so important as his enunciation of "the Monroe doctrine." The words of this famous utterance constitute two paragraphs in the president's message of 2 Dec., 1823. In the first of these paragraphs he declares that the governments of Russia and Great Britain have been informed that the American continents henceforth are not to be considered subjects for future colonization by any European powers. In the second paragraph he says that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of the European powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. He goes further, and says that if the governments established in North and South America who have declared their independence of European control should be interfered with by any European power, this interference would be regarded as the manifestation of unfriendly disposition to the United States. These utterances were addressed especially to Spain and Portugal. They

undoubtedly expressed the dominant sentiments of the people of the United States at the time they were uttered, and, moreover, they embodied a doctrine which had been vaguely held in the days of Washington, and from that time to the administration of Monroe had been more and more clearly avowed. It has received the approval of successive administrations and of the foremost publicists and statesmen. The peace and prosperity of America have been greatly promoted by the declaration, almost universally assented to, that European states are not to gain new dominion in America. For convenience of reference the two passages of the message are here quoted :

“ At the proposal of the Russian imperial government, made through the minister of the emperor residing here, full power and instructions have been transmitted to the minister of the United States at St. Petersburg, to arrange, by amicable negotiation, the respective rights and interests of the two nations on the northwest coast of this continent. A similar proposal had been made by his imperial majesty to the government of Great Britain, which has likewise been acceded to. The government of the United States has been desirous, by this friendly proceeding, of manifesting the great value which they have invariably attached to the friendship of the emperor, and their solicitude to cultivate the best understanding with his government. In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power. . . . We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or con-

trolling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."


At the close of Monroe's second term as president he retired to private life, and during the seven years that remained to him resided part of the time at Oak Hill, Loudon co., Va., and part of the time in the city of New York. The illustration on page 110 represents both the old and the new Oak Hill mansions. He accepted the office of regent in the University of Virginia in 1826 with Jefferson and Madison. He was asked to serve on the electoral ticket of Virginia in 1828, but declined on the ground that an ex-president should not be a party-leader. He consented to act as a local magistrate, however, and to become a member of the Virginia constitutional convention. The administration of Monroe has often been designated as the "era of good feeling." Schouler, the historian, has found this heading on an article that appeared in the Boston "Centinel" of 12 July, 1817. It is, on the whole, a suitable phrase to indicate the state of political affairs that succeeded to the troublesome period of organization and preceded the fearful strains of threatened disruption and of civil war. One idea is consistently represented by Monroe from the beginning to the end of his public life—the idea that America is for Americans, that the territory of the United States is to be protected and enlarged, and that foreign intervention will never be permitted. In his early youth Monroe enlisted for the defence of American independence. He was one of the first to perceive the importance of free navigation upon the Mississippi; he negotiated with France and Spain for the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida; he gave a vigorous impulse to the second war with Great Britain in defence of our maritime rights when the rights of a neutral power were endangered; and he enunciated a dictum against foreign interference which has now the force of international law. Judged by the high stations he was called upon to fill, his career was brilliant; but the writings he has left in state papers and correspondence are inferior to those of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and others of his contemporaries. He is rather to be honored as an upright and patriotic citizen who served his party with fidelity and never condescended to low and unworthy measures. He deserved well of the country, which he served faithfully during

his career. After his retirement from the office of president he urged upon the government the judgment of unsettled claims which he presented for outlays made during his prolonged political services abroad, and for which he had never received adequate remuneration. During the advance of old age his time was largely occupied in correspondence, and he undertook to write a philosophical history of the origin of free governments, which was published long after his decease. While attending congress, Monroe married, in 1786, a daughter of Lawrence Kortright, of New York. One of his two daughters, Eliza, married George Hay, of Virginia, and the other, Maria, married Samuel L. Gouverneur, of New York.

A large number of manuscripts, including drafts of state papers, letters addressed to Monroe, and letters from him, have been preserved. Most of these have been purchased by congress and are preserved in the archives of the state department; others are still held by his descendants. Schouler, in his "History of the United States," has made use of this material to advantage, particularly in his account of the administrations of Madison and Monroe, which he has treated in detail. Bancroft, in his "History of the Constitution," draws largely upon the Monroe papers, many of which he prints for the first time. The eulogy of John Quincy Adams (Boston, 1831) and his diary afford the best contemporary view of Monroe's characteristics as a statesman. Jefferson, Madison, Webster, Calhoun, and Colonel Benton have each left their appreciative estimates of his character.

The remains of James Monroe were buried in Marble cemetery, Second street, between First and Second avenues, New York, but in 1858 were taken to Richmond, Va., and there reinterred on the 28th of April, in Hollywood Cemetery.

(See illustration.) See Samuel P. Waldo's "Tour of James Monroe through the Northern and Eastern States, with a Sketch of his Life" (Hartford, 1819); "Life of James Monroe, with a Notice of his Administration," by John Quincy Adams



(Buffalo, 1850); "Concise History of the Monroe Doctrine," by George F. Tucker (Boston, 1885); and Daniel C. Gilman's life of Monroe, in the "American Statesmen" series (Boston, 1883). In the volume last named is an appendix by J. F. Jameson, which gives a list of writings pertaining to Monroe's career and to the Monroe doctrine. President Monroe's portrait by Gilbert Stuart is in the possession of Thomas J. Coolidge, of Massachusetts, late American minister to France, and that by John Vanderlyn is in the City-hall, New York, both of which have been engraved.

His wife, ELIZABETH KORTRIGHT, born in New York city in 1768; died in Loudon county, Va., in 1830, was the daughter of Lawrence Kortright, a captain in the British army. She married James Monroe in 1786, accompanied him in his missions abroad in 1794 and 1803, and while he was U. S. minister to France she effected the release of Madame de Lafayette, who was confined in the prison of La Force, hourly expecting to be executed. On the accession of her husband to the presidency Mrs. Monroe became the mistress of the White House; but she mingled little in society on account of her delicate health. She is described by a contemporary writer as "an elegant and accomplished woman, with a dignity of manner that peculiarly fitted her for the station." The accompanying vignette is copied from the only portrait that was ever made of Mrs. Monroe, which was executed in Paris in 1796.



*Elizabeth Monroe.*


His nephew, JAMES, soldier, born in Albemarle county, Va., 10 Sept., 1799; died in Orange, N. J., 7 Sept., 1870, was a son of the president's elder brother, Andrew. He was graduated at the U. S. military academy in 1815, assigned to the artillery corps, and served in the war with Algiers, in which he was wounded while directing part of the quarter-deck guns of the "Guerrière" in an action with the "Mashouda" off Cape de Gata, Spain. He was aide to Gen. Winfield Scott in 1817-'22, became 1st lieutenant of the 4th artillery on the reorganization

of the army in 1821, and served on garrison and commissary duty till 1832, when he was again appointed Gen. Scott's aide on the Black Hawk expedition, but did not reach the seat of war, owing to illness. He resigned his commission on 30 Sept., 1832, and entered politics, becoming an alderman of New York city in 1833, and president of the board in 1834. In 1836 he declined the appointment of aide to Gov. William L. Marcy. He was in congress in 1839-'41, and was chosen again in 1846, but his seat was contested, and congress ordered a new election, at which he refused to be a candidate. During the Mexican war he was active in urging the retention in command of Gen. Scott. In 1850-'2 he was in the New York legislature, and in 1852 was an earnest supporter of his old chief for the presidency. After the death of his wife in that year he retired from politics, and spent much of his time at the Union club, of which he was one of the earliest and most popular members. Just before the civil war he visited Richmond, and, by public speeches and private effort, tried to prevent the secession of Virginia, and in the struggle that followed he remained a firm supporter of the National government. He much resembled his uncle in personal appearance.

## JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, sixth president of the United States, born in Braintree, Mass., 11 July, 1767; died in Washington, D. C., 23 Feb., 1848. He was named for his mother's grandfather, John Quincy. In his eleventh year he accompanied his father to France, and was sent to school near Paris, where his proficiency in the French language and other studies soon became conspicuous. In the following year he returned to America, and back again to France with his father, whom, in August, 1780, he accompanied to Holland. After a few months at school in Amsterdam, he entered the university of Leyden. Two years afterward John Adams's secretary of legation, Francis Dana, was appointed minister to Russia, and the boy accompanied him as private secretary. After a stay of fourteen months, as Catharine's government refused to recognize Mr. Dana as minister, young Adams left St. Petersburg and travelled alone through Sweden, Denmark, and northern Germany to France, spending six months in the journey. Arriving in Paris, he found his father busy with the negotiation of the treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States, and was immediately set to work as secretary, and aided in drafting the papers that "dispersed all possible doubt of the independence of his country." In 1785, when his father was appointed minister to England, he decided not to stay with him in London, but to return at once to Massachusetts in order to complete his education at Harvard college. For an American career he believed an American education to be best fitted. Considering the immediate sacrifice of pleasure involved, it was a remarkably wise decision in a lad of eighteen. But Adams's character was already fully formed; he was what he remained throughout his life, a Puritan of the sternest and most uncompromising sort, who seemed to take a grim enjoyment in the performance of duty, especially when





*J. Q. Adams.*

D. Appleton & Co



disagreeable. Returning home, he was graduated at Harvard college in 1788, and then studied law in the office of Theophilus Parsons, afterward chief justice of Massachusetts. In 1791 he was admitted to the Suffolk bar, and began the practice of law, the tedium of which he relieved by writing occasional articles for the papers. Under the signature of "Publicola" he criticised some positions taken by Thomas Paine in his "Rights of Man"; and these articles, when republished in England, were generally attributed to his father. In a further series of papers, signed "Marcellus," he defended Washington's policy of neutrality; and in a third series, signed "Columbus," he discussed the extraordinary behavior of Citizen Genet, whom the Jacobins had sent over to browbeat the Americans into joining France in hurling defiance at the world. These writings made him so conspicuous that in 1794 Washington appointed him minister to Holland, and two years later made an appointment transferring him to Portugal. Before he had started for the latter country his father became president of the United States, and asked Washington's advice as to the propriety of promoting his own son by sending him to Berlin. Washington in strong terms recommended the promotion, declaring that in his opinion the young man would prove to be the ablest diplomat in the American service. In the fall of 1797 Mr. Adams accordingly took up his residence at the capital of Prussia. Shortly before this he had married Miss Louisa Johnson, a niece of Thomas Johnson, of Maryland. During his residence at Berlin Mr. Adams translated Wieland's "Oberon" into English. In 1798 he was commissioned to make a commercial treaty with Sweden. In 1800 he made a journey through Silesia, and wrote an account of it, which was published in London and afterward translated into German and French. When Jefferson became president, Mr. Adams's mission terminated. He resumed the practice of law in Boston, but in 1802 was elected to the Massachusetts senate, and next year was chosen to the senate of the United States instead of Timothy Pickering. The federalist party was then rent in twain by the feud between the partisans of John Adams and those of Hamilton, and the reception of the younger Adams in the senate was far from flattering. Affairs grew worse when, at the next vacancy, Pickering was chosen to be his uncongenial colleague. Mr. Adams was grossly and repeatedly insulted. Any motion he might make

was sure to be rejected by the combined votes of republicans and Hamiltonians, though frequently the same motion, made soon afterward by somebody else, would be carried by a large majority. A committee of which he was a member would make and send in its report without even notifying him of its time and place of meeting. At first Mr. Adams was subjected to such treatment merely because he was the son of his father; but presently he rendered himself more and more amenable to it by manifesting the same independence of party ties that had made his father so unpopular. Independence in politics has always been characteristic of the Adams family, and in none has this been more strongly marked than in John Quincy Adams. His first serious difference with the federalist party was occasioned by his qualified approval of Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana, a measure that was bitterly opposed and fiercely censured by nearly all the federalists, because it was feared it would add too much strength to the south. A much more serious difference arose somewhat later, on the question of the embargo. Questions of foreign rather than of domestic policy then furnished the burning subjects of contention in the United States. Our neutral commerce on the high seas, which had risen to very considerable proportions, was plundered in turn by England and by France, until its very existence was threatened. In May, 1806, the British government declared the northern coast of Europe, from Brest to the mouth of the Elbe, to be blockaded. By the Russian proclamation of 1780, which was then accepted by all civilized nations except Great Britain, such paper blockades were illegal; but British ships none the less seized and confiscated American vessels bound to any port on that coast. In November Napoleon issued his Berlin decree making a paper blockade of the whole British coast, whereupon French cruisers began seizing and confiscating American vessels on their way from British to French ports. Two months later England issued an order in council, forbidding neutrals to trade between any of her enemy's ports; and this was followed by orders decreeing fines or confiscation to all neutral ships daring to violate the edict. In December, 1807, Napoleon replied with the Milan decree, threatening to confiscate all ships bound to England, or which should have paid a fine to the British government or submitted to search at the hands of a British commander.

All these decrees and orders were in flagrant violation of international law, and for a time they made the ocean a pandemonium of robbery and murder. Their effect upon American commerce was about the same as if both England and France had declared war against the United States. Their natural and proper effect upon the American people would have been seen in an immediate declaration of war against both England and France, save that our military weakness was then too manifest to make such a course anything but ridiculous. Between the animus of the two bullies by whom we were thus tormented there was little to choose; but in two respects England's capacity for injuring us was the greater. In the first place, she had more ships engaged in this highway robbery than France, and stronger ones; in the second place, owing to the difficulty of distinguishing between Americans and Englishmen, she was able to add the crowning wickedness of kidnapping American seamen. The wrath of the Americans was thus turned more against England than against France; and never perhaps in the revolutionary war had it waxed stronger than in the summer of 1807, when, in full sight of the American coast, the "Leopard" fired upon the "Chesapeake," killed and wounded several of her crew, and violently carried away four of them. For this outrage the commander of the "Leopard" was promoted in the British service. In spite of all these things, the hatred of the federalists for France was so great that they were ready to put up with insult added to injury rather than attack the power that was warring against Napoleon. So far did these feelings carry them that Mr. John Lowell, a prominent federalist of Boston, was actually heard to defend the action of the "Leopard." Such pusillanimity incensed Mr. Adams. "This was the cause," he afterward said, "which alienated me from that day and forever from the councils of the federal party." He tried to persuade the federalists of Boston to hold a meeting and pledge their support to the government in any measures, however serious, that it might see fit to adopt in order to curb the insolence of Great Britain. But these gentlemen were too far blinded by party feeling to respond to the call; whereupon Mr. Adams attended a republican meeting, at which he was put upon a committee to draft and report such resolutions. Presently the federalists bowed to the storm of popular feeling and held their meeting,

at which Mr. Adams was also present and drafted resolutions. For his share in the proceedings of the republicans it was threatened that he should "have his head taken off for apostasy." It was never of much use to threaten Mr. Adams. An extra session of congress was called in October to consider what was to be done. Mr. Jefferson's government was averse to war, for which the country was ill prepared, and it was thought that somewhat milder measures might harass England until she would submit to reason. For a year and a half a non-importation act had been in force; but it had proved no more effective than the non-importation agreements of 1768 and 1774. Now an embargo was laid upon all the shipping in American ports. The advantage of such a measure was very doubtful; it was damaging ourselves in the hope of damaging the enemy. The greatest damage fell upon the maritime states of New England, and there the vials of federalist wrath were poured forth with terrible fury upon Mr. Jefferson and the embargo. But the full measure of their ferocity was reserved for Mr. Adams, who had actually been a member of the committee that reported the bill, and had given it his most earnest support. All the choicest epithets of abuse were showered upon him; few men in our history have been more fiercely berated and reviled. His term of service in the senate was to expire on 3 March, 1809. In the preceding June the Massachusetts legislature chose Mr. Lloyd to succeed him, a proceeding that was intended and accepted as an insult. Mr. Adams instantly resigned, and Mr. Lloyd was chosen to fill the remainder of his term. In the course of the next month the republicans of his congressional district wished to elect him to the house of representatives, but he refused. In 1806 Mr. Adams had been appointed professor of rhetoric and belles-lettres at Harvard college, and in the intervals of his public duties had delivered lectures there, which were published in 1810, and for a time were held in esteem.

One of Mr. Madison's first acts on succeeding to the presidency in 1809 was to nominate Mr. Adams' minister to Russia. Since Mr. Dana's failure to secure recognition in 1782, the United States had had no minister in that country, and the new mission was now to be created. The senate at first declined to concur in creating the mission, but a few months later the objectors yielded, and Mr. Adams's nomination was confirmed. He

Quincy 11. Sept 1830.

My dear Charles.

I enclose a power of Attorney to vote for  
me at the Free and Masonic Societies Conventions  
Also a Letter for Mr. Stoddard, to be forwarded by the Post. You  
know we have a new error who was almost in time to bid you good  
by - but we do not miss you the less for that - nor your partner  
whose place it will be to see vacant at breakfast - But we take  
Patience, and hope still to see you both often

your affectionate father


J. J. Adams.





was very courteously received by Alexander I., and his four years and a half in Russia passed very pleasantly. His diary gives us a vivid account of the Napoleonic invasion and its disastrous ending. In the autumn of 1812 the czar offered his services as mediator between the United States and Great Britain. War had only been declared between these powers three months before, but the American government promptly accepted the proposal, and, in the height of the popular enthusiasm over the naval victories of Hull and Decatur, sent Messrs. Gallatin and Bayard to St. Petersburg to act as commissioners with Mr. Adams. The British government refused to accept the mediation of Russia, but proposed instead an independent negotiation, to which the United States agreed, and the commissioners were directed to meet at Ghent. Much time was consumed in these arrangements; while we were defeating England again and again on the sea, and suffering in return some humiliating reverses on land, until at last the commissioners met at Ghent, in August, 1814. Henry Clay and Jonathan Russell were added to the American commission, while England was represented by Lord Gambier, Dr. Adams, and Mr. Goulburn. After four months of bitter wrangling, from which no good result could have been expected, terms of peace were suddenly agreed upon in December. In warding off the British attempts to limit our rights in the fisheries Mr. Adams played an important part, as his father had done in 1782. The war had been a drawn game, neither side was decisively victorious, and the treaty apparently left things much as before. Nothing was explicitly done to end the pretensions of England to the right of search and the impressment of seamen, yet the naval victories of the United States had taught the British a lesson, and these pretensions were never renewed. The treaty was a great disappointment to the British people, who had hoped to obtain some advantages, and Mr. Adams, for his share in it, was reviled by the London press in a tone which could not but be regarded as a compliment to his powers. After the conclusion of the treaty he visited Paris and witnessed the return of Napoleon from Elba and the exciting events that followed up to the eve of Waterloo. Here his wife and children joined him, after a tedious journey from St. Petersburg, not without distress and peril by the way. By this time Mr. Adams had been appointed commissioner, with Clay and Gal-

latin, to negotiate a new commercial treaty with England. This treaty was completed on 13 July, 1815; but already, on 26 May, when Mr. Adams arrived in London, he had received the news of his appointment as minister to England. The series of double coincidences in the Adams family between missions to England and treaties with that power is curious. First John Adams is minister, just after his share in the treaty that concluded the revolutionary war, then his son, just after



the treaty that concluded the war of 1812-'15, and then the grandson is minister during the civil war and afterward takes part in the treaty that disposed of the Alabama question.

After an absence of eight years, John Quincy Adams was called

back to his native land to serve as secretary of state under President Monroe. A new era in American politics was dawning. The war which had just been concluded has sometimes been called our second war of independence; certainly the year 1815, which saw the end of the long strife between France and England, marks an important era in American history. Our politics ceased to be concerned mainly with foreign affairs. So suddenly were men's bones of political contention taken away from them that Monroe's presidency is traditionally remembered as the "era of good feeling." So far as political parties were concerned, such an epithet is well applied; but as between prominent individuals struggling covertly to supplant one another, it was anything rather than an era of good feeling. Mr. Adams's principal achievement as secretary of state was the treaty with Spain, whereby Florida was ceded to the United States in consideration of \$5,000,000, to be applied to the liquidation of outstanding claims of American merchants against Spain. By the same treaty the boundary between Louisiana and Mexico was established as running along the Sabine and Red rivers, the upper Arkansas, the crest of the Rocky mountains, and the 42d parallel. Mr. Adams defended the conduct of Gen. Jackson in invading Spanish Florida and

hanging Arbuthnot and Ambrister. He supported the policy of recognizing the independence of the revolted colonies of Spanish America, and he was the principal author of what is known as the "Monroe Doctrine," that the American continent is no longer open to colonization by European powers. His official report on weights and measures showed remarkable scientific knowledge. Toward the close of Monroe's first term came up the first great political question growing out of the purchase of Louisiana: Should Missouri be admitted to the union as a slave-state, and should slavery be allowed or prohibited in the vast territory beyond? After the Missouri compromise had passed through congress, and been submitted to President Monroe for his signature, two questions were laid before the cabinet. First, had congress the constitutional right to prohibit slavery in a territory? and, secondly, in prohibiting slavery "forever" in the territory north of Mason and Dixon's line, as prolonged beyond the Mississippi river, did the Missouri bill refer to this district only so long as it should remain under territorial government, or did it apply to such states as might in future be formed from it? To the first question the cabinet replied unanimously in the affirmative. To the second question Mr. Adams replied that the term "forever" really meant forever; but all his colleagues replied that it only meant so long as the district in question should remain under territorial government. Here for the first time we see Mr. Adams taking that firm stand in opposition to slavery which hereafter was to make him so famous.

Mr. Monroe's second term of office had scarcely begun when the question of the succession came into the foreground. The candidates were John Quincy Adams, secretary of state; William H. Crawford, secretary of the treasury; John C. Calhoun, secretary of war; and Henry Clay, speaker of the house of representatives. Shortly before the election Gen. Jackson's strength began to loom up as more formidable than the other competitors had supposed. Jackson was then at the height of his popularity as a military hero, Crawford was the most dexterous political manager in the country. Clay was perhaps the most persuasive orator. Far superior to these three in intelligence and character, Mr. Adams was in no sense a popular favorite. His manners were stiff and disagreeable; he told the truth bluntly, whether it hurt or not; and he never took

pains to conciliate any one. The best of men in his domestic circle, outside of it he had few warm friends, but he seemed to have a talent for making enemies. When Edward Everett asked him if he was "determined to do nothing with a view to promote his future election to the presidency as the successor of Mr. Monroe," he replied that he "should do absolutely nothing," and from this resolution he never swerved. He desired the presidency as much as any one who was ever chosen to that high office; but his nature was such that unless it should come to him without scheming of his own, and as the unsolicited expression of popular trust in him, all its value would be lost. Under the circumstances, it was a remarkable evidence of the respect felt for his lofty character and distinguished services that he should have obtained the presidency at all. The result of the election showed 99 votes for Jackson, 84 for Adams, 41 for Crawford, 37 for Clay. Mr. Calhoun, who had withdrawn from the contest for the presidency, received 182 votes for the vice-presidency, and was elected. The choice of the president was thrown into the house of representatives, and Mr. Clay now used his great influence in favor of Mr. Adams, who was forthwith elected. When Adams afterward made Clay his secretary of state, the disappointed partisans of Jackson pretended that there had been a bargain between the two, that Adams had secured Clay's assistance by promising him the first place in the cabinet, and thus, according to a usage that seemed to be establishing itself, placing him in the line of succession for the next presidency. The peppery John Randolph characterized this supposed bargain as "a coalition between Bliffl and Black George, the Puritan and the Blackleg." There never was a particle of foundation for this reckless charge, and it has long since been disproved.

During Monroe's administration the Federalist party had become extinct. In the course of John Quincy Adams's administration the new division of parties into Whigs and Democrats began to grow up, the Whigs favoring internal improvements, the national bank, and a high tariff on importations, while the Democrats opposed all such measures on the ground that they were incompatible with a strict construction of the constitution. In its relation to such questions Mr. Adams's administration was Whig, and thus arrayed against itself not

only all the southern planters, but also the ship-owners of New England and the importers of New York. But a new and powerful tendency now came in to overwhelm such an administration as that of Adams. The so-called "spoils system" was already germinating, and the time had come when it could be put into operation. Mr. Adams would have nothing to say to such a system. He would not reward the men who worked for him, and he would not remove from office the men who most vigorously opposed him. He stood on his merits, asked no favors and granted none; and was, on the whole, the most independent president we have had since Washington. Jackson and his friends promised their supporters a share in the government offices, in which



*Louisa Catherine Adams*

a "clean sweep" was to be made by turning out the present incumbents. The result of the election of 1828 showed that for the time Jackson's method was altogether the more potent; since he obtained 178 electoral votes, against 83 for Adams.

The close of his career as president was marked by an incident that increased the odium in which Mr. Adams was held by so many of the old federalist families of Boston. In the excitement of the election the newspapers devoted to Jackson swarmed with mischievous paragraphs designed to injure Adams's reputation. Among other things it was said that, in 1808, he had suspected some of the federalist leaders of entertaining a scheme for carrying New England out of the union, and, fearing that such a scheme would be promoted by hatred of the embargo, and that in case of its success the seceded states would almost inevitably be driven into alliance with Great Britain, he communicated his suspicions to President Jefferson and other leading republicans. These tales, published by unscrupulous newspapers twenty years after the event, grossly distorted what Mr. Adams had actually said and done; and thirteen eminent Massachusetts federalists addressed to him an open letter, demanding that he should bring in a bill of particulars supported by evidence. Adams replied by stating

the substance of what he had really said, but declining to mention names or to point out the circumstances upon which his suspicion had been based. In preserving this reticence he was actuated mainly by unwillingness to stir up a furious controversy under circumstances in which it could do no good. But his adversaries made the mistake of attributing his forbearance to dread of ill consequences to himself—a motive by which, it is safe to say, Mr. Adams was never influenced on any occasion whatever. So the thirteen gentlemen returned to the attack. Mr. Adams then wrote out a full statement of the case, completely vindicating himself, and bringing forward more than enough evidence to justify any such suspicions as he had entertained and guardedly stated. After finishing this pamphlet he concluded not to issue it, but left it among his papers. It has been published by Prof. Henry Adams, in his "Documents relating to New England Federalism," and is not only of great historical importance, but is one of the finest specimens of political writing to be found in the English language.

Although now an ex-president, Mr. Adams did not long remain in private life. The greatest part of his career still lay before him. Owing to the mysterious disappearance of William Morgan, who had betrayed some of the secrets of the Masonic order, there was in some of the northern states a sudden and violent prejudice against the Freemasons and secret societies in general. An "anti-mason party" was formed, and by its votes Mr. Adams was, in 1831, elected to congress, where he remained, representing the same district of Massachusetts until his death in 1848. He was shortly afterward nominated by the anti-masons for the governorship of Massachusetts, but was defeated in the legislature, there being no choice by the people. In congress he occupied a perfectly independent attitude. He was one of those who opposed President Jackson's high-handed treatment of the bank, but he supported the president in his firm attitude toward the South Carolina nullifiers and toward France. In 1835, as the French government delayed in paying over the indemnity of \$5,000,000 which had been agreed upon by the treaty of 1831 for plunder of American shipping in the Napoleonic wars, Jackson threatened, in case payment should be any longer deferred, to issue letters of marque and reprisal against French commerce. This bold policy, which was successful in obtaining the money, enlisted

Mr. Adams's hearty support. He defended Jackson as he had defended Jefferson on the occasion of the embargo; and this time, as before, his course was disapproved in Massachusetts, and he lost a seat in the U. S. senate. He had been chosen to that office by the state senate, but the lower house did not concur, and before the question was decided the news of his speech in favor of reprisals turned his supporters against him. He was thus left in the house of representatives more independent of party ties than ever, and was accordingly enabled to devote his energies to the aid of the abolitionists, who were now beginning to appear conspicuously upon the scene. At that time it was impossible for the opponents of slavery to effect much. The only way in which they could get their case before congress was by presenting petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. Unwilling to receive such petitions, or to allow any discussion on the dreaded question, congress in 1836 enacted the cowardly "gag rule," that "all petitions, memorials, resolutions, or papers relating in any way or to any extent whatsoever to the subject of slavery or the abolition of slavery, shall, without being either printed or referred, be laid upon the table; and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon." After the yeas and nays had been ordered on this, when Mr. Adams's name was called he rose and said: "I hold the resolution to be a direct violation of the constitution of the United States, the rules of this house, and the rights of my constituents." The house sought to drown his words with loud shrieks and yells of "Order!" "Order!" but he raised his voice to a shout and defiantly finished his sentence. The rule was adopted by a vote of 117 to 68, but it did more harm than good to the pro-slavery party. They had put themselves in an untenable position, and furnished Mr. Adams with a powerful weapon which he used against them without mercy. As a parliamentary debater he has had few if any superiors; in knowledge and dexterity there was no one in the house who could be compared with him; he was always master of himself, even at the white heat of anger to which he often rose; he was terrible in invective, matchless at repartee, and insensible to fear. A single-handed fight against all the slave-holders in the house was something upon which he was always ready to enter, and he usually came off with the last word. Though the vituperative vocabulary of

the English language seemed inadequate to express the hatred and loathing with which the pro-slavery party regarded him, though he was more than once threatened with assassination, nevertheless his dauntless bearing and boundless resources compelled the respect of his bitterest opponents, and members from the south, with true chivalry, sometimes confessed it. Every session he returned to the assault upon the gag-rule, until the disgraceful measure was rescinded in 1845. This part of Mr. Adams's career consisted of a vast number of small incidents, which make a very interesting and instructive chapter in American history, but can not well be epitomized. He came to serve as the rallying-point in congress for the ever-growing anti-slavery sentiment, and may be regarded, in a certain sense, as the first founder of the new republican party. He seems to have been the first to enunciate the doctrine upon which Mr. Lincoln afterward rested his great proclamation of emancipation. In a speech in congress in 1836 he said: "From the instant that your slave-holding states become the theatre of war—civil, servile, or foreign—from that instant the war powers of the constitution extend to interference with the institution of slavery in every way in which it can be interfered with." As this principle was attacked by the southern members, Mr. Adams from time to time reiterated it, especially in his speech of 14 April, 1842, on the question of war with England and Mexico, when he said: "Whether the war be civil, servile, or foreign, I lay this down as the law of nations: I say that the military authority takes for the time the place of all municipal institutions, slavery among the rest. Under that state of things, so far from its being true that the states where slavery exists have the exclusive management of the subject, not only the president of the United States, but the commander of the army unquestionably has power to order the universal emancipation of the slaves."

After the rescinding of the gag-rule Mr. Adams spoke less frequently. In November, 1846, he had a shock of paralysis, which kept him at home four months. On 21 Feb., 1848, while he was sitting in the house of representatives, came the second shock. He was carried into the speaker's room, where he lay two days, and died on the 23d. His last words were: "This is the last of earth; I am content." See "Life and Public Services of John Quincy Adams," by William H. Seward (Auburn,



1849); "Life of John Quincy Adams," by Josiah Quincy (Boston, 1858); "Diary of John Quincy Adams," edited by Charles F. Adams, 12 vols., 8vo (Philadelphia, 1874-'7); and "John Quincy Adams," by John T. Morse, Jr. (Boston, 1882).

The steel portrait of Mr. Adams, facing page 120, is from a picture by Marchant, in the possession of the New York Historical Society. The mansion represented on page 126 is the Adams homestead at Quincy, in which the two presidents lived, was the summer residence of Charles Francis Adams, and is now occupied by his oldest son, John Quincy Adams.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, diplomatist, son of John Quincy Adams, born in Boston, 18 Aug., 1807; died there, 21 Nov., 1886. When two years old he was taken by his father to St. Petersburg, where he learned German, French, and Russian. Early in 1815 he travelled all the way from St. Petersburg to Paris with his mother in a private carriage, a difficult journey at that time, and not unattended with danger. His father was soon afterward appointed minister to England, and the little boy was placed at an English boarding-school. The feelings between British and Americans was then more hostile than ever before or since, and young Adams was frequently called upon to defend with his fists the good name of his country. When he returned after two years to



*Charles Francis Adams*

America, his father placed him in the Boston Latin school, and he was graduated at Harvard college in 1825, shortly after his father's inauguration as president of the United States. He spent two years in Washington, and then returned to Boston, where he studied law in the office of Daniel Webster, and was admitted to the Suffolk bar in 1828. The next year he married the youngest daughter of Peter Chardon Brooks, whose elder daughters were married to Edward Everett and Rev. Nathaniel L. Frothingham. From 1831 to 1836 Mr. Adams served in the Massachusetts legislature. He was a member of the whig party, but, like all the rest of his vigorous and free-thinking family, he was extremely independent in politics and inclined to strike out

into new paths in advance of the public sentiment. After 1836 he came to differ more and more widely with the leaders of the whig party with whom he had hitherto acted. In 1848 the newly organized free-soil party, consisting largely of democrats, held its convention at Buffalo and nominated Martin Van Buren for president and Charles Francis Adams for vice-president. There was no hope of electing these candidates, but this little party grew, six years later, into the great republican party. In 1858 he was elected to congress by the republicans of the 3d district of Massachusetts, and in 1860 he was reëlected. In the spring of 1861 President Lincoln appointed him minister to England, a place which both his father and his grandfather had filled before him. Mr. Adams had now to fight with tongue and pen for his country as in school-boy days he had fought with fists. It was an exceedingly difficult time for an American minister in England. Though there was much sympathy for the U. S. government on the part of the workmen in the manufacturing districts and of many of the liberal constituencies, especially in Scotland, on the other hand the feeling of the governing classes and of polite society in London was either actively hostile to us or coldly indifferent. Even those students of history and politics who were most friendly to us failed utterly to comprehend the true character of the sublime struggle in which we were engaged—as may be seen in reading the introduction to Mr. E. A. Freeman's elaborate "History of Federal Government from the Formation of the Achæan League to the Disruption of the United States" (London, 1862). Difficult and embarrassing questions arose in connection with the capture of the confederate commissioners Mason and Slidell, the negligence of Lord Palmerston's government in allowing the "Alabama" and other confederate cruisers to sail from British ports to prey upon American commerce, and the ever manifest desire of Napoleon III. to persuade Great Britain to join him in an acknowledgment of the independence of the confederacy. The duties of this difficult diplomatic mission were discharged by Mr. Adams with such consummate ability as to win universal admiration. No more than his father or grandfather did he belong to the school of suave and crafty, intriguing diplomats. He pursued his ends with dogged determination and little or no attempt at concealment, while his demeanor was haughty and often defiant. His unflinching

firmness bore down all opposition, and his perfect self-control made it difficult for an antagonist to gain any advantage over him. His career in England from 1861 to 1868 must be cited among the foremost triumphs of American diplomacy. In 1872 it was attempted to nominate him for the presidency of the United States, as the candidate of the liberal republicans, but Horace Greeley secured the nomination. He was elected in 1869 a member of the board of overseers of Harvard university, and was for several years president of the board. Mr. Adams was a prominent member of the Geneva board of arbitration. He edited the works and wrote the memoirs of his father and grandfather, in 22 octavo volumes; the Familiar Letters of John Adams and his Wife, Abigail Adams, during the Revolution, with a Memoir of Mrs. Adams (New York, 1876), a volume which takes its place by the side of the most valuable documents of that period, and published many of his addresses and orations. (See article on Mr. Adams by Dr. John G. Palfrey, in Lippincott's Magazine, vol. vii.)

JOHN QUINCY, lawyer, eldest son of Charles Francis Adams, born in Boston, 22 Sept., 1833. He was graduated at Harvard college in 1853, and admitted to the Suffolk bar in 1855. During the civil war he was on Gov. Andrew's staff. He was elected to the legislature by the town of Quincy in 1866, but failed to secure a reëlection the following year because he had declared his approval of Andrew Johnson's policy. In 1869 and 1870 he was again a member of the legislature. In 1867 and 1871 he was democratic candidate for governor of Massachusetts, and was defeated. In 1877 he was chosen a member of the corporation of Harvard. Mr. Adams died 14 Aug., 1894.


CHARLES FRANCIS, lawyer, second son of Charles Francis Adams, born in Boston, 27 May, 1835. He was graduated at Harvard in 1856, and admitted to the bar in 1858. He served through almost the whole of the civil war, being commissioned lieutenant of the First Massachusetts cavalry in November, 1861, and resigning as colonel of the Fifth Massachusetts Cavalry (colored), with the brevet of brigadier-general, in July, 1865. In 1869 he was appointed a member of the board of railroad commissioners of Massachusetts, and continued in that office by successive reappointments until 1879, when he retired. He was then selected as one of the board of arbitrators for the executive committee of eastern trunk lines and

western roads, and subsequently as sole arbitrator, which position he resigned in June, 1884, when he became president of the Union Pacific Railway Company. He continued president of that company until November, 1890. He then retired from all connection with railroad matters, and has since devoted himself to historical and literary pursuits. In 1882 he was elected a member of the board of overseers of Harvard university, and re-elected in 1888. In connection with his brother, Henry Adams, he prepared "Chapters of Erie and other Essays" (Boston, 1871). He subsequently published a treatise entitled "Railroads; their Origin and Problems" (New York, 1878); a work on "Railroad Accidents" (1879); "Life of Richard H. Dana (Boston, 1890); "Three Episodes in Massachusetts History" (1892); and "Massachusetts: Its Historians and its History" (1893). He has also delivered a number of occasional addresses, and been a frequent contributor to the *North American Review*, the *Forum*, and the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, in which last he has printed several monographs on historical subjects.

HENRY, author, another son of Charles Francis Adams, born in Boston, 16 Feb., 1838. He was graduated at Harvard in 1858, and was his father's private secretary in London from 1861 to 1868. From 1870 till 1877 he was assistant professor of history in Harvard college, and was one of the ablest instructors the university has known during the present generation, possessing to an extraordinary degree the power of inciting his pupils to original work. He again resided in London for a few years, and is now living in Washington. He has published "Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law" (Boston, 1876); "Documents relating to New England Federalism, 1800-1815" (1877); "Life of Albert Gallatin" (Philadelphia, 1879); "Writings of Albert Gallatin," edited (3 vols., 1879); "John Randolph" (Boston, 1882), and "History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison," 9 vols. (New York, 1889-1891).

BROOKS, lawyer, youngest son of Charles Francis Adams, born in Quincy, Mass., 24 June, 1848, graduated at Harvard university in 1870, and was admitted to the Suffolk bar in 1873. He has published articles in the "Atlantic Monthly" and other periodicals, and is the author of "The Emancipation of Massachusetts" (Boston, 1886).





Etched by H.B. Hall, New York

*Andrew Jackson*

## ANDREW JACKSON.

ANDREW JACKSON, seventh president of the United States, born in the Waxhaw settlement on the border between North and South Carolina, 15 March, 1767; died at the Hermitage, near Nashville, Tenn., 8 June, 1845. His father, Andrew Jackson, came over from Carrickfergus, on the north coast of Ireland, in 1765. His grandfather, Hugh Jackson, had been a linen-draper. His mother's name was Elizabeth Hutchinson, and her family were linen-weavers. Andrew Jackson, the father, died a few days before the birth of his son. The log cabin in which the future president was born was situated within a quarter of a mile of the boundary between the two Carolinas, and the people of the neighborhood do not seem to have had a clear idea as to which province it belonged. In a letter of 24 Dec., 1830, in the proclamation addressed to the nullifiers, in 1832, and again in his will, Gen. Jackson speaks of himself as a native of South Carolina; but the evidence adduced by Parton seems to show that the birthplace was north of the border. Three weeks after the birth of her son Mrs. Jackson moved to the house of her brother-in-law, Mr. Crawford, just over the border in South Carolina, near the Waxhaw creek, and there his early years were passed. His education, obtained in an "old-field school," consisted of little more than the "three R's," and even in that limited sphere his attainments were but scanty. He never learned, in the course of his life, to write English correctly. His career as a fighter began early. In the spring and early summer of 1780, after the disastrous surrender of Lincoln's army at Charleston, the whole of South Carolina was overrun by the British. On 6 Aug. Jackson was present at Hanging Rock when Sumter surprised and destroyed a British regiment. Two of his brothers, as well as his mother, died from hardships sustained in the war. In after years he

could remember how he had been carried as prisoner to Camden and nearly starved there, and how a brutal officer had cut him with a sword because he refused to clean his boots; these reminiscences kept alive his hatred for the British, and doubtless gave unction to the tremendous blow dealt them at New Orleans. In 1781, left quite alone in the world, he was apprenticed for a while to a saddler. At one time he is said to have done a little teaching in an "old-field school." At the age of eighteen he entered the law-office of Spruce McCay, in Salisbury. While there he was said to have been "the most roaring, rollicking, gamecocking, horse-racing, card-playing, mischievous fellow" that had ever been seen in that town. Many and plentiful were the wild-oat crops sown at that time and in that part of the country; and in such sort of agriculture young Jackson was much more proficient than in the study of jurisprudence. He never had a legal tone of mind, or any but the crudest knowledge of law; but in that frontier society a small amount of legal knowledge went a good way, and in 1788 he was appointed public prosecutor for the western district of North Carolina, the district since erected into the state of Tennessee. The emigrant wagon-train in which Jackson journeyed to Nashville carried news of the ratification of the Federal constitution by the requisite two thirds of the states. He seems soon to have found business enough. In the April term of 1790, out of 192 cases on the dockets of the county court at Nashville, Jackson was employed as counsel in 42; in the year 1794, out of 397 cases he acted as counsel in 228; while at the same time he was practising his profession in the courts of other counties. The great number of these cases is an indication of their trivial character. As a general rule they were either actions growing out of disputed land-claims or simple cases of assault and battery. Court day was a great occasion in that wild community, bringing crowds of men into the county town to exchange gossip, discuss politics, drink whiskey, and break heads. Probably each court day produced as many new cases as it settled. Amid such a turbulent population the public prosecutor must needs be a man of nerve and resource. It was a state of chronic riot, in which he must be ever ready to court danger. Jackson proved himself quite equal to the task of introducing law and order in so far as it depended on him. "Just inform Mr. Jackson," said Gov.



Blount when sundry malfeasances were reported to him; "he will be sure to do his duty, and the offenders will be punished." Besides the lawlessness of the white pioneer population, there was the enmity of the Indians to be reckoned with. In the immediate neighborhood of Nashville the Indians murdered, on the average, one person every ten days. From 1788 till 1795 Jackson performed the journey of nearly two hundred miles between Nashville and Jonesboro twenty-two times; and on these occasions there were many alarms from Indians, which sometimes grew into a forest campaign. In one of these affairs, having nearly lost his life in an adventurous feat, Jackson made the characteristic remark: "A miss is as good as a mile; you see how near I can graze danger." It was this wild experience that prepared the way for Jackson's eminence as an Indian-fighter. In the autumn of 1794 the Cherokees were so thoroughly punished by Gen. Robertson's famous Nickajack expedition that henceforth they thought it best to leave the Tennessee settlements in peace. With the rapid increase of the white population which soon followed, the community became more prosperous and more orderly. In the general prosperity Jackson had an ample share, partly through the diligent practice of his profession, partly through judicious purchases and sales of land.

With most men marriage is the most important event of their life; in Jackson's career his marriage was peculiarly important. Rachel Donelson was a native of North Carolina, daughter of Col. John Donelson, a Virginia surveyor in good circumstances, who in 1780 migrated to the neighborhood of Nashville in a very remarkable boat-journey of 2,000 miles down the Holston and Tennessee rivers and up the Cumberland. During an expedition to Kentucky some time afterward, the blooming Rachel was wooed and won by Capt. Lewis Robards. She was an active, sprightly, and interesting girl, the best horsewoman and best dancer in that country; her husband seems to have been a young man of tyrannical and unreasonably jealous disposition. In Kentucky they lived with Mrs. Robards, the husband's mother; and, as was common in a new society where houses were too few and far between, there were other boarders in the family—among them the late Judge Overton, of Tennessee, and a Mr. Stone. Presently Robards made complaints against his wife, in which he implicated Stone.

According to Overton and the elder Mrs. Robards, these complaints were unreasonable and groundless, but the affair ended in Robards sending his wife home to her mother in Tennessee. This was in 1788. Col. Donelson had been murdered, either by Indians or by white desperadoes, and his widow, albeit in easy circumstances, felt it desirable to keep boarders as a means of protection against the Indians. To her house came Andrew Jackson on his arrival at Nashville, and thither about the same time came Overton, also fresh from his law studies. These two young men were boarded in the house and lodged in a cabin hard by. At about the same time Robards became reconciled with his wife, and, having bought land in the neighborhood, came to dwell for a while at Mrs. Donelson's. Throughout life Jackson was noted alike for spotless purity and for a romantic and chivalrous respect for the female sex. In the presence of women his manner was always distinguished for grave and courtly politeness. This involuntary homage to woman was one of the finest and most winsome features in his character. As unconsciously rendered to Mrs. Robards, it was enough to revive the slumbering demon of jealousy in her husband. According to Overton's testimony, Jackson's conduct was irreproachable, but there were high words between him and Robards, and, not wishing to make further trouble, he changed his place of abode. After some months Capt. Robards left his wife and went to Kentucky, threatening by and by to return and "haunt her" and make her miserable. In the autumn of 1790 rumors of his intended return frightened Mrs. Robards, and determined her to visit some friends at distant Natchez in order to avoid him. In pursuance of this plan, with which the whole neighborhood seems to have concurred, she went down the river in company with the venerable Col. Stark and his family. As the Indians were just then on the war-path, Jackson accompanied the party with an armed escort, returning to Nashville as soon as he had seen his friends safely deposited at Natchez. While these things were going on, the proceedings of Capt. Robards were characterized by a sort of Machiavelian astuteness. In 1791 Kentucky was still a part of Virginia, and, according to the code of the Old Dominion, if a husband wished to obtain a divorce on account of his wife's alleged unfaithfulness, he must procure an act of the legislature empowering him to bring the case before a jury, and authorizing

a divorce conditionally upon the jury's finding a verdict of guilty. Early in 1791 Robards obtained the preliminary act of the legislature upon his declaration, then false, that his wife had gone to live with Jackson. Robards deferred further action for more than two years. Meanwhile it was reported and believed in the west that a divorce had been granted, and, acting upon this report, Jackson, whose chivalrous interest in Mrs. Robards's misfortunes had ripened into sincere affection, went, in the summer of 1791, to Natchez and married her there, and brought her to his home at Nashville. In the autumn of 1793 Capt. Robards, on the strength of the facts that undeniably existed since the act of the Virginia legislature, brought his case into court and obtained the verdict completing the divorce. On hearing of this, to his great surprise, in December, Jackson concluded that the best method of preventing future cavil was to procure a new license and have the marriage ceremony performed again; and this was done in January. Jackson was certainly to blame for not taking more care to ascertain the import of the act of the Virginia legislature. By a carelessness peculiarly striking in a lawyer, he allowed his wife to be placed in a false position. The irregularity of the marriage was indeed atoned by forty years of honorable and happy wedlock, ending only with Mrs. Jackson's death in December, 1831; and no blame was attached to the parties in Nashville, where the circumstances were well known. But the story, half understood and maliciously warped, grew into scandal as it was passed about among Jackson's personal enemies or political opponents; and herein some of the bitterest of his many quarrels had their source. His devotion to Mrs. Jackson was intense, and his pistol was always ready for the rash man who should dare to speak of her slightly.

In January, 1796, we find Jackson sitting in the convention assembled at Knoxville for making a constitution for Tennessee, and tradition has it that he proposed the name of the "Great Crooked River" as the name for the new state. Among the rules adopted by the convention, one is quaintly significant: "He that digresseth from the subject to fall on the person of any member shall be suppressed by the speaker." The admission of Tennessee to the Union was effected in June, 1796, in spite of earnest opposition from the Federalists, and in the autumn Jackson was chosen as the single representative

in congress. When the house had assembled, he heard President Washington deliver in person his last message to congress. He was one of twelve who voted against the adoption of the address to Washington in approval of his administration. Jackson's chief objections to Washington's government were directed against two of its most salutary and admirable acts—the Jay treaty with Great Britain, and Hamilton's financial measures. His feeling toward the Jay treaty was that of a man who could not bear to see anything but blows dealt to Great Britain. His condemnation of Hamilton's policy was mingled with the not unreasonable feeling of distrust which he had already begun to harbor against a national bank. The year 1797 was a season of financial depression, and the general paralysis of business was ascribed—no doubt too exclusively—to the over-issue of notes by the national bank. Jackson's antipathy to such an institution would seem to have begun thus early to show itself. Of his other votes in this congress, one was for an appropriation to defray the expenses of Sevier's expedition against the Cherokees, which was carried; three others were eminently wise and characteristic of the man: 1. For finishing the three frigates then building and destined to such renown—the “*Constitution*,” “*Constellation*,” and “*United States*.” 2. Against the further payment of blackmail to Algiers. 3. Against removing “the restriction which confined the expenditure of public money to the specific objects for which each sum was appropriated.” Another vote, silly in itself, was characteristic of the representative from a rough frontier community; it was against the presumed extravagance of appropriating \$14,000 to buy furniture for the newly built White House. Jackson's course was warmly approved by his constituents, and in the following summer he was chosen to fill a vacancy in the Federal senate. Of his conduct as senator nothing is known beyond the remark, made by Jefferson in 1824 to Daniel Webster, that he had often, when presiding in the senate, seen the passionate Jackson get up to speak and then choke with rage so that he could not utter a word. As Parton very happily suggests, one need not wonder at this if one remembers what was the subject chiefly before the senate during the winter of 1797-'8. The outrageous insolence of the French Directory was enough to arouse the wrath of far tamer and less patriotic spirits than Jackson's. Yet in a letter writ-

ten at that time he seems eager to see the British throne overturned by Bonaparte. In April, 1798, he resigned his seat in the senate, and was appointed judge in the supreme court of Tennessee. He retained this office for six years, but nothing is known of his decisions, as the practice of recording decisions began only with his successor, Judge Overton. During this period he was much harassed by business troubles arising from the decline in the value of land consequent upon the financial crisis of 1798. At length, in 1804, he resigned his judgeship in order to devote his attention exclusively to his private affairs. He paid up all his debts, and engaged extensively both in planting and in trade. He was noted for fair and honorable dealing, his credit was always excellent, and a note with his name on it was considered as good as gold. He had a clear head for business, and was never led astray by the delusions about paper money by which American frontier communities have so often been infected. His plantation was well managed, and his slaves kindly and considerately treated.

But while genial and kind toward his inferiors, he was among his fellow-citizens apt to be rough and quarrelsome. In 1795 he fought a duel with Avery, an opposing counsel, over some hasty words that had passed in the court-room. Next year he quarrelled with John Sevier, governor of Tennessee, and came near shooting him "at sight." Sevier had alluded to the circumstances of his marriage. Ten years afterward, for a similar offence, though complicated with other matters in the course of a long and extremely silly quarrel, he fought a duel with Charles Dickinson. The circumstances were revolting, but showed Jackson's wonderful nerve and rare skill in "grazing danger." Dickinson was killed, and Jackson received a wound from the effects of which he never recovered. In later years, when he was a candidate for the presidency, the number of his violent quarrels was variously reckoned by his enemies at from a dozen to a hundred. In 1805 Jackson was visited by Aaron Burr, who was then preparing his mysterious southwestern expedition. Burr seems to have wished, if possible, to make use of Jackson's influence in raising troops, but without indicating his purpose. In this he was unsuccessful, but Jackson appears to have regarded the charge of treason brought against Burr as ill-founded. At Richmond, while Burr's trial was going on, Jackson made a


speech attacking Jefferson. He thus made himself obnoxious to Madison, then secretary of state, and afterward, in 1808, he declared his preference for Monroe over Madison as candidate for the presidency. He was known as unfriendly to Madison's administration, but this did not prevent him from offering his services, with those of 2,500 men, as soon as war was declared against Great Britain in 1812. Since 1801 he had been commander-in-chief of the Tennessee militia, but there had been no occasion for him to take the field. Late in 1812, after the disasters in the northwest, it was feared that the British might make an attempt upon New Orleans, and Jackson was ordered down to Natchez, at the head of 2,000 men. He went in high spirits, promising to plant the American eagle upon the ramparts of Mobile, Pensacola, and St. Augustine, if so directed. On 6 Feb., as it had become evident that the British were not meditating a southward expedition, the new secretary of war, Armstrong, sent word to Jackson to disband his troops. This stupid order reached the general at Natchez toward the end of March, and inflamed his wrath. He took upon himself the responsibility of marching his men home in a body, an act in which the government afterward acquiesced and reimbursed Jackson for the expense involved. During this march Jackson became the idol of his troops, and his sturdiness won him the nickname of "Old Hickory," by which he was affectionately known among his friends and followers for the rest of his life.

Shortly after his arrival at Nashville there occurred an affray between Jackson and Thomas H. Benton, growing out of an unusually silly duel in which Jackson had acted as second to the antagonist of Benton's brother. In a tavern at Nashville, Jackson undertook to horsewhip Benton, and in the ensuing scuffle the latter was pitched down-stairs, while Jackson got a bullet in his left shoulder which he carried for more than twenty years. Jackson and Benton had formerly been friends. After this affair they did not meet again until 1823, when both were in the U. S. senate. Their friendship was then renewed.

The war with Great Britain was complicated with an Indian war which could not in any case have been avoided. The westward progress of the white settlers toward the Mississippi river was gradually driving the red man from his hunting-grounds; and the celebrated Tecumseh had formed a scheme, quite similar to that of Pontiac fifty years earlier, of uniting all the

tribes between Florida and the Great Lakes in a grand attempt to drive back the white men. This scheme was partially frustrated in the autumn of 1811 while Tecumseh was preaching his crusade among the Cherokees, Creeks, and Seminoles. During his absence his brother, known as the Prophet, attacked Gen. Harrison at Tippecanoe and was overwhelmingly defeated. The war with Great Britain renewed Tecumseh's opportunity, and his services to the enemy were extremely valuable until his death in the battle of the Thames. Tecumseh's principal ally in the south was a half-breed Creek chieftain named Weathersford. On the shore of Lake Tensas, in the southern part of what is now Alabama, was a stockaded fortress known as Fort Mimms. There many of the settlers had taken refuge. On 30 Aug., 1813, this stronghold was surprised by Weathersford at the head of 1,000 Creek warriors, and more than 400 men, women, and children were massacred. The news of this dreadful affair aroused the people of the southwest to vengeance. Men and money were raised by the state of Tennessee, and, before he had fully recovered from the wound received in the Benton affray, Jackson took the field at the head of 2,500 men. Now for the first time he had a chance to show his wonderful military capacity, his sleepless vigilance, untiring patience, and unrivalled talent as a leader of men. The difficulties encountered were formidable in the extreme. In that frontier wilderness the business of the commissariat was naturally ill managed, and the men, who under the most favorable circumstances had little idea of military subordination, were part of the time mutinous from hunger. More than once Jackson was obliged to use one half of his army to keep the other half from disbanding. In view of these difficulties, the celerity of his movements and the force with which he struck the enemy were truly marvellous. The Indians were defeated at Tallusatches and Talladega. At length, on 27 March, 1814, having been re-enforced by a regiment of U. S. infantry, Jackson struck the decisive blow at Tohopeka, otherwise known as the Horseshoe Bend of the Tallapoosa river. In this bloody battle no quarter was given, and the strength of the Creek nation was finally broken. Jackson pursued the remnant to their place of refuge called the Holy Ground, upon which the medicine-men had declared that no white man could set foot and live. Such of the Creek chieftains as had

not fled to Florida now surrendered. The American soldiers were ready to kill Weathersford in revenge for Fort Mimms; but Jackson, who was by no means wanting in magnanimity, spared his life and treated him so well that henceforth he and his people remained on good terms with the white men. Among the officers who served under Jackson in this remarkable campaign were two who in later years played an important part in the history of the southwest—Samuel Houston and David Crockett. The Creek war was one of critical importance. It was the last occasion on which the red men could put forth sufficient power to embarrass the U. S. government.



More than any other single battle that of Tohopeka marks the downfall of Indian power. Its immediate effects upon the war with Great Britain were very great.

By destroying the only hostile power within the southwestern territory it made it possible to concentrate the military force of the border states upon any point, however remote, that might be threatened by the British. More specifically, it made possible the great victory at New Orleans. Throughout the whole of this campaign, in which Jackson showed such indomitable energy, he was suffering from illness such as would have kept any ordinary man groaning in bed, besides that for most of the time his left arm had to be supported in a sling. The tremendous pluck exhibited by William of Orange at Neerwinden, and so justly celebrated by Macaulay, was no greater than Jackson showed in Alabama. His pluck was equalled by his thoroughness. Many generals after victory are inclined to relax their efforts. Not so Jackson, who followed up every success with furious persistence, and whose admirable maxim was that in war "until all is done, nothing is done."

On 31 May, 1814, Jackson was made major-general in the regular army, and was appointed to command the Department of the South. It was then a matter of dispute whether Mobile belonged to Spain or to the United States. In August, Jackson occupied the town and made his headquarters there. With



the consent of Spain the British used Florida as a base of operations and established themselves at Pensacola. Jackson wrote to Washington for permission to attack them there; but the government was loth to sanction an invasion of Spanish territory until the complicity of Spain with our enemy should be proved beyond cavil. The letter from Sec. Armstrong to this effect did not reach Jackson. The capture of Washington by the British prevented his receiving orders and left him to act upon his own responsibility, a kind of situation from which he was never known to flinch.

On 14 Sept. the British advanced against Mobile; but in their attack upon the outwork, Fort Bowyer, they met with a disastrous repulse. They retreated to Pensacola, whither Jackson followed them with 3,000 men. On 7 Nov. he stormed the town. His next move would have been against Fort Barrancas, six miles distant at the mouth of the harbor. By capturing this post he would have entrapped the British fleet and might have forced it to surrender; but the enemy forestalled him by blowing up the fort and beating a precipitate retreat. By thus driving the British from Florida—an act for which he was stupidly blamed by the Federalist press—Jackson now found himself free to devote all his energies to the task of defending New Orleans, and there, after an arduous journey, he arrived on 2 Dec. The British expedition directed against that city was more formidable than any other that we had to encounter during that war. Its purpose was also more deadly. In the north the British warfare had been directed chiefly toward defending Canada and gaining such a foothold upon our frontier as might be useful in making terms at the end of the war. The burning of Washington was intended chiefly for an insult, and had but slight military significance; but the expedition against New Orleans was intended to make a permanent conquest of the lower Mississippi valley and to secure for Great Britain the western bank of the river. The fall of Napoleon had set free some of Wellington's finest troops for service in America, and in December a force of 12,000 men, under command of Wellington's brother-in-law, the gallant Sir Edward Pakenham, was landed below New Orleans. To oppose these veterans of the Spanish peninsula, Jackson had 6,000 of that sturdy race whose fathers had vanquished Ferguson at King's Mountain, and whose children so nearly vanquished Grant at

Shiloh. After considerable preliminary manœuvring and skirmishing, Jackson intrenched himself in a strong position near the Bienvenu and Chalmette plantations and awaited the approach of the enemy. His headquarters, the McCarte mansion, are shown in the illustration on page 146. On 8 Jan., Pakenham was unwise enough to try to overwhelm him by a direct assault. In less than half an hour the British were in full retreat, leaving 2,600 of their number killed and wounded. Among the slain was Pakenham. The American loss was eight killed and thirteen wounded. Never, perhaps, in the history of the world has a battle been fought between armies of civilized men with so great a disparity of loss. It was also the most complete and overwhelming defeat that any English army has ever experienced. News travelled so slowly then that this great victory, like the three last naval victories of the war, occurred after peace had been made by the commissioners at Ghent. Nevertheless, no American can regret that the battle was fought. The insolence and rapacity of Great Britain had richly deserved such castigation. Moreover, if she once gained a foothold in the Mississippi valley, it might have taken an armed force to dislodge her in spite of the treaty, for in the matter of the western frontier posts after 1783 she had by no means acted in good faith. Jackson's victory decided that henceforth the Mississippi valley belonged indisputably to the people of the United States. It was the recollection of that victory, along with the exploits of Hull and Decatur, Perry and McDonough, which caused the Holy Alliance to look upon the Monroe doctrine as something more than an idle threat. All over the United States the immediate effect of the news was electric, and it was enhanced by the news of peace which arrived a few days later. By this "almost incredible victory," as the "National Intelligencer" called it, the credit of the American arms upon land was fully restored. Not only did the administration glory in it, as was natural, but the opposition lauded it for a different reason, as an example of what American military heroism could do in spite of inadequate support from government. Thus praised by all parties, Jackson, who before the Creek war had been little known outside of Tennessee, became at once the foremost man in the United States. People in the north, while throwing up their hats for him, were sometimes heard to ask: "Who is this Gen. Jackson? To what state does he belong?"



The president with his  
respects to Col Polk,  
member in congress, and  
asks the favor of him  
to call today to see him  
on business, at as early  
an hour as his convenience  
will permit

Dec<sup>r</sup> 15<sup>th</sup> 1832

Andrew Jackson

Henceforth until the civil war he occupied the most prominent place in the popular mind.

After his victory Jackson remained three months in New Orleans, in some conflict with the civil authorities of the town, which he found it necessary to hold under martial law. In April he returned to Nashville, still retaining his military command of the southwest. He soon became involved in a quarrel with Mr. Crawford, the secretary of war, who had undertaken to modify some provisions in his treaty with the Creeks. Jackson was also justly incensed by the occasional issue of orders from the war department directly to his subordinate officers; such orders sometimes stupidly thwarted his plans. The usual course for a commanding general thus annoyed would be to make a private representation to the government; but here, as ordinarily, while quite right in his position, Jackson was violent and overbearing in his methods. He published, 22 April, 1817, an order forbidding his subordinate officers to pay heed to any order from the war department unless issued through him. Mr. Calhoun, who in October succeeded Crawford as secretary of war, gracefully yielded the point; but the public had meanwhile been somewhat scandalized by the collision of authorities. In private conversation Gen. Scott had alluded to Jackson's conduct as savoring of mutiny. This led to an angry correspondence between the two generals, ending in a challenge from Jackson, which Scott declined on the ground that duelling is a wicked and unchristian custom.

Affairs in Florida now demanded attention. That country had become a nest of outlaws, and chaos reigned supreme there. Many of the defeated Creeks had found a refuge in Florida, and runaway negroes from the plantations of Georgia and South Carolina were continually escaping thither. During the late war British officers and adventurers, acting on their own responsibility upon this neutral soil, committed many acts which their government would never have sanctioned. They stirred up Indians and negroes to commit atrocities on the United States frontier. The Spanish government was at that time engaged in warfare with its revolted colonies in South America, and the coasts of Florida became a haunt for contraband traders, privateers, and filibusters. One adventurer would announce his intention to make Florida a free republic; another would go about committing robbery on his own account; a third

would set up an agency for kidnapping negroes on speculation. The disorder was hideous. On the Appalachicola river the British had built a fort, and amply stocked it with arms and ammunition, to serve as a base of operations against the United States. On the departure of the British the fort was seized and held by negroes. This alarmed the slave-owners of Georgia, and in July, 1816, United States troops, with permission from the Spanish authorities, marched in and bombarded the negro fort. A hot shot found its way into the magazine, three hundred negroes were blown into fragments, and the fort was demolished. In this case the Spaniards were ready to leave to United States troops a disagreeable work, for which their own force was incompetent. Every day made it plainer that Spain was quite unable to preserve order in Florida, and for this reason the United States entered upon negotiations for the purchase of that country. Meanwhile the turmoil increased. White men were murdered by Indians, and United States troops, under Col. Twiggs, captured and burned a considerable Seminole village, known as Fowltown. The Indians retorted by the massacre of fifty people who were ascending the Appalachicola river in boats; some of the victims were tortured with fire-brands. Jackson was now ordered to the frontier. He wrote at once to President Monroe: "Let it be signified to me through any channel (say Mr. John Rhea) that the possession of the Floridas would be desirable to the United States, and in sixty days it will be accomplished." Mr. Rhea was a representative from Tennessee, a confidential friend of both Jackson and Monroe. The president was ill when Jackson's letter reached him, and does not seem to have given it due consideration. On referring to it a year later he could not remember that he had ever seen it before. Rhea, however, seems to have written a letter to Jackson, telling him that the president approved of his suggestion. As to this point the united testimony of Jackson, Rhea, and Judge Overton seems conclusive. Afterward Mr. Monroe, through Rhea, seems to have requested Jackson to burn this letter, and an entry on the general's letter-book shows that it was accordingly burned, 12 April, 1819. There can be no doubt that, whatever the president's intention may have been, or how far it may have been correctly interpreted by Rhea, the general honestly considered himself authorized to take possession of Florida on the ground that the Spanish gov-

ernment had shown itself incompetent to prevent the denizens of that country from engaging in hostilities against the United States. Jackson acted upon this belief with his accustomed promptness. He raised troops in Tennessee and neighboring states, invaded Florida in March, 1818, captured St. Marks, and pushed on to the Seminole headquarters on the Suwanee river. In less than three months from this time he had overthrown the Indians and brought order out of chaos. His measures were praised by his friends as vigorous, while his enemies stigmatized them as high-handed. In one instance his conduct was open to serious question. At St. Marks his troops captured an aged Scotch trader and friend of the Indians, named Alexander Arbuthnot; near Suwanee, some time afterward, they seized Robert Ambrister, a young English lieutenant of marines, nephew of the governor of New Providence. Jackson believed that these men had incited the Indians to make war upon the United States, and were now engaged in aiding and abetting them in their hostilities. They were tried by a court-martial at St. Marks. On very insufficient evidence Arbuthnot was found guilty and sentenced to be hanged. Appearances were somewhat more strongly against Ambrister. He did not make it clear what his business was in Florida, and threw himself upon the mercy of the court, which at first condemned him to be shot, but on further consideration commuted the sentence to fifty lashes and a year's imprisonment. Jackson arbitrarily revived the first sentence, and Ambrister was accordingly shot. A few minutes afterward Arbuthnot was hanged from the yard-arm of his own ship, declaring with his last breath that his country would avenge him. In this lamentable affair Jackson doubtless acted from a sense of duty; as he himself said, "My God would not have smiled on me, had I punished only the poor ignorant savages, and spared the white men who set them on." Here, as elsewhere, however, when under the influence of strong feeling, he showed himself utterly incapable of estimating evidence. The case against both the victims was so weak that a fair-minded and prudent commander would surely have pardoned them; while the interference with the final sentence of the court, in Ambrister's case, was an act that can hardly be justified. Throughout life Jackson was perpetually acting with violent energy upon the strength of opinions hastily formed and based upon inadequate data. Fortunately, his instincts

were apt to be sound, and in many most important instances his violent action was highly beneficial to his country; but a man of such temperament is liable to make serious mistakes.

On his way home, hearing that some Indians had sought refuge in Pensacola, Jackson captured the town, turned out the Spanish governor, and left a garrison of his own there. He had now virtually conquered Florida, but he had moved too fast for the government at Washington. He had gone further, perhaps, than was permissible in trespassing upon neutral territory; and his summary execution of two British subjects aroused furious excitement in England. For a moment we seemed on the verge of war with Great Britain and Spain at once. Whatever authority President Monroe may have intended, through the Rhea letter, to confer upon Jackson, he certainly felt that the general had gone too far. With one exception, all his cabinet agreed with him that it would be best to disavow Jackson's acts and make reparation for them. But John Quincy Adams, secretary of state, felt equal to the task of dealing with the two foreign powers, and upon his advice the administration decided to assume the responsibility for what Jackson had done. Pensacola and St. Marks were restored to Spain, and an order of Jackson's for the seizing of St. Augustine was countermanded by the president. But Adams represented to Spain that the American general, in his invasion of Florida, was virtually assisting the Spanish government in maintaining order there; and to Great Britain he justified the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister on the ground that their conduct had been such that they had forfeited their allegiance and become virtual outlaws. Spain and Great Britain accepted the explanations; had either nation felt in the mood for war with the United States, it might have been otherwise. As soon as the administration had adopted Jackson's measures, they were for that reason attacked in Congress by Clay, and this was the beginning of the bitter and lifelong feud between Jackson and Clay. In 1819 the purchase of Florida from Spain was effected, and in 1821 Jackson was appointed governor of that territory. In 1823 he was elected to the U. S. senate. Some of his friends, under the lead of William B. Lewis, had already conceived the idea of making him president. At first Gen. Jackson cast ridicule upon the idea. "Do they suppose," said he, "that I am such a d—d fool as to think myself fit for presi-



dent of the United States? No, sir, I know what I am fit for. I can command a body of men in a rough way, but I am not fit to be president." Such is the anecdote told by H. M. Brackenridge, who was Jackson's secretary in Florida. In 1821 the general felt old and weak, and had made up his mind to spend his remaining days in peace on his farm. Of personal ambition, as ordinarily understood, Jackson had much less than many other men. But he was, like most men, susceptible to flattery, and the discovery of his immense popularity no doubt went far to persuade him that he might do credit to himself as president. On 20 July, 1822, he was nominated for that office by the legislature of Tennessee. On 22 Feb., 1824, he was nominated by a Federalist convention at Harrisburg, Pa., and on 4 March following by a Republican convention at the same place. The regular nominee of the congressional caucus was William H. Crawford, of Georgia. The other candidates were John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay. There was a general agreement upon Calhoun for the vice-presidency. All the candidates belonged to the Republican party, which had kept the presidency since Jefferson's election in 1800. The Federalists were hopelessly discredited by their course in the war of 1812-'15. Of the four candidates Adams and Clay were loose constructionists, while Crawford and Jackson were strict constructionists, and in this difference was foreshadowed a new division of parties. At the election in November, 1824, there were 99 electoral votes for Jackson, 84 for Adams, 41 for Crawford, and 37 for Clay. As none of the candidates had a majority, it was left for the house of representatives to choose a president from the three highest names on the list, in accordance with the twelfth amendment to the constitution. As Clay was thus rendered ineligible, there was naturally some scheming among the friends of the other candidates to secure his powerful co-operation. Clay and his friends quite naturally supported the other loose-constructionist candidate, Adams, with the result that 13 states voted for Adams, 7 for Jackson, and 4 for Crawford. Adams thus became president, and Jackson's friends, in their disappointment, hungered for a "grievance" upon which they might vent their displeasure, and which might serve as a "rallying cry" for the next campaign. Benton, who was now one of Jackson's foremost supporters, went so far as to maintain that, because Jackson had a greater number of electoral votes than

any other candidate, the house was virtually "defying the will of the people" in choosing any name but his. To this it was easily answered that in any case our electoral college, which was one of the most deliberately framed devices of the constitution, gives but a very indirect and partial expression of the "will of the people"; and furthermore, if Benton's argument was sound, why should the constitution have provided for an election by congress, instead of allowing a simple plurality in the college to decide the election? The extravagance of Benton's objection, coming from so able a source, is an index to the bitter disappointment of Jackson's followers. The needed "grievance" was furnished when Adams selected Clay as his secretary of state. Many of Jackson's friends interpreted this appointment as the result of a bargain whereby Clay had made Adams president in consideration of obtaining the first place in the cabinet, carrying with it, according to the notion then prevalent, a fair prospect of the succession to the presidency. It was natural enough for the friends of a disappointed candidate to make such a charge. It was to Benton's credit that he always scouted the idea of a corrupt bargain between Adams and Clay. Many people, however, believed it. In congress, John Randolph's famous allusion to the "coalition between Blifil and Black George—the Puritan and the blackleg"—led to a duel between Randolph and Clay, which served to impress the matter upon the popular mind without enlightening it; the pistol is of small value as an agent of enlightenment. The charge was utterly without support and in every way improbable. The excellence of the appointment of Clay was beyond cavil, and the sternly upright Adams was less influenced by what people might think of his actions than any other president since Washington. But the appointment was no doubt ill-considered. It made it necessary for Clay, in many a public speech, to defend himself against the cruel imputation. To mention the charge to Jackson, whose course in Florida had been severely censured by Clay, was enough to make him believe it; and he did so to his dying day.

It is not likely that the use made of this "grievance" had much to do with Jackson's victory in 1828. The causes at work lay far deeper. The population west of the Alleghanies was now beginning to count for much in politics. Jackson was our first western president, and his election marks the rise of

that section of our country. The democratic tendency was moreover a growing one. Heretofore our presidents had been men of aristocratic type, with advantages of wealth, or education, or social training. A stronger contrast to them than Jackson afforded cannot well be imagined. A man with less training in statesmanship would have been hard to find. In his defects he represented average humanity, while his excellences were such as the most illiterate citizen could appreciate. In such a man the ploughboy and the blacksmith could feel that in some essential respects they had for president one of their own sort. Above all, he was the great military hero of the day, and as such he came to the presidency as naturally as Taylor and Grant in later days, as naturally as his contemporary Wellington became prime minister of England. A man far more politic and complaisant than Adams could not have won the election of 1828 against such odds. He obtained 83 electoral votes against 178 for Jackson. Calhoun was re-elected vice-president. Jackson came to the presidency with a feeling that he had at length succeeded in making good his claim to a violated right, and he showed this feeling in his refusal to call on his illustrious predecessor, who he declared had got the presidency by bargain and sale.

In Jackson's cabinet, as first constituted, Martin Van Buren, of New York, was secretary of state; Samuel D. Ingham, of Pennsylvania, secretary of the treasury; John H. Eaton, of Tennessee, secretary of war; John Branch, of North Carolina, secretary of the navy; John M. Berrien, of Georgia, attorney-general; William T. Barry, of Kentucky, postmaster-general. As compared with earlier cabinets—not merely with such men as Hamilton, Madison, or Gallatin, but with Pickering, Wolcott, Monroe, or even Crawford—these were obscure names. The innovation in the personal character of the cabinet was even more marked than the innovation in the presidency. The autocratic Jackson employed his secretaries as clerks. His confidential advisers were a few intimate friends who held no important offices. These men—William B. Lewis, Amos Kendall, Duff Green, and Isaac Hill—came to be known as the “kitchen cabinet.” Lewis had had much to do with bringing Jackson forward as a candidate for the presidency in 1821. Green and Hill were editors of partisan newspapers. Kendall was a man of considerable ability and many good qualities, but a “machine

politician" of the worst sort. He was on many occasions the ruling spirit of the administration, and the cause of some of its most serious mistakes. Jackson's career as president cannot be fully understood without taking into account the agency of Kendall; yet it is not always easy to assign the character and extent of the influence which he exerted.

A yet more notable innovation was Jackson's treatment of the civil service. The earlier presidents had proceeded upon the theory that public office is a public trust, and not a reward for partisan services. They conducted the business of government upon business principles, and as long as a postmaster showed himself efficient in distributing the mail they did not turn him out of office because of his vote. Between 30 April, 1789, and 4 March, 1829, the total number of removals from office was seventy-four, and out of this number five were defaulters. Between 4 March, 1829, and 22 March, 1830, the number of changes made in the civil service was about 2,000. This was the inauguration upon a national scale of the so-called "spoils system." The phrase originated with William L. Marcy, of New York, who in a speech in the senate in 1831 declared that "to the victors belong the spoils." The system had been perfected in the state politics of New York and Pennsylvania, and it was probably inevitable that it should sooner or later be introduced into the sphere of national politics. The way was prepared in 1820 by Crawford, when he succeeded in getting the law passed that limits the tenure of office to four years. This dangerous measure excited very little discussion at the time. People could not understand the evil until taught by hard experience. Jackson did not understand that he was laying the foundations of a gigantic system of corruption, which within a few years would develop into the most serious of the dangers threatening the continuance of American freedom. He was very ready to believe ill of political opponents, and to make generalizations from extremely inadequate data. Democratic newspapers, while the campaign frenzy was on them, were full of windy declamation about the wholesale corruption introduced into all parts of the government by Adams and Clay. Nothing was too bad for Jackson to believe of these two men, and when the fourth auditor of the treasury was found to be delinquent in his accounts it was easy to suppose that many others were, in one way or another, just as bad. In

his wholesale removals Jackson doubtless supposed he was doing the country a service by "turning the rascals out." The immediate consequence of this demoralizing policy was a struggle for control of the patronage between Calhoun and Van Buren, who were rival aspirants for the succession to the presidency. A curious affair now came in to influence Jackson's personal relations to these men. Early in 1829 Eaton, secretary of war, married a Mrs. Timberlake, with whose reputation gossip had been busy. It was said that he had shown her too much attention during the lifetime of her first husband. Jackson was always slow to believe charges against a woman. His own wife, who had been outrageously maligned by the Whig newspapers during the campaign, had lately died, and there was just enough outward similarity between Eaton's marriage and his own to make him take Mrs. Eaton's part with more than his customary vehemence. Mrs. Calhoun and the wives of the secretaries would not recognize Mrs. Eaton. Mrs. Donelson, wife of the president's nephew, and mistress of ceremonies at the White House, took a similar stand. Jackson scolded his secretaries and sent Mrs. Donelson home to Tennessee; but all in vain. He found that vanquishing Wellington's veterans was a light task compared with that of contending against the ladies in an affair of this sort. Foremost among those who frowned Mrs. Eaton out of society was Mrs. Calhoun. On the other hand, Van Buren, a widower, found himself able to be somewhat more complaisant, and accordingly rose in Jackson's esteem. The fires were fanned by Lewis and Kendall, who saw in Van Buren a more eligible ally than Calhoun. Presently intelligence was obtained from Crawford, who hated Calhoun, to the effect that the latter, as member of Monroe's cabinet, had disapproved of Jackson's conduct in Florida. This was quite true, but Calhoun had discreetly yielded his judgment to that of the cabinet led by Adams, and thus had officially sanctioned Jackson's conduct. These facts, as handled by Eaton and Lewis, led Jackson to suspect Calhoun of treacherous double-dealing, and the result was a quarrel which broke up the cabinet. In order to get Calhoun's friends—Ingham, Branch, and Berrien—out of the cabinet, the other secretaries began by resigning. This device did not succeed, and the ousting of the three secretaries entailed further quarrelling, in the course of which the Eaton affair and the Florida business were beaten

threadbare in the newspapers, and evoked sundry challenges to deadly combat. In the spring and summer of 1831 the new cabinet was formed, consisting of Edward Livingston, secretary of state; Louis McLane, treasury; Lewis Cass, war; Levi Woodbury, navy; Roger B. Taney, attorney-general; in post-office no change. On Van Buren's resignation, Jackson at once appointed him minister to England, but there was a warm dispute in the senate over his confirmation, and it was defeated at length by the casting-vote of Calhoun. This check only strengthened Jackson's determination to have Van Buren for his successor in the presidency. The progress of this quarrel entailed a break in the "kitchen cabinet," in which Duff Green, editor of the "Telegraph" and friend of Calhoun, was thrown out. His place was taken by Francis Preston Blair, of Kentucky, a man of eminent ability and earnest patriotism. To him and his sons, as energetic opponents of nullification and secession, our country owes a debt of gratitude which can hardly be overstated. Blair's indignant attitude toward nullification brought him at once into earnest sympathy with Jackson. In December, 1830, Blair began publishing the "Globe," the organ henceforth of Jackson's party. For a period of ten years, until the defeat of the Democrats in 1840, Blair and Kendall were the ruling spirits in the administration. Their policy was to re-elect Jackson to the presidency in 1832, and make Van Buren his successor in 1836.

During Jackson's administration there came about a new division of parties. The strict constructionists, opposing internal improvements, protective tariff, and national banks, retained the name of Democrats, which had long been applied to members of the old Republican party. The term Republican fell into disuse. The loose constructionists, under the lead of Clay, took the name of Whigs, as it suited their purposes to describe Jackson as a kind of tyrant; and they tried to discredit their antagonists by calling them Tories, but the device found little favor. On strict constructionist grounds Jackson in 1829 vetoed the bill for a government subscription to the stock of the Maysville turnpike in Kentucky, and two other similar bills he disposed of by a new method, which the Whigs indignantly dubbed a "pocket veto." The struggle over the tariff was especially important as bringing out a clear expression of the doctrine of nullification on the part of South Caro-

lina. Practically, however, nullification was first attempted by Georgia in the case of the disputes with the Cherokee Indians. Under treaties with the Federal government these Indians occupied lands that were coveted by the white people. Adams had made himself very unpopular in Georgia by resolutely defending the treaty rights of these Indians. Immediately upon Jackson's election, the state government assumed jurisdiction over their lands, and proceeded to legislate for them, passing laws that discriminated against them. Disputes at once arose, in the course of which Georgia twice refused to obey the supreme court of the United States. At the request of the governor of Georgia, Jackson withdrew the Federal troops from the Cherokee country, and refused to enforce the rights that had been guaranteed to the Indians by the United States. His feelings toward Indians



were those of a frontier fighter, and he asked, with telling force, whether an eastern state, such as New York, would endure the nuisance of an independent Indian state within her own boundaries. In his sympathy with the people of Georgia on the particular question at issue, he seemed to be conniving at the dangerous principle of nullification. These events were carefully noted by the politicians of South Carolina. The protectionist policy, which since the peace of 1815 had been growing in favor at the north, had culminated in 1828 in the so-called "tariff of abominations." This tariff, the result of a wild helter-skelter scramble of rival interests, deserved its name on many accounts. It discriminated, with especial unfairness, against the southern people, who were very naturally and properly enraged by it. A new tariff, passed in 1832, modified some of the most objectionable features of the old one, but still failed of justice to the southerners. Jackson was opposed to the principle of protective tariffs, and from his course with Georgia it might be argued that he would not interfere with extreme measures on the part of the south. During the whole of Jackson's first term there was more or less vague talk about nullification. The subject had a way of obtruding itself upon all sorts of discussions, as

in the famous debates on Foot's resolutions, which lasted over five months in 1830, and called forth Webster's immortal speech in reply to Hayne. A few weeks after this speech, at a public dinner in commemoration of Jefferson's birthday, after sundry regular toasts had seemed to indicate a drift of sentiment in approval of nullification, Jackson suddenly arose with a volunteer toast: "Our Federal Union: it must be preserved." Calhoun was prompt to reply with a toast and a speech in behalf of "Liberty, dearer than the Union," but the nullifiers were greatly disappointed and chagrined. In spite of this warning, South Carolina held a convention, 19 Nov., 1832, and declared the tariffs of 1828 and 1832 to be null and void in South Carolina; all state officers and jurors were required to take an oath of obedience to this edict; appeals to the Federal supreme court were prohibited under penalties; and the Federal government was warned that an attempt on its part to enforce the revenue laws would immediately provoke South Carolina to secede from the Union. The ordinance of nullification was to take effect on 1 Feb., 1833, and preparations for war were begun at once. On 16 Dec. the president issued a proclamation, in which he declared that he should enforce the laws in spite of any and all resistance that might be made, and he showed that he was in earnest by forthwith sending Lieut. Farragut with a naval force to Charleston harbor, and ordering Gen. Scott to have troops ready to enter South Carolina if necessary. In the proclamation, which was written by Livingston, the president thus defined his position: "I consider the power to annul a law of the United States, assumed by one state, incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed." Gov. Hayne, of South Carolina, issued a counter-proclamation, and a few days afterward Calhoun resigned the vice-presidency, and was chosen to succeed Hayne in the senate. Jackson's determined attitude was approved by public opinion throughout the country. By the southern people generally the action of South Carolina was regarded as precipitate and unconstitutional. Even in that state a Union convention met at Columbia, and announced its intention of supporting the president. In January, Calhoun declared in the senate that his state was not hostile to the



Union, and had not meditated an armed resistance; a "peaceable secession," to be accomplished by threats, was probably the ultimatum really contemplated. In spite of Jackson's warning, the nullifiers were surprised by his unflinching attitude, and quite naturally regarded it as inconsistent with his treatment of Georgia. When the 1st of February came the nullifiers deferred action. In the course of that month a bill for enforcing the tariff passed both houses of congress, and at the same time Clay's compromise tariff was adopted, providing for the gradual reduction of the duties until 1842, after which all duties were to be kept at 20 per cent. This compromise enabled the nullifiers to claim a victory, and retreat from their position with colors flying.

During the nullification controversy Jackson kept up the attacks upon the United States bank which he had begun in his first annual message to congress in 1829. The charter of the bank would expire in 1836, and Jackson was opposed to its renewal. The grounds of his opposition were partly sound, partly fanciful. There was a wholesome opposition to paper currency, combined with great ignorance of the natural principles of money and trade, as illustrated in a willingness to tolerate the notes of local banks, according to the chaotic system prevalent between Jackson's time and Lincoln's. There was something of the demagogue's appeal to the prejudice that ignorant people are apt to cherish against capitalists and corporations, though Jackson cannot be accused of demagoguery in this regard, because he shared the prejudice. Then there was good reason for believing that the bank was in some respects mismanaged, and for fearing that a great financial institution, so intimately related to the government, might be made an engine of political corruption. Furthermore, the correspondence between Sec. Ingham and Nicholas Biddle, president of the bank, in the summer of 1829, shows that some of Jackson's friends wished to use the bank for political purposes, and were enraged at Biddle's determination in pursuing an independent course. The occasion was duly improved by the "kitchen cabinet" to fill Jackson's ears with stories tending to show that the influence of the bank was secretly exerted in favor of the opposite party. Jackson's suggestions with reference to the bank in his first message met with little favor, especially as he coupled them with suggestions for the distribution of the surplus reve-

nue among the states. He returned to the attack in his two following messages, until in 1832 the bank felt obliged in self-defence to apply, somewhat prematurely, for a renewal of its charter on the expiration of its term. Charges brought against the bank by Democratic representatives were investigated by a committee, which returned a majority report in favor of the bank. A minority report sustained the charges. After prolonged discussion, the bill to renew the charter passed both houses, and on 10 July, 1832, was vetoed by the president. An attempt to pass the bill over the veto failed of the requisite two-third majority.

Circumstances had already given a flavor of personal contest to Jackson's assaults upon the bank. There was no man whom he hated so fiercely as Clay, who was at the same time his chief political rival. Clay made the mistake of forcing the bank question into the foreground, in the belief that it was an issue upon which he was likely to win in the coming presidential campaign. Clay's movement was an invitation to the people to defeat Jackson in order to save the bank; and this naturally aroused all the combativeness in Jackson's nature. His determined stand impressed upon the popular imagination the picture of a dauntless "tribune of the people" fighting against the "monster monopoly." Clay unwisely attacked the veto power of the president, and thus gave Benton an opportunity to defend it by analogies drawn from the veto power of the ancient Roman tribune; which in point of fact it does not at all resemble. The discussion helped Jackson more than Clay. It was also a mistake on the part of the Whig leader to risk the permanence of such an institution as the U. S. bank upon the fortunes of a presidential canvass. It dragged the bank into politics in spite of itself, and, by thus affording justification for the fears to which Jackson had appealed, played directly into his hands. In this canvass all the candidates were for the first time nominated in national conventions. There were three conventions—all held at Baltimore. In September, 1831, the Anti-Masons nominated William Wirt, of Virginia, in the hope of getting the national Republicans or Whigs to unite with them; but the latter, in December, nominated Clay. In the following March the Democrats nominated Jackson, with Van Buren for vice-president. During the year 1832 the action of congress and president with regard to the bank charter was

virtually a part of the campaign. In the election South Carolina voted for candidates of her own—John Floyd, of Virginia, and Henry Lee, of Massachusetts. There were 219 electoral votes for Jackson, 49 for Clay, 11 for Floyd, and 7 for Wirt. Jackson interpreted this overwhelming victory as a popular condemnation of the bank and approval of all his actions as president. The enthusiastic applause from all quarters which now greeted his rebuke of the nullifiers served still further to strengthen his belief in himself as a “saviour of society” and champion of “the people.” Men were getting into a state of mind in which questions of public policy were no longer argued upon their merits, but all discussion was drowned in cheers for Jackson. Such a state of things was not calculated to check his natural vehemence and disposition to override all obstacles in carrying his point. He now felt it to be his sacred duty to demolish the bank. In his next message to congress he created some alarm by expressing doubts as to the bank’s solvency and recommending an investigation to see if the deposits of public money were safe. In some parts of the country there were indications of a run upon the branches of the bank. The committee of ways and means investigated the matter, and reported the bank as safe and sound, but a minority report threw doubt upon these conclusions, so that the public uneasiness was not allayed. The conclusions of the members of the committee, indeed, bore little reference to the evidence before them, and were determined purely by political partisanship. Jackson made up his mind that the deposits must be removed from the bank. The act of 1816, which created that institution, provided that the public funds might be removed from it by order of the secretary of the treasury, who must, however, inform congress of his reasons for the removal. As congress resolved, by heavy majorities, that the deposits were safe in the bank, the spring of 1833 was hardly a time when a secretary of the treasury would feel himself warranted, in accordance with the provisions of the act, to order their removal. Sec. McLane was accordingly unwilling to issue such an order. In what followed, Jackson had the zealous co-operation of Kendall and Blair. In May, McLane was transferred to the state department, and was succeeded in the treasury by William J. Duane, of Pennsylvania. The new secretary, however, was convinced that the removal was neither necessary nor wise, and,

in spite of the president's utmost efforts, refused either to issue the order or to resign his office. In September, accordingly, Duane was removed, and Roger B. Taney was appointed in his place. Taney at once ordered that after the 1st of October the public revenues should no longer be deposited with the national bank, but with sundry state banks, which soon came to be known as the "pet banks." Jackson alleged, as one chief reason for this proceeding, that if the bank were to continue to receive public revenues on deposit, it would unscrupulously use them in buying up all the members of congress and thus securing an indefinite renewal of its charter. This, he thought, would be a death-blow to free government in America. His action caused intense excitement and some commercial distress, and prepared the way for further disturbance. In the next session of the senate Clay introduced a resolution of censure, which was carried after a debate which lasted all winter. It contained a declaration that the president had assumed "authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both." Jackson protested against the resolution, but the senate refused to receive his protest. Many of his appointments were rejected by the senate, especially those of the directors of the bank, and of Taney as secretary of the treasury. An attempt was made to curtail the president's appointing power. On the other hand, many of the president's friends declaimed against the senate as an aristocratic institution, which ought to be abolished. Benton was Jackson's most powerful and steadfast ally in the senate. Benton was determined that the resolution of censure should be expunged from the records of the senate, and his motion continued to be the subject of acrimonious debate for two years. The contest was carried into the state elections, and some senators resigned in consequence of instructions received from their state legislatures. At length, on 16 Jan., 1837, a few weeks before Jackson's retirement from office, Benton's persistency triumphed, and the resolution of censure was expunged. Meanwhile the consequence of the violent method with which the finances had been handled were rapidly developing. Many state banks, including not a few of the "wildcat" species, had been formed, to supply the paper currency that was supposed to be needed. The abundance of paper, together with the rapid westward movement of population, caused reckless speculation and an

inflation of values. Extensive purchases of public lands were paid for in paper until the treasury scented danger, and by the president's order in July, 1836, the "specie circular" was issued, directing that only gold or silver should be received for public lands. This caused a demand for coin, which none but the "pet banks" could hope to succeed in meeting. But these banks were at the same time crippled by orders to surrender, on the following New-Year's day, one fourth of the surplus revenues deposited with them, as it was to be distributed as a loan among the states. The "pet banks" had regarded the deposits as capital to be used in loans, and they were now suddenly obliged to call in these loans.



*Andrew Jackson*

These events led to the great panic of 1837, which not only scattered thousands of private fortunes to the winds, but wrecked Van Buren's administration and prepared the way for the Whig victory of 1840.

In foreign affairs Jackson's administration won great credit through its enforcement of the French spoliation claims. European nations which had claims for damages against France on account of spoliations committed by French cruisers during the Napoleonic wars had found no difficulty after the peace of 1815 in obtaining payment; but the claims of the United States had been superciliously neglected. In 1831, after much fruitless negotiation, a treaty was made by which France agreed to pay the United States \$5,000,000 in six annual instalments. The first payment was due on 2 Feb., 1833. A draft for the amount was presented to the French minister of finance, and payment was refused on the ground that no appropriation for that purpose had been made by the chambers. Louis Philippe brought the matter before the chambers, but no appropriation was made. Jackson was not the man to be trifled with in this way. In his message of December, 1834, he gravely recommended to congress that a law be passed authorizing the capture of French vessels enough to make up the amount due. The French government was enraged, and threatened war unless the president should apologize—not a hopeful sort of

demand to make of Andrew Jackson. Here Great Britain interposed with good advice to France, which led to the payment of the claim without further delay. The effect of Jackson's attitude was not lost upon European governments, while at home the hurrahs for "Old Hickory" were louder than ever. The days when foreign powers could safely insult us were evidently gone by.

The period of Jackson's presidency was one of the most remarkable in the history of the world, and nowhere more remarkable than in the United States. It was signalized by the introduction and rapid development of railroads, of ocean navigation through Ericsson's invention of the screw-propeller, of agricultural machines, anthracite coal, and friction matches, of the modern type of daily newspaper, of the beginnings of such cities as Chicago, of the steady immigration from Europe, of the rise of the Abolitionists and other reformers, and of the blooming of American literature when to the names of Bryant, Cooper, and Irving were added those of Longfellow, Whittier, Prescott, Holmes, and Hawthorne. The rapid expansion of the country and the extensive changes in ideas and modes of living brought to the surface much crudeness of thought and action. As the typical popular hero of such a period, Andrew Jackson must always remain one of the most picturesque and interesting figures in American history. His ignorance of the principles of statesmanship, the crudeness of his methods, and the evils that have followed from some of his measures, are obvious enough and have often been remarked upon. But in having a president of this type and at such a time we were fortunate in securing a man so sound in most of his impulses, of such absolute probity, truthfulness, and courage, and such unflinching loyalty to the Union. Jackson's death, in the year in which Texas was annexed to the United States, marks in a certain sense the close of the political era in which he had played so great a part. From the year 1845 the Calhoun element in the Democratic party became more and more dominant until 1860, while the elements more congenial with Jackson and variously represented by Benton, Blair, and Van Buren, went to form an important part of the force of Republicans and War Democrats that finally silenced the nullifiers and illustrated the maxim that the Union must be preserved.

Jackson died at his home, "The Hermitage," near Nashville,

a view of which is given on page 159. The principal biographies of him are by James Parton (3 vols., New York, 1861) and William G. Sumner (Boston, 1882); also General Jackson (New York, 1892), contributed by James Parton to the "Great Commanders" series. Other biographies are by John H. Eaton (Philadelphia, 1817); P. A. Goodwin (Hartford, 1832); William Cobbett (New York, 1834); Amos Kendall (1843); Oliver Dyer (New York, 1891). For accounts of his administration, see, in general, Benton's "Thirty Years' View," the memoirs of John Q. Adams, the histories of the United States by Schouler and Von Holst, and the biographies of Clay, Webster, Adams, Calhoun, Benton, and Edward Livingston. See, also, Mayo's "Political Sketches of Eight Years in Washington" (Baltimore, 1839). The famous "Letters of Major Jack Downing" (New York, 1834), a burlesque on Jackson's administration, were wonderfully popular in their day. The picture on page 165, taken from a miniature made much earlier in life than the steel portrait that appears with this article, was painted by Vallé, a French artist, and presented by Jackson to his friend Livingston, with the following note, written at his headquarters, New Orleans, 1 May, 1815: "Mr. E. Livingston is requested to accept this picture as a mark of the sense I entertain of his public services, and as a token of my private friendship and esteem." The full-length portrait from a painting by Earle, prefixed to Parton's third volume, is said to be the best representation of Jackson as he appeared upon the street.

His wife, RACHEL, born in 1767; died at the Hermitage, Tenn., 22 Dec., 1828, was the daughter of Col. John Donelson, a wealthy Virginia surveyor, who owned extensive iron-works in Pittsylvania county, Va., but sold them in 1779 and settled in French Salt Springs, where the city of Nashville now stands. He kept an account of his journey thither, entitled "Journal of a Voyage, intended by God's Permission, in the Good Boat 'Adventure,' from Fort Patrick Henry, on Holston River, to the French Salt Springs, on Cumberland River, kept by John Donelson." Subsequently he removed to Kentucky, where he had several land-claims, and, after his daughter's marriage to Capt. Lewis Robards, he returned to Tennessee, where he was murdered by unknown persons in the autumn of 1785. (For an account of the peculiar circumstances of her marriage to

Jackson, see page 139.) Mrs. Jackson went to New Orleans after the battle, and was presented by the ladies of that city with a set of topaz jewelry. In her portrait at the Hermitage, painted by Earle, she wears the dress in which she appeared at




*Rachel Jackson*

the ball that was given in New Orleans in honor of her husband, and of which the accompanying vignette is a copy. She went with Gen. Jackson to Florida in 1821, to Washington and Charleston in 1824, and to New Orleans in 1828. For many years she had suffered from an affection of the heart, which was augmented by various reports that were in circulation regarding her previous career, and her death was hastened by overhearing a magnified account of her experiences. She was pos-

sessed of a kind and attractive manner, was deeply religious and charitable, and adverse to public life.—Their niece, EMILY, born in Tennessee; died there in December, 1836, was the youngest daughter of Capt. John Donelson and the wife of Andrew J. Donelson. She presided in the White House during the administration of President Jackson, who always spoke of her as “my daughter.” During the Eaton controversy she received Mrs. Eaton on public occasions, but refused to recognize her socially.—His daughter-in-law, SARAH YORK, the wife of his adopted son, Andrew Jackson, born in 1806; died at the Hermitage, Nashville, Tenn., 23 Aug., 1887, also presided at the White House during President Jackson’s administration. Her son, Andrew, was graduated at the U. S. military academy in 1858, and served in the Confederate army, in which he was colonel of the First Regiment of Tennessee Artillery.







Eng<sup>d</sup> by H.B. Hall Jr New York

Wm Van Buren

## MARTIN VAN BUREN.

MARTIN VAN BUREN, eighth president of the United States, born in Kinderhook, Columbia co., N. Y., 5 Dec., 1782; died there, 24 July, 1862. He was the eldest son of Abraham Van Buren, a small farmer, and of Mary Hoes (originally spelled Goes), whose first husband was named Van Alen. Martin studied the rudiments of English and Latin in the schools of his native village, and read law in the office of Francis Sylvester at the age of fourteen years. Rising as a student by slow gradations from office-boy to lawyer's clerk, copyist of pleas, and finally to the rank of special pleader in the constables' courts, he patiently pursued his legal novitiate through the term of seven years and familiarized himself with the technique of the bar and with the elements of common law. Combining with these professional studies a fondness for extemporaneous debate, he was early noted for his intelligent observation of public events and for his interest in politics. He was chosen to participate in a nominating convention when he was only eighteen years old. In 1802 he went to New York and there studied law with William P. Van Ness, a friend of Aaron Burr. He was admitted to the bar in 1803, returned to Kinderhook, and associated himself in practice with his half-brother, James J. Van Alen.

Van Buren was a zealous adherent of Jefferson, and supported Morgan Lewis for governor of New York in 1803 against Aaron Burr. In February, 1807, he married Hannah Hoes, a distant kinswoman, and in the winter of 1806-'7 he removed to Hudson, the county-seat of Columbia county, and in the same year was admitted to practice in the supreme court. In the state election of 1807 he supported Daniel D. Tompkins for governor against Morgan Lewis, the latter, in the factional changes of New York politics, having come to be considered less true than the former to the measures of Jefferson. In 1808 Van Buren became surrogate of Columbia county, displacing

his half-brother and partner, who belonged to the defeated faction. He held his office till 1813, when, on a change of party predominance at Albany, his half-brother was restored. Attentively watching the drift of political events, he figured in the councils of his party at a convention held in Albany early in 1811, when the proposed recharter of the United States bank was the leading question of Federal politics. Though Albert Gallatin, secretary of the treasury, had recommended a recharter, the predominant sentiment of the Republican party was adverse to the measure. Van Buren shared in this hostility and publicly lauded the "Spartan firmness" of George Clinton when as vice-president he gave his casting-vote in the U. S. senate against the bank bill, 20 Feb., 1811.

In 1812 Van Buren was elected to the senate of New York from the middle district as a Clinton Republican, defeating Edward P. Livingston, the candidate of the "Quids," by a majority of 200. He took his seat in November of that year and became thereby a member of the court of errors, then composed of senators in connection with the chancellor and the supreme court. As senator he strenuously opposed the charter of "the Bank of America," which, with a large capital and with the promise of liberal subsidies to the state treasury, was then seeking to establish itself in New York and to take the place of the United States bank. He upheld Gov. Tompkins when, exercising his extreme prerogative, he prorogued the legislature on 27 March, 1812, to prevent the passage of the bill. Though counted among the adherents of the administration of Madison, and though committed to the policy of declaring war against Great Britain, he sided with the Republican members of the New York legislature when in 1812 they determined to break from "the Virginia dynasty" and to support De Witt Clinton for the presidency. In the following year, however, he dissolved his political relations with Clinton and resumed the *entente cordiale* with Madison's administration. In 1814 he carried through the legislature an effective war-measure known as "the classification bill," providing for the levy of 12,000 men, to be placed at the disposal of the government for two years. He drew up the resolution of thanks voted by the legislature to Gen. Jackson for the victory of New Orleans. In 1815, while still a member of the state senate, he was appointed attorney-general of the state, superseding the venerable Abra-

ham Van Vechten. In this same year De Witt Clinton, falling a prey to factional rivalries in his own party, was removed by the Albany council from the mayoralty of New York city—an act of petty proscription in which Van Buren sympathized, according to the “spoils system” then in vogue. In 1816 he was re-elected to the state senate for a further term of four years, and, removing to Albany, formed a partnership with his life-long friend, Benjamin F. Butler. In the same year he was appointed a regent of the University of New York. In the legislative discussions of 1816 he advocated the surveys preliminary to Clinton’s scheme for uniting the waters of the great lakes with the Hudson.

The election of Gov. Tompkins as vice-president of the United States had left the “Bucktails” of the Republican party without their natural leader. The people, moreover, in just resentment at the indignity done to Clinton by his removal from the New York mayoralty, were now spontaneously minded to make him governor that he might preside over the execution of the Erie canal which he had projected. Van Buren acquiesced in a drift of opinion that he was powerless to check, and, on the election of Clinton, supported the canal policy; but he soon came to an open rupture with the governor on questions of public patronage, and, arraying himself in active opposition to Clinton’s re-election, he was in turn subjected to the proscription of the Albany council acting in Clinton’s interest. He was removed from the office of attorney-general in 1819. He opposed the election of Clinton in 1820. Clinton was re-elected by a small majority, but both houses of the legislature and the council of appointment fell into the hands of the anti-Clinton Republicans. The office of attorney-general was now tendered anew to Van Buren, but he declined it. The politics of New York, a mesh of factions from the beginning of the century, were in a constant state of swirl and eddy from 1819 till 1821. The old party-formations were dissolved in the “era of good feeling.” What with “Simon-pure” Republicans, Clintonian Republicans, Clintonian Federalists, “high-minded” Federalists cleaving to Monroe, and Federalists pure and simple, the points of crystallization were too many to admit of forming a strong or compact body around any centre. No party could combine votes enough in the legislature of 1818-’19 to elect its candidate for U. S. senator. Yet out of this medley of factions

and middle of opinions Van Buren, by his moderation and his genius for political organization, evolved order and harmony at the election for senator in the following year. Under his lead all parties united on Rufus King, a Federalist of the old school, who had patriotically supported the war against Great Britain after it was declared, and who by his candor had won the confidence of President Monroe; and Rufus King was re-elected with practical unanimity at a time when he was fresh from the hot debate in the U. S. senate against the admission of Missouri without a restriction on slavery. His anti-slavery views on that question were held by Van Buren to "conceal no plot" against the Republicans, who, he engaged, would give "a true direction" to that momentous issue. What the "true direction" was to be he did not say, except as it might be inferred from his concurrence in a resolution of the legislature of New York instructing the senators of that state "to oppose the admission, as a state in the Union, of any territory not comprised within the original boundaries of the United States without making the prohibition of slavery therein an indispensable condition of admission." In that Republican resolution of 1820 "the Wilmot proviso" of 1847 appeared above our political horizon, but soon vanished from sight on the passage of the Missouri compromise in 1821.

On 6 Feb., 1821, Van Buren was elected U. S. senator, receiving in both houses of the legislature a majority of twenty-five over Nathan Sanford, the Clintonian candidate, for whom the Federalists also voted. In the same year he was chosen from Otsego county as a member of the convention to revise the constitution of the state. In that convention he met in debate Chancellor Kent, Chief-Justice Ambrose Spencer, and others. Against innovations his attitude was here conservative. He advocated the executive veto. He opposed manhood suffrage, seeking to limit the elective franchise to householders, that this "invaluable right" might not be "cheapened" and that the rural districts might not be overborne by the cities. He favored negro suffrage if negroes were taxed. With offence to party friends, he vehemently resisted the eviction by constitutional change of the existing supreme court, though its members were his bitter political enemies. He opposed an elective judiciary and the choice of minor offices by the people, as swamping the right it pretended to exalt.

He took his seat in the U. S. senate, 3 Dec., 1821, and was at once made a member of its committees on the judiciary and finance. For many years he was chairman of the former. In March, 1822, he voted, on the bill to provide a territorial government for Florida, that no slave should be directly or indirectly imported into that territory "except by a citizen removing into it for actual settlement and being at the time a *bona-fide* owner of such slave." Van Buren voted with the northern senators for the retention of this clause; but its exclusion by the vote of the southern senators did not import any countenance to the introduction of slaves into Florida from abroad, as such introduction was already prohibited by a Federal statute which in another part of the bill was extended to Florida. Always averse to imprisonment for debt as the result of misfortune, Van Buren took an early opportunity to advocate its abolition as a feature of Federal jurisprudence. He opposed in 1824 the ratification of the convention with England for the suppression of the slave-trade (perhaps because a qualified right of search was annexed to it), though the convention was urgently pressed on the senate by President Monroe. He supported William H. Crawford for the presidency in 1824, both in the congressional caucus and before the people. He voted for the protective tariff of 1824 and for that of 1828, though he took no part in the discussion of the economic principles underlying either. He voted for the latter under instructions, maintaining a politic silence as to his personal opinions, which seem to have favored a revenue tariff with incidental protection. He vainly advocated an amendment of the constitution for the election of president by the intervention of an electoral college to be specially chosen from as many separate districts as would comprise the whole country while representing the electoral power of all the states. The measure was designed to appease the jealousy of the small states by practically wiping out state lines in presidential elections and at the same time proposed to guard against elections by the house of representa-



*M. Van Buren*

tives, as in case of no choice at a first scrutiny the electoral colleges were to be reconvened. After voting for a few "internal improvements," he opposed them as unconstitutional in the shape then given to them, and proposed in 1824 and again in 1825 to bring them within the power of congress by a constitutional amendment that should protect the "sovereignty of the states" while equally distributing these benefits of the government. In a debate on the Federal judiciary in 1826 he took high ground in favor of "state rights" as against the umpirage of the supreme court on political questions, and deplored the power of that court to arraign sovereign states at its bar for the passage of laws alleged to impair "the obligation of contracts." He confessed admiration for the Republicans of 1802 who had repealed "the midnight judiciary act." He opposed the Panama mission, and reduced the "Monroe doctrine" to its true historical proportions as a caveat and not a "pledge." On all questions he was strenuous for a "strict construction of the constitution." He favored in 1826 the passage of a general bankrupt law, but, in opposing the pending measure, sharply accentuated the technical distinction of English law between "bankrupt" and "insolvent" acts—a distinction which, in the complexity of modern business transactions, Chief-Justice Marshall had pronounced to be more metaphysical than real, but which to Van Buren was vital because the constitution says nothing about "insolvent laws."

He was re-elected to the senate in 1827, but soon resigned his seat to accept the office of governor of New York, to which he was elected in 1828. As governor he opposed free banking and advocated the "safety-fund system," making all the banks of the state mutual insurers of each other's soundness. He vainly recommended the policy of separating state from Federal elections. After entering on the office of governor he never resumed the practice of law. Van Buren was a zealous supporter of Andrew Jackson in the presidential election of 1828, and was called in 1829 to be the premier of the new administration. As secretary of state he brought to a favorable close the long-standing feud between the United States and England with regard to the West India trade. Having an eye to the presidential succession after Jackson's second term, and not wishing meanwhile to compromise the administration or himself, he resigned his secretaryship in June, 1831, and was



sent as minister to England. The senate refused in 1832 to confirm his nomination, by the casting-vote of John C. Calhoun, the vice-president. Conscientious Whigs, like Theodore Frelinghuysen, confessed in after days the reluctance with which they consented to this doubtful act. A clause in one of Van Buren's despatches while secretary, containing an invidious reference to the preceding administration, was alleged as the ground of his rejection. The offence was venial, compared with the license taken by Robert R. Livingston when, in negotiating the Louisiana purchase, he cited the spectre of a Federalist administration playing into the hands of "the British faction." Moreover, the pretext was an afterthought, as the clause had excited no remark when first published, and, when the outcry was raised, Jackson "took the responsibility" for it. The tactical blunder of the Whigs soon avenged itself by bringing increased popularity to Van Buren. He became, with Jackson, the symbol of his party, and, elected vice-president in 1832, he came in 1833 to preside over the body which a year before had rejected him as foreign minister. He presided with unvarying suavity and fairness. Taking no public part in the envenomed discussions of the time, he was known to sympathize with Jackson in his warfare on the United States bank, and soon came to be generally regarded by his party as the lineal successor of that popular leader.

He was formally nominated for the presidency on 20 May, 1835, and was elected in 1836 over his three competitors, William H. Harrison, Hugh L. White, and Daniel Webster, by a majority of 57 in the electoral college, but of only 25,000 in the popular vote. The tide of Jacksonism was beginning to ebb. South Carolina, choosing her electors by state legislature and transferring to Van Buren her hatred of Jackson, voted for Willie P. Mangum. During the canvass Van Buren had been opposed at the north and championed at the south as "a northern man with southern principles." As vice-president, he had in 1835 given a casting-vote for the bill to prohibit the circulation of "incendiary documents" through the mails, and as a candidate for the presidency he had pledged himself to resist the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia without the consent of the slave-states and to oppose the "slightest interference" with slavery in the states. He had also pledged himself against the distribution of surplus revenues among the

states, against internal improvements at Federal expense, and against a national bank.

Compelled by the fiscal embarrassments of the government, in the financial crash of 1837, to summon congress to meet in special session, 4 Sept., 1837, he struck in his first message the key-note of his whole administration. After a detailed analysis of the financial situation, and of the causes in trade and speculation that had led to it, he proceeded to develop his favorite idea of an independent treasury for the safe-keeping and disbursement of the public moneys. This idea was not new. It was as old as the constitution. The practice of the government had departed from it only by insensible degrees, until at length, in spite of the protests of Jefferson, it had been consolidated into a formal order of congress that the revenues of the government should be deposited in the United States bank. On the removal of the deposits by Jackson in 1833, they had been placed in the custody of "the pet banks," and had here been used to stimulate private trade and speculation, until the crisis in 1837 necessitated a change of fiscal policy. By every consideration of public duty and safety, conspiring with what he believed to be economic advantage to the people, Van Buren enforced the policy of an independent treasury on a reluctant congress. There was here no bating of breath or mincing of words; but it was not until near the close of his administration that he succeeded in procuring the assent of congress to the radical measure that divorced the treasury from private banking and trade. The measure was formally repealed by the Whig congress of 1842, after which the public moneys were again deposited in selected banks until 1846, when the independent treasury was reinstalled and has ever since held its place under all changes of administration. He signed the independent treasury bill on 4 July, 1840, as being a sort of "second Declaration of Independence," in his own idea and in that of his party. Von Holst, the sternest of Van Buren's critics, awards to him on "this one question" the credit of "courage, firmness, and statesman-like insight." It was the *chef d'œuvre* of his public career. He also deserves credit for the fidelity with which, at the evident sacrifice of popularity with a certain class of voters, he adhered to neutral obligations on the outbreak of the Canada rebellion late in 1837.

The administration of Van Buren, beginning and ending

with financial panic, went down under the cloud rising on the country in 1840. The enemies and the friends of the United States bank had equally sown the wind during Jackson's administration. Van Buren was left to reap the whirlwind, which in the "political hurricane" of 1840 lifted Gen. Harrison into the presidential chair. The Democratic defeat was overwhelming. Harrison received 234 electoral votes, and Van Buren only 60. The majority for Harrison in the popular vote was nearly 140,000. Retiring after this overthrow to the shades of Lindenwald, a beautiful country-seat which he had purchased in his native county, Van Buren gave no vent to repinings. In 1842 he made a tour through the southern states, visiting Henry Clay at Ashland. In 1843 he came to the front with clear-cut views in favor of a tariff for revenue only. But on the newly emergent question of Texas annexation he took a decided stand in the negative, and on this rock of offence to the southern wing of his party his candidature was wrecked in the Democratic national convention of 1844, which met at Baltimore on 27 May. He refused to palter with this issue, on the ground of our neutral obligations to Mexico, and when the nomination went to James K. Polk, of Tennessee, he gave no sign of resentment. His friends brought to Polk a loyal support, and secured his election by carrying for him the decisive vote of the State of New York.

Van Buren continued to take an interest in public affairs, and when in 1847 the acquisition of new territory from Mexico raised anew the vexed question of slavery in the territories, he gave in his adhesion to the "Wilmot proviso." In the new elective affinities produced by this "burning question" a redistribution of political elements took place in the chaos of New York politics. The "Barnburner" and the "Hunker" factions came to a sharp cleavage on this line of division. The former declared their "uncompromising hostility to the extension of slavery." In the Herkimer Democratic convention of 26 Oct., 1847, the Free-soil banner was openly displayed, and delegates were sent to the Democratic national convention. From this convention, assembled at Baltimore in May, 1848, the Herkimer delegates seceded before any presidential nomination was made. In June, 1848, a Barnburner convention met at Utica to organize resistance to the nomination of Gen. Lewis Cass, who, in his "Nicholson letter," had disavowed the

"Wilmot proviso." To this convention Van Buren addressed a letter, declining in advance a nomination for the presidency, but pledging opposition to the new party shibboleth. In spite of his refusal, he was nominated, and this nomination was reaffirmed by the Freesoil national convention of Buffalo, 9 Aug., 1848, when Charles Francis Adams was associated with him as candidate for the vice-presidency. In the ensuing presidential election this ticket received only 291,263 votes, but, as the result of the triangular duel, Gen. Cass was defeated and Gen. Zachary Taylor, the Whig candidate, was elected. The precipitate annexation of Texas and its natural sequel, the war with Mexico, had brought their Nemesis in the utter confusion of national politics. Van Buren received no electoral votes, but his popular Democratic vote in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New York exceeded that of Cass. Henceforth he was simply a spectator in the political arena. On all public questions save that of slavery he remained an unfaltering Democrat, and when it was fondly supposed that "the slavery issue" had been forever exorcised by the compromise measures of 1850, he returned in full faith and communion to his old party allegiance. In 1852 he began to write his "Inquiry into the Origin and Course of Political Parties in the United States" (New York, 1867), but it was never finished and was published as a fragment. He supported Franklin Pierce for the presidency in 1852, and, after spending two years in Europe, returned in time to vote for James Buchanan in 1856. In 1860 he voted for the combined electoral ticket against Lincoln, but when the civil war began he gave to the administration his zealous support.

Van Buren was the target of political accusation during his whole public career, but kept his private character free from reproach. In his domestic life he was as happy as he was exemplary. Always prudent in his habits and economical in his tastes, he none the less maintained in his style of living the easy state of a gentleman, whether in public station at Albany and Washington, or at Lindenwald in his retirement. As a man of the world he was singularly affable and courteous, blending formal deference with natural dignity and genuine cordiality. Intensely partisan in his opinions and easily startled by the red rag of "Hamiltonian Federalism," he never carried the contentions of the political arena into the social sphere. The asperities of personal rivalry estranged him for a time from

1942

I have some friends to  
dine with me at five to  
day & will be happy to  
have the pleasure of your  
company.

Do me the additional  
favor to bring Mr Bentler  
with you.

Yours truly

Wm C. Buring  
Saturday Feb 21

Mr Halluk



Calhoun, after the latter denounced him in the senate in 1837 as "a practical politician," with whom "justice, right, patriotism, etc., were mere vague phrases," but with his great Whig rival, Henry Clay, he maintained unbroken relations of friendship through all vicissitudes of political fortune. As a lawyer his rank was eminent. Though never rising in speech to the heights of oratory, he was equally fluent and facile before bench or jury, and equally felicitous whether expounding the intricacies of fact or of law in a case. His manner was mild and insinuating, never declamatory. Without carrying his juridical studies into the realm of jurisprudence, he yet had a knowledge of law that fitted him to cope with the greatest advocates of the New York bar. The evidences of his legal learning and acute dialectics are still preserved in the New York reports of Cowen, Johnson, and Wendell. As a debater in the senate, he always went to the pith of questions, disdaining the arts of rhetoric. As a writer of political letters or of state papers, he carried diffusiveness to a fault, which sometimes hinted at a weakness in positions requiring so much defence. As a politician he was masterful in leadership—so much so that, alike by friends and foes, he was credited with reducing its practices to a fine art. He was a member of the famous Albany regency which for so many years controlled the politics of New York, and was long popularly known as its "director." Fertile in the contrivance of means for the attainment of the public ends which he deemed desirable, he was called "the little magician," from the deftness of his touch in politics. But combining the statesman's foresight with the politician's tact, he showed his sagacity rather by seeking a majority for his views than by following the views of a majority. Accused of "non-committalism," and with some show of reason in the early stages of his career, it was only as to men and minor measures of policy that he practised a prudent reticence. On questions of deeper principle—an elective judiciary, negro suffrage, universal suffrage, etc.—he boldly took the unpopular side. In a day of unexampled political giddiness he stood firmly for his sub-treasury system against the doubts of friends, the assaults of enemies, and the combined pressure of wealth and culture in the country. Dispensing patronage according to the received custom of his times, he yet maintained a high standard of appointment. That he could rise above selfish considerations

was shown when he promoted the elevation of Rufus King in 1820, or when he strove in 1838 to bring Washington Irving into his cabinet with small promise of gain to his doubtful political fortunes by such an "unpractical" appointment. As a statesman he had his compact fagot of opinions, to which he adhered in evil or good report. It might seem that the logic of his principles in 1848, combined with the subsequent drift of events, should have landed him in the Free-soil party that Abraham Lincoln led to victory in 1860; but it is to be remembered that, while Van Buren's political opinions were in a fluid state, they had been cast in the doctrinal moulds of Jefferson, and had there taken rigid form and pressure. In the natural history of American party-formations he supposed that an enduring antithesis had always been discernible between the "money power" and the "farming interest" of the land. In his annual message of December, 1838, holding language very modern in its emphasis, he counted "the anti-republican tendencies of associated wealth" as among the strains that had been put upon our government. This is indeed the main thesis of his "Inquiry," a book which is more an *apologia* than a history. In that chronicle of his life-long antipathy to a splendid consolidated government, with its imperial judiciary, funding systems, high tariffs, and internal improvements—the whole surmounted by a powerful national bank as the "regulator" of finance and politics—he has left an outlined sketch of the only dramatic unity that can be found for his eventful career. Confessing in 1848 that he had gone further in concession to slavery than many of his friends at the north had approved, he satisfied himself with a formal protest against the repeal of the Missouri compromise, carried through congress while he was travelling in Europe, and against the policy of making the Dred Scott decision a rule of Democratic politics, though he thought the decision sound in point of technical law. With these reservations, avowedly made in the interest of "strict construction" and of "old-time Republicanism" rather than of Free-soil or National reformation, he maintained his allegiance to the party with which his fame was identified, and which he was perhaps the more unwilling to leave because of the many sacrifices he had made in its service. The biography of Van Buren has been written by William H. Holland (Hartford, 1835); Francis J. Grund (in German, 1835); William Emmons



(Washington, 1835); David Crockett (Philadelphia, 1836); William L. Mackenzie (Boston, 1846); William Allen Butler (New York, 1862); and Edward M. Shepard (Boston, 1888). Mackenzie's book is compiled in part from surreptitious letters, shedding a lurid light on the "practical politics" of the times. Butler's sketch was published immediately after the ex-president's death. Shepard's biography is written with adequate learning and in a philosophical spirit, which may also be said of a brief and appreciative biography that appeared from the practiced pen of the venerable historian of the United States, in his ninetieth year, entitled "Martin Van Buren to the End of his Public Career, by George Bancroft" (New York, 1889).

His wife, HANNAH, born in Kinderhook, N. Y., in 1782; died in Albany, N. Y., 5 Feb., 1819, was of Dutch descent, and her maiden name was Hoes. She was educated in the schools of her native village, and was the classmate of Mr. Van Buren, whom she married in 1807. She was devoted to her domestic cares and duties, and took little interest in social affairs, but was greatly beloved by the poor. When Mrs. Van Buren learned that she could live but a few days, she expressed a desire that her funeral be conducted with the utmost simplicity, and the money that would otherwise have been devoted to mourning emblems be given to the poor and needy.

Their son, ABRAHAM, soldier, born in Kinderhook, N. Y., 27 Nov., 1807; died in New York city, 15 March, 1873, was graduated at the U. S. military academy in 1827, and attached to the 2d infantry as 2d lieutenant. He served for two years on the western frontier, and for the next seven years as aide-de-camp to the general-in-chief, Alexander Macomb, except during several months in 1836, when he accompanied Gen. Winfield Scott as a volunteer aide in the expedition against the Seminole Indians. He was commissioned as a captain in the 1st dragoons on 4 July, 1836, resigning on 3 March, 1837, to become his father's private secretary. He brought daily reports of the proceedings of congress to President Van Buren, who was often influenced by his suggestions. At the beginning of the war with Mexico he re-entered the army as major and paymaster, his commission dating from 26 June, 1846. He served on the staff of Gen. Zachary Taylor at Monterey, and

subsequently joined the staff of Gen. Scott as a volunteer, and participated in every engagement from Vera Cruz to the capture of the city of Mexico, being brevetted lieutenant-colonel for bravery at Contreras and Churubusco on 20 Aug., 1847. He served in the paymaster's department after the war till 1 June, 1854, when he again resigned, after which he resided for a part of the time in Columbia, S. C. (where his wife inherited a plantation), till 1859, and afterward for fourteen years leading a life of leisure in New York city.

Another son, JOHN, lawyer, born in Hudson, N. Y., 18 Feb., 1810; died at sea, 13 Oct., 1866, was graduated at Yale in 1828, studied law with Benjamin F. Butler, and was admitted to the bar at Albany in 1830. In the following year he accompanied his father to London as an attaché of the legation. In February, 1845, he was elected attorney-general of the state of New York, serving till 31 Dec., 1846. He took an active part in the political canvass of 1848 as an advocate of the exclusion of slavery from the territories, but did not remain with the Free-soil party in its later developments. He



*Wm. B. Allen*

held high rank as a lawyer, appearing in the Edwin Forrest and many other important cases, was an eloquent pleader, and an effective political speaker. He died on the voyage from Liverpool to New York. He was popularly known as "Prince John" \* after his travels abroad during his father's presidency,

---

\* Walking in Broadway with Fitz-Greene Halleck the year before the war, he exclaimed, "Ah! there's Little Van and Prince John!" when I saw approaching arm-in-arm the silvery-haired ex-president and his handsome son. The former was perhaps the smallest, physically, of our chief magistrates, and it was a constant delight to his political opponents to designate him as "Little Van." In this respect, however, he in no way differed from the other twenty-two presidents, who without exception were labelled with more or less inimical or popular nicknames. Washington was called the "Father of his Country" and the "American Fabius"; John Adams, the "Colossus of Independence"; Jefferson, the "Sage of Monticello," and "Long Tom" by his political opponents; Madison, "Father of the Constitution"; Monroe, "Last Cocked

was tall and handsome, of elegant manners and appearance, a charming conversationalist, and an admirable *raconteur*. The accompanying excellent vignette is copied from a photograph by Brady, presented, in 1865, to the editor by Mr. Van Buren.

Hat," from the circumstance of his being the last of the revolutionary presidents to wear the cocked hat of that period; John Quincy Adams, the "Old Man Eloquent"; Jackson, the "Hero of New Orleans" and "Old Hickory"; Van Buren, the "Little Magician," in allusion to his political sagacity and astuteness, "King Martin the First," and "Little Van"; Harrison, the "Washington of the West" and "Old Tippecanoe"; Tyler, "Accidental President"; Polk, "Young Hickory," so christened by his admiring adherents of the presidential campaign; Taylor, "Rough and Ready" and "Old Zach"; Fillmore, the "American Louis Philippe," owing to his dignified, courteous manners and supposed resemblance to the French king; Pierce, "Poor Pierce," pronounced *Purse*; Buchanan, "Old Public Functionary" and "Old Buck"; Lincoln, "Honest Old Abe" and "Father Abraham," used in the famous war-song, "We're coming, Father Abra'am, three hundred thousand strong"; Johnson, "Sir Veto" and the "Tailor President"; Grant, "Unconditional Surrender," and by his political adversaries the "American Cæsar," in allusion to his third-term candidacy and their claim that Grantism was a synonym of Cæsarism; Hayes, "President *de facto*"; Garfield, the "Teacher President" and "Martyr President"; Arthur, "The First Gentleman in the Land," and by his New York admirers "Our Chet," a contraction of Chester; Cleveland, the "Man of Destiny" and "Old Grover"; and Benjamin Harrison, "Backbone Ben" and the "Son of his Grandfather," the latter's hat being a conspicuous object in the campaign cartoons of 1888 and afterward.

At the Broadway meeting referred to, the poet mentioned a pleasant visit to Van Buren at Lindenwald, where he had met Washington Irving, and that the latter had written the concluding chapters of his "History of New York" when in retirement there for two months after the death of his betrothed, Miss Matilda Hoffman. At that time (1809) it was the estate of Irving's intimate friend, William P. Van Ness, an eminent lawyer and jurist, who acted as Burr's second in his duel with Hamilton. The ex-president purchased the property, Halleck informed me, from the heirs of Judge Van Ness, and incidentally remarked that he had seen all the presidents except Washington, and had known most of them. The poet also alluded to the circumstance of Irving having been offered by President Van Buren the portfolio of the secretary of the navy, which, on his declining its acceptance, was conferred on the amiable author's friend and literary partner, James K. Paulding. Halleck on several occasions introduced the name of Van Buren in his poems, and in "Fanny," which first appeared in 1819, he remarks:

"What, Egypt, was thy magic, to the tricks  
Of Mr. Charles, Judge Spencer, or Van Buren?  
The first with cards, the last in politics,  
A conjurer's fame for years has been securing."

—EDITOR.


Abraham's wife, ANGELICA, born in Sumter district, S. C., about 1820; died in New York city, 29 Dec., 1878, was a daughter of Richard Singleton, a planter, and a cousin of Will-



*Angelica Van Buren*

iam C. Preston and of Mrs. James Madison, who, while her kinswoman was completing her education in Philadelphia, presented her to President Van Buren. A year later she married Maj. Van Buren, in November, 1838, and on the following New-Year's-day she made her first appearance as mistress of the White House. With her husband she visited England (where her uncle, Andrew Stevenson, was U. S. minister) and other countries of Europe, in the spring of 1839, returning in the autumn to resume her place as hostess of the presidential mansion. The accompanying vignette is from a portrait painted by Henry Inman.





Engr. by E. H. Knight. New York.

W H Harrison

## WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, ninth president of the United States, born in Berkeley, Charles City co., Va., 9 Feb., 1773; died in Washington, D. C., 4 April, 1841, was the third and youngest son of Benjamin Harrison, signer of the Declaration of Independence, born in Berkeley, Charles City co., Va., about 1740; died in April, 1791. He was a descendant of Colonel John Harrison, a distinguished officer during the civil wars of England, and one of the judges who tried and condemned the unfortunate Charles the First, for which, and for his active participation in the affairs of the commonwealth under Cromwell, he was himself tried and executed after the restoration. As a member of the burgesses in 1764 he served on the committee that prepared the memorials to the king, lords, and commons; but in 1765, with many other prominent men, opposed the stamp act resolutions of Henry as impolitic. He was chosen in 1773 one of the committee of correspondence which united the colonies against Great Britain in 1774, appointed one of the delegates to congress, and four times re-elected to a seat in that body. As a member of all the Virginia conventions to organize resistance, he acted with the party led by Pendleton in favor of "general united opposition." On 10 June, 1776, as chairman of the committee of the whole house of congress, he introduced the resolution that had been offered three days before by Richard Henry Lee, declaring the independence of the American colonies, and on 4 July he reported the Declaration of Independence, of which he was one of the signers. On his return from congress he became a member of the Virginia house of delegates under the new constitution, was chosen speaker, filling that office until 1781, when he was twice elected governor of the commonwealth. As a delegate to the Virginia convention of 1788, he opposed the ratification of the Federal constitution, taking the ground of

Patrick Henry, James Monroe, and others, that it was a national and not a Federal government, though when the instrument was adopted he gave it his hearty support. At the time of his death he was a member of the Virginia legislature. In



*Benj<sup>l</sup> Harrison*

person Benjamin Harrison was large and fleshy; and, in spite of his suffering from gout, of unfailling good humor. Although without conspicuous intellectual endowments, he was a man of excellent judgment and the highest sense of honor, with a courage and cheerfulness that never faltered, and a "downright candor" and sincerity of character which conciliated the affection and respect of all who knew him.

William Henry was educated at Hampden Sidney college, Virginia, and began the study of medicine, but before he had finished it accounts of the Indian outrages that had been committed on the western frontier raised in him a desire to enter the army for its defence. Robert Morris, who had been appointed his guardian on the death of his father in 1791, endeavored to dissuade him, but his purpose being approved by Washington, who had been his father's friend, he was commissioned ensign in the 1st infantry on 16 Aug., 1791. He joined his regiment at Fort Washington, Ohio, was appointed lieutenant of the 1st sub-legion, to rank from June, 1792, and afterward united with the army under Gen. Anthony Wayne. Being made aide-de-camp to the commanding officer, he took part, in December, 1793, in the expedition that erected Fort Recovery on the battle field where St. Clair had been defeated two years before, and, with others, received thanks by name in general orders for his services. He participated in the engagements with the Indians that began on 30 June, 1794, and on 19 Aug., at a council of war, submitted a plan of march, which was adopted and led to the victory on the Miami on the following day.

Lieut. Harrison was specially complimented by Gen. Wayne, in his despatch to the secretary of war, for gallantry in this fight, and in May, 1797, was made captain, and given command of Fort Washington. Here he was intrusted with the duty of



receiving and forwarding troops, arms, and provisions to the forts in the northwest that had been evacuated by the British in obedience to the Jay treaty of 1794, and also instructed to report to the commanding general on all movements in the south, and to prevent the passage of French agents with military stores intended for an invasion of Louisiana. While in command of this fort he formed an attachment for Anna, youngest daughter of John Cleves Symmes, one of the judges of the northwest territory, and the founder of the Miami settlement in Ohio. Peace having been made with the Indians, Capt. Harrison resigned his commission on 1 June, 1798, and was immediately appointed by President John Adams secretary of the northwest territory, under Gen. Arthur St. Clair as governor, but in October, 1799, resigned to take his seat as territorial delegate in congress. In his one year of service, though he was opposed by speculators, he secured the subdivision of the public lands into small tracts, and the passage of other measures for the welfare of the settlers. During the session, part of the northwest territory was formed into the territory of Indiana, including the present states of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and Harrison was made its governor and superintendent of Indian affairs. Resigning his seat in congress, he entered on the duties of his office, which included the confirmation of land-grants, the defining of townships, and others that were equally important. Gov. Harrison was reappointed successively by President Jefferson and President Madison. He organized the legislature at Vincennes in 1805, and applied himself especially to improving the condition of the Indians, trying to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors among them, and to introduce inoculation for the small-pox. He frequently held councils with them, and, although his life was sometimes endangered, succeeded by his calmness and courage in averting many outbreaks. On 30 Sept., 1809, he concluded a treaty with several tribes by which they sold to the United States about 3,000,000 acres of land on Wabash and White rivers. This, and the former treaties of cession that had been made, were condemned by Tecumseh and other chiefs on the ground that the consent of all the tribes was necessary to a legal sale. The discontent was increased by the action of speculators in ejecting Indians from the lands, by agents of the British government, and by the preaching of Tecumseh's brother,

the "prophet," and it was evident that an outbreak was at hand. The governor pursued a conciliatory course, gave to needy Indians provisions from the public stores, and in July, 1810, invited Tecumseh and his brother, the prophet, to a council at Vincennes, requesting them to bring with them not more than thirty men. In response, the chief, accompanied by 400 fully armed warriors, arrived at Vincennes on 12 Aug. The council, held under the trees in front of the governor's house, was nearly terminated by bloodshed on the first day, but Harrison, who foresaw the importance of conciliating Tecumseh, prevented, by his coolness, a conflict that almost had been precipitated by the latter. The discussion was resumed on the next day, but with no result, the Indians insisting on the return of all the lands that had recently been acquired by treaty. On the day after the council Harrison visited Tecumseh at his camp, accompanied only by an interpreter, but without success. In the following spring depredations by the savages were frequent, and the governor sent word to Tecumseh that, unless they should cease, the Indians would be punished. The chief promised another interview, and appeared at Vincennes on 27 July, 1811, with 300 followers, but, awed probably by the presence of 750 militia, professed to be friendly. Soon afterward, Harrison, convinced of the chief's insincerity, but not approving the plan of the government to seize him as a hostage, proposed, instead, the establishment of a military post near Tippecanoe, a town that had been established by the prophet on the upper Wabash. The news that the government had given assent to this scheme was received with joy, and volunteers flocked to Vincennes. Harrison marched from that town on 26 Sept., with about 900 men, including 350 regular infantry, completed Fort Harrison, near the site of Terre Haute, Ind., on 28 Oct., and, leaving a garrison there, pressed forward toward Tippecanoe. On 6 Nov., when the army had reached a point a mile and a half distant from the town, it was met by messengers demanding a parley. A council being proposed for the next day, Harrison at once went into camp, taking, however, every precaution against a surprise. At four o'clock on the following morning a fierce attack was made on the camp by the savages, and the fighting continued till daylight, when the Indians were driven from the field by a cavalry charge. During the battle, in which the American loss was 108 killed and wounded, the

governor directed the movements of the troops. He was highly complimented by President Madison in his message of 18 Dec., 1811, and also received the thanks of the legislatures of Kentucky and Indiana.

On 18 June, 1812, war was declared between Great Britain and the United States. On 25 Aug., Gov. Harrison, although not a citizen of Kentucky, was commissioned major-general of the militia of that state, and given command of a detachment that was sent to re-enforce Gen. William Hull, the news of whose surrender had not yet reached Kentucky. On 2 Sept., while on the march, he received a brigadier-general's commission in the regular army, but withheld his acceptance till he could learn whether or not he was to be subordinate to Gen. James Winchester, who had been appointed to the command of the northwestern army. After relieving Fort Wayne, which had been invested by the Indians, he turned over his force to Gen. Winchester, and was returning to his home in Indiana when he met an express with a letter from the secretary of war, appointing him to the chief command in the northwest. "You will exercise," said the letter, "your own discretion, and act in all cases according to your own judgment." No latitude as great as this had been given to any commander since Washington. Harrison now prepared to concentrate his force on the rapids of the Maumee, and thence to move on Malden and Detroit. Various difficulties, however, prevented him from carrying out his design immediately. Forts were erected and supplies forwarded, but, with the exception of a few minor engagements with Indians, the remainder of the year was occupied merely in preparation for the coming campaign. Winchester had been ordered by Harrison to advance to the rapids, but the order was countermanded on receipt of information that Tecumseh, with a large force, was at the head-waters of the Wabash. Through a misunderstanding, however, Winchester continued, and on 18 Jan. captured Frenchtown (now Monroe, Mich.), but three days later met with a bloody repulse on the river Raisin from Col. Henry Proctor. Harrison hastened to his aid, but was too late. After establishing a fortified camp, which he named Fort Meigs, after the governor of Ohio, the commander visited Cincinnati to obtain supplies, and while there urged the construction of a fleet on Lake Erie. On 2 March, 1813, he was given a major-

general's commission. Shortly afterward, having heard that the British were preparing to attack Fort Meigs, he hastened thither, arriving on 12 April. On 28 April it was ascertained that the enemy under Proctor was advancing in force, and on 1 May siege was laid to the fort. While a heavy fire was kept up on both sides for five days, re-enforcements under Gen. Green Clay were hurried forward and came to the relief of the Americans in two bodies, one on each side of Maumee river. Those on the opposite side from the fort put the enemy to flight, but, disregarding Harrison's signals, allowed themselves to be drawn into the woods, and were finally dispersed or captured. The other detachment fought their way to the fort, and at the same time the garrison made a sortie and spiked the enemy's guns. Three days later Proctor raised the siege. He renewed his attack in July with 5,000 men, but after a few days again withdrew.

On 10 Sept. Com. Oliver H. Perry gained his victory on Lake Erie, and on 16 Sept. Harrison embarked his artillery and supplies for a descent on Canada. The troops followed between the 20th and 24th, and on the 27th the army landed on the enemy's territory. Proctor burned the fort and navy-yard at Malden and retreated, and Harrison followed on the next day. Proctor was overtaken on 5 Oct., and took position with his left flanked by the Thames, and a swamp covering his right, which was still further protected by Tecumseh and his Indians. He had made the mistake of forming his men in open order, which was the plan that was adopted in Indian fighting, and Harrison, taking advantage of the error, ordered Col. Richard M. Johnson to lead a cavalry charge, which broke through the British lines, and virtually ended the battle. Within five minutes almost the entire British force was captured, and Proctor escaped only by abandoning his carriage and taking to the woods. Another band of cavalry charged the Indians, who lost their leader, Tecumseh, in the beginning of the fight, and afterward made no great resistance. This battle, which, if mere numbers alone be considered, was insignificant, was most important in its results. Together with Perry's victory it gave the United States possession of the chain of lakes above Erie, and put an end to the war in uppermost Canada. Harrison's praises were sung in the president's message, in congress, and in the legislatures of the different states. Cele-

Senate Chamber

22. ~ May 1828.

Dear Sir

The nomination James Barbour  
minister to London & myself to Columbia has  
this day been read & mine & I suppose the other  
will pass unanimously. I have already been  
told so by a majority of the Senate. So that  
you can be sure any business we undertake

Delmonoy going in route

W. H. Harrison

D. K. E. Esq.



brations in honor of his victory were held in the principal cities of the Union, and he was one of the heroes of the hour. He now sent his troops to Niagara, and proceeded to Washington, where he was ordered by the president to Cincinnati to devise means of protection for the Indiana border. Gen. John Armstrong, who was at this time secretary of war, in planning the campaign of 1814 assigned Harrison to the 8th military district, including only western states, where he could see no active service, and on 25 April issued an order to Maj. Holmes, one of Harrison's subordinates, without consulting the latter. Harrison thereupon tendered his resignation, which, President Madison being absent, was accepted by Armstrong. This terminated Harrison's military career. In 1814, and again in 1815, he was appointed on commissions that concluded satisfactory Indian treaties, and in 1816 chosen to congress to fill a vacancy, serving till 1819. While in congress he was charged by a dissatisfied contractor with misuse of the public money when in command of the northwestern army, but was completely exonerated by an investigating committee of the house. At this time his opponents succeeded, by a vote of 13 to 11 in the senate, in striking his name from a resolution that had already passed the house, directing gold medals to be struck in honor of Gov. Shelby, of Kentucky, and himself, for the victory of the Thames. The resolution was passed unanimously two years later, on 24 March, 1818, and Harrison received the medal. Among the charges made against him was this one, that he would not have pursued Proctor at all, after the latter's abandonment of Malden, had it not been for Gov. Shelby; but the latter denied it in a letter read before the senate, and gave Gen. Harrison the highest praise for his promptitude and vigilance. While in congress, Harrison drew up and advocated a general militia bill, which was not successful, and also proposed an admirable measure for the relief of soldiers, which was passed.

In 1819 Gen. Harrison was chosen to the senate of Ohio, and in 1822 was a candidate for congress, but defeated on account of his vote against the admission of Missouri to the Union with the restriction that slavery should be prohibited there. In 1824 he was a presidential elector, voting for Henry Clay, and in the same year sent to the U. S. senate, where he succeeded Andrew Jackson as chairman of the committee on military affairs, introduced a bill to prevent desertions, and

exerted himself to obtain pensions for old soldiers. He resigned in 1828, having been appointed by President John Quincy Adams U. S. minister to the United States of Colombia. While there he wrote a letter to Gen. Simon Bolivar urging him not to accept dictatorial powers. He was recalled at the outset of Jackson's administration, as is asserted by some, at the demand of Gen. Bolivar, and retired to his farm at North Bend, near Cincinnati, Ohio, where he lived quietly, filling the offices of clerk of the county court and president of the county agricultural society. In 1835 Gen. Harrison was nominated for the presidency by meetings in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and other states; but the opposition to Van Buren was not united on him, and he received only 73 electoral votes to the former's 170. Four years later the National Whig convention, which was called at Harrisburg, Pa., for 4 Dec., 1839, to decide between the claims of several rival candidates, nominated him for the same office, with John Tyler, of Virginia, for vice-president. The Democrats renominated President Van Buren. The canvass that followed has been often called the "Log-cabin and hard-cider campaign." The eastern end of Gen. Harrison's house at North Bend consisted of a log-cabin



that had been built by one of the first settlers of Ohio, but which had long since been covered with clapboards. The republican simplicity of his home was extolled by his admirers, and a political biography of that time says that "his table, instead of being covered with exciting wines, is well supplied with the best cider." Log-cabins and hard cider, then, became the party emblems, and both were features of all the political demonstrations of the canvass, which witnessed the introduction of the enormous mass-meetings and processions that have since been common just before presidential elections. The result of the contest was the choice of Harrison, who received 234 electoral votes to Van Buren's 60. He was inaugurated at Washington on 4 March, 1841, and immediately sent to the senate his nominations for cabinet officers, which were con-



firmed. They were Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, secretary of state; Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, secretary of the treasury; John Bell, of Tennessee, secretary of war; George E. Badger, of North Carolina, secretary of the navy; Francis Granger, of New York, postmaster-general; and John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky, attorney-general. The senate adjourned on 15 March, and two days afterward the president called congress together in extra session to consider financial measures. On 27 March, after several days of indisposition, he was prostrated by a chill, which was followed by bilious pneumonia, and on Sunday morning, 4 April, he died. Amid the shadows of approaching death, he imagined he was addressing his successor, and exclaimed: "Sir, I wish you to understand the principles of the government. I desire them carried out. I ask nothing more." The end came so suddenly that his wife, who had remained at North Bend on account of illness, was unable to be present at his death-bed. The event was a shock to the country, the more so that a chief magistrate had never before died in office, and especially to the Whig party, who had formed high hopes of his administration. His body was interred in the congressional cemetery at Washington; but on 7 July of the same year, at the request of his family, removed to North Bend, where it was placed in a tomb overlooking the Ohio river. This was subsequently allowed to fall into neglect, and afterward Gen. Harrison's son, John Scott, offered it and the surrounding land to the state of Ohio, on condition that it should be kept in repair. Several unsuccessful efforts have been made to induce the state to raise money by taxation for the purpose of erecting a monument to Gen. Harrison's memory. "He was not," it has been well said, "a great man, but he had lived in a great time, and had been a leader in great things." Harrison's inaugural address is the longest ever delivered by any of our presidents (the shortest is Washington's second address, consisting of but 134 words, while Harrison's is 8,578), and he was also the author of a "Discourse on the Aborigines of the Valley of the Ohio" (Cincinnati, 1838). His life has been written by Moses Dawson (Cincinnati, 1834); by James Hall (Philadelphia, 1836); by Richard Hildreth (1839); by Samuel J. Burr (New York, 1840); by Isaac R. Jackson; and by Henry Montgomery (New York, 1853).

His wife, ANNA, born near Morristown, N. J., 25 July, 1775; died near North Bend, Ohio, 25 Feb., 1864, was a daughter of John Cleves Symmes, and married Gen. Harrison 22 Nov., 1795. After her husband's death she lived at North Bend till 1855, when she went to the house of her son, John Scott Harrison, a few miles distant. Her funeral sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Horace Bushnell, and her body lies by the side of her husband at North Bend.




*J. Harrison*

Their son, JOHN SCOTT, born in Vincennes, Ind., 4 Oct., 1804; died near North Bend, Ohio, 26 May, 1878, received a liberal education, and was elected to congress as a Whig, serving from 5 Dec., 1853, till 3 March, 1857. His third son, Benjamin, became the twenty-third president of the United States.

A daughter, LUCY, born in Richmond, Va., in 1798; died in Cincinnati, Ohio, 7 April, 1826, became the wife of David K. Este, an eminent lawyer and jurist of the latter city, and was noted for her piety and benevolence.





Eng<sup>d</sup> by H.B.Hall Jr. New York

*John Tyler*

## JOHN TYLER.

JOHN TYLER, tenth president of the United States, born at Greenway, Charles City co., Va., 29 March, 1790; died in Richmond, Va., 18 Jan., 1862. He was the second son of Judge John Tyler and Mary Armistead. In early boyhood he attended the small school kept by John McMurdo, who was so diligent in his use of the birch that in later years Mr. Tyler said "it was a wonder he did not whip all the sense out of his scholars." At the age of eleven young Tyler was one of the ring-leaders in a rebellion in which the despotic McMurdo was overpowered by numbers, tied hand and foot, and left locked up in the school-house until late at night, when a passing traveller effected an entrance and released him. On complaining to Judge Tyler, the indignant school-master was met with the apt reply, "*Sic semper tyrannis!*" The future president was graduated at William and Mary in 1807. At college he showed a strong interest in ancient history. He was also fond of poetry and music, and, like Thomas Jefferson, was a skilful performer on the violin. In 1809 he was admitted to the bar, and had already begun to obtain a good practice when he was elected to the legislature, and took his seat in that body in December, 1811. He was here a firm supporter of Mr. Madison's administration, and the war with Great Britain, which soon followed, afforded him an opportunity to become conspicuous as a forcible and persuasive orator. One of his earliest public acts is especially interesting in view of the famous struggle with the Whigs, which in later years he conducted as president. The charter of the first Bank of the United States, established in 1791, was to expire in twenty years; and in 1811 the question of renewing the charter came before congress. The bank was very unpopular in Virginia, and the assembly of that state, by a vote of 125 to 35, instructed its senators at Washington, Rich-

ard Brent and William B. Giles, to vote against a recharter. The instructions denounced the bank as an institution in the founding of which congress had exceeded its powers and grossly violated state rights. Yet there were many in congress who, without approving the principle upon which the bank was founded, thought the eve of war an inopportune season for making a radical change in the financial system of the nation. Of the two Virginia senators, Brent voted in favor of the recharter, and Giles spoke on the same side, and although, in obedience to instructions, he voted contrary to his own opinion, he did so under protest. On 14 Jan., 1812, Mr. Tyler, in the Virginia legislature, introduced resolutions of censure, in which the senators were taken to task, while the Virginia doctrines, as to the unconstitutional character of the bank and the binding force of instructions, were formally asserted.

Mr. Tyler married, 29 March, 1813, Letitia, daughter of Robert Christian, and a few weeks afterward was called into the field at the head of a company of militia to take part in the defence of Richmond and its neighborhood, now threatened by the British. This military service lasted for a month, during which Mr. Tyler's company was not called into action. He was re-elected to the legislature annually, until in November, 1816, he was chosen to fill a vacancy in the U. S. house of representatives. In the regular election to the next congress, out of 200 votes given in his native county, he received all but one. As a member of congress he soon made himself conspicuous as a strict constructionist. When Mr. Calhoun introduced his bill in favor of internal improvements, Mr. Tyler voted against it. He opposed the bill for changing the *per diem* allowance of members of congress to an annual salary of \$1,500. He opposed, as premature, Mr. Clay's proposal to add to the general appropriation bill a provision for \$18,000 for a minister to the provinces of the La Plata, thus committing the United States to a recognition of the independence of those revolted provinces. He also voted against the proposal for a national bankrupt act. He condemned, as arbitrary and in-subordinate, the course of Gen. Jackson in Florida, and contributed an able speech to the long debate over the question as to censuring that gallant commander. He was a member of a committee for inquiring into the affairs of the national bank, and his most elaborate speech was in favor of Mr. Trimble's

motion to issue a *scire facias* against that institution. On all these points Mr. Tyler's course seems to have pleased his constituents; in the spring election of 1819 he did not consider it necessary to issue the usual circular address, or in any way to engage in a personal canvass. He simply distributed copies of his speech against the bank, and was re-elected to congress unanimously.

The most important question that came before the 16th congress related to the admission of Missouri to the Union. In the debates over this question Mr. Tyler took ground against the imposition of any restrictions upon the extension of slavery. At the same time he declared himself on principle opposed to the perpetuation of slavery, and he sought to reconcile these positions by the argument that in diffusing the slave population over a wide area the evils of the institution would be diminished and the prospects of ultimate emancipation increased. "Slavery," said he, "has been represented on all hands as a dark cloud, and the candor of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Whitman] drove him to the admission that it would be well to disperse this cloud. In this sentiment I entirely concur with him. How can you otherwise disarm it? Will you suffer it to increase in its darkness over one particular portion of this land till its horrors shall burst upon it? Will you permit the lightnings of its wrath to break upon the south, when by the interposition of a wise system of legislation you may reduce it to a summer's cloud?" New York and Pennsylvania, he argued, had been able to emancipate their slaves only by reducing their number by exportation. Dispersion, moreover, would be likely to ameliorate the condition of the black man, for by making his labor scarce in each particular locality it would increase the demand for it and would thus make it the interest of the master to deal fairly and generously with his slaves. To the objection that the increase of the slave population would fully keep up with its territorial expansion, he replied by denying that such would be the case. His next argument was that if an old state, such as Virginia, could have slaves, while a new state, such as Missouri, was to be prevented by Federal authority from having them, then the old and new states would at once be placed upon a different footing, which was contrary to the spirit of the constitution. If congress could thus impose one restriction upon a state, where was the

exercise of such a power to end? Once grant such a power, and what was to prevent a slave-holding majority in congress from forcing slavery upon some territory where it was not wanted? Mr. Tyler pursued the argument so far as to deny "that congress, under its constitutional authority to establish rules and regulations for the territories, had any control whatever over slavery in the territorial domain." (See life, by Lyon G. Tyler, vol. i., p. 319.) Mr. Tyler was unquestionably foremost among the members of congress in occupying this position. When the Missouri compromise bill was adopted by a vote of 134 to 42, all but five of the nays were from the south, and from Virginia alone there were seventeen, of which Mr. Tyler's vote was one. The Richmond "Enquirer" of 7 March, 1820, in denouncing the compromise, observed, in language of prophetic interest, that the southern and western representatives now "owe it to themselves to keep their eyes firmly fixed on Texas; if we are cooped up on the north, we must have elbow-room to the west."

Mr. Tyler's further action in this congress related chiefly to the question of a protective tariff, of which he was an unflinching opponent. In 1821, finding his health seriously impaired, he declined a re-election, and returned to private life. His retirement, however, was of short duration, for in 1823 he was again elected to the Virginia legislature. Here, as a friend to the candidacy of William H. Crawford for the presidency, he disapproved the attacks upon the congressional caucus begun by the legislature of Tennessee in the interests of Andrew Jackson. The next year he was nominated to fill the vacancy in the United States senate created by the death of John Taylor; but Littleton W. Tazewell was elected over him. He opposed the attempt to remove William and Mary college to Richmond, and was afterward made successively rector and chancellor of the college, which prospered signally under his management. In December, 1825, he was chosen by the legislature to the governorship of Virginia, and in the following year he was re-elected by a unanimous vote. A new division of parties was now beginning to show itself in national politics. The administration of John Quincy Adams had pronounced itself in favor of what was then, without much regard to history, described as the "American system" of government banking, high tariffs, and internal improvements. Those persons who



were inclined to a loose construction of the constitution were soon drawn to the side of the administration, while the strict constructionists were gradually united in opposition. Many members of Crawford's party, under the lead of John Randolph, became thus united with the Jacksonians, while others, of whom Mr. Tyler was one of the most distinguished, maintained a certain independence in opposition. It is to be set down to Mr. Tyler's credit that he never attached any importance to the malicious story, believed by so many Jacksonians, of a corrupt bargain between Adams and Clay. Soon after the meeting of the Virginia legislature, in December, 1826, the friends of Clay and Adams combined with the opposite party who were dissatisfied with Randolph, and thus Mr. Tyler was elected to the U. S. senate by a majority of 115 votes to 110. Some indiscreet friends of Jackson now attempted to show that there must have been some secret and reprehensible understanding between Tyler and Clay; but this scheme failed completely. In the senate Mr. Tyler took a conspicuous stand against the so-called "tariff of abominations" enacted in 1828, which Benton, Van Buren, and other prominent Jacksonians, not yet quite clear as to their proper attitude, were induced to support. There was thus some ground for the opinion entertained at this time by Tyler, that the Jacksonians were not really strict constructionists. In February, 1830, after taking part in the Virginia convention for revising the state constitution, Mr. Tyler returned to his seat in the senate, and found himself first drawn toward Jackson by the veto message of the latter, 27 May, upon the Maysville turnpike bill. He attacked the irregularity of Jackson's appointment of commissioners to negotiate a commercial treaty with Turkey without duly informing the senate. On the other hand, he voted in favor of confirming the appointment of Van Buren as minister to Great Britain. In the presidential election of 1832 he supported Jackson as a less objectionable candidate than the others, Clay, Wirt, and Floyd. Mr. Tyler disapproved of nullification, and condemned the course of South Carolina as both unconstitutional and impolitic. At the same time he objected to President Jackson's famous proclamation of 10 Dec., 1832, as a "tremendous engine of federalism," tending to the "consolidation" of the states into a single political body. Under the influence of these feelings he undertook to play the part of mediator be-

tween Clay and Calhoun, and in that capacity earnestly supported the compromise tariff introduced by the former in the senate, 12 Feb., 1833. On the so-called "force bill," clothing the president with extraordinary powers for the purpose of enforcing the tariff law, Mr. Tyler showed that he had the courage of his convictions. When the bill was put to vote, 20 Feb., 1833, some of its opponents happened to be absent; others got up and went out in order to avoid putting themselves on record. The vote, as then taken, stood: yeas, thirty-two; nay, one (John Tyler).

As President Jackson's first term had witnessed a division in the Democratic party between the nullifiers led by Calhoun and the unconditional upholders of the Union, led by the president himself, with Benton, Blair, and Van Buren, so his second term witnessed a somewhat similar division arising out of the war upon the United States bank. The tendency of this fresh division was to bring Mr. Tyler and his friends nearer to co-operation with Mr. Calhoun, while at the same time it furnished points of contact that might, if occasion should offer, be laid hold of for the purpose of forming a temporary alliance with Mr. Clay and the National Republicans. The origin of the name "Whig," in its strange and anomalous application to the combination in 1834, is to be found in the fact that it pleased the fancy of President Jackson's opponents to represent him as a kind of arbitrary tyrant. On this view it seemed proper that they should be designated "Whigs," and at first there were some attempts to discredit the supporters of the administration by calling them "Tories." On the question of the bank, when it came to the removal of the deposits, Mr. Tyler broke with the administration. Against the bank he had fought, on every fitting occasion, since the beginning of his public career. In 1834 he declared emphatically: "I believe the bank to be the original sin against the constitution, which, in the progress of our history, has called into existence a numerous progeny of usurpations. Shall I permit this serpent, however bright its scales or erect its mien, to exist by and through my vote?" Nevertheless, strongly as he disapproved of the bank, Mr. Tyler disapproved still more strongly of the methods by which President Jackson assailed it. There seemed at that time to be growing up in the United States a spirit of extreme unbridled democracy quite foreign to the spirit in

which our constitutional government, with its carefully arranged checks and limitations, was founded. It was a spirit that prompted mere majorities to insist upon having their way, even at the cost of overriding all constitutional checks and limits. This spirit possessed many members of Jackson's party, and it found expression in what Benton grotesquely called the "*demos krato*" principle. A good illustration of it was to be seen in Benton's argument, after the election of 1824, that Jackson, having received a plurality of electoral votes, ought to be declared president, and that the house of representatives, in choosing Adams, was "defying the will of the people."

In similar wise President Jackson, after his triumphant reelection in 1832, was inclined to interpret his huge majorities as meaning that the people were ready to uphold him in any course that he might see fit to pursue. This feeling no doubt strengthened him in his determined attitude toward the nullifiers, and it certainly contributed to his arbitrary and overbearing method of dealing with the bank, culminating in 1833 in his removal of the deposits. There was ground for maintaining that in this act the president exceeded his powers, and it seemed to illustrate the tendency of unbridled democracy toward despotism, under the leadership of a headstrong and popular chief. Mr. Tyler saw in it such a tendency, and he believed that the only safeguard for constitutional government, whether against the arbitrariness of Jackson or the latitudinarianism of the National Republicans, lay in a most rigid adherence to strict constructionist doctrines. Accordingly, in his speech of 24 Feb., 1834, he proposed to go directly to the root of the matter and submit the question of a national bank to the people in the shape of a constitutional amendment, either expressly forbidding or expressly allowing congress to create such an institution. According to his own account, he found Clay and Webster ready to co-operate with him in this course, while Calhoun held aloof. Nothing came of the project: but it is easy to see in Mr. Tyler's attitude at this time the basis for a short-lived alliance with the National Republicans, whenever circumstances should suggest it. On Mr. Clay's famous resolution to censure the president he voted in the affirmative. In the course of 1835 the seriousness of the schism in the Democratic party was fully revealed. Not only had the small body of nullifiers broken away, under the lead of Cal-

houn, but a much larger party was formed in the southern states under the appellation of "state-rights Whigs." They differed with the National Republicans on the fundamental questions of tariff, bank, and internal improvements, and agreed with them only in opposition to Jackson as an alleged violator of the constitution. Even in this opposition they differed from the party of Webster and Clay, for they grounded it largely upon a theory of state rights which the latter statesmen had been far from accepting. The "state-rights Whigs" now nominated Hugh L. White, of Tennessee, for president, and John Tyler for vice-president. The National Republicans, wishing to gather votes from the other parties, nominated for president Gen. William H. Harrison as a more colorless candidate than Webster or Clay. The Democratic followers of Jackson nominated Van Buren, who received a large majority of both popular and electoral votes, in spite of the defections



above mentioned. There was a great deal of bolting in this election. Massachusetts threw its vote for Webster for president, and South Carolina for Willie P. Mangum. Virginia, which voted for Van Buren, rejected his colleague, Richard M. Johnson, and cast its twenty-three electoral votes for William Smith, of Alabama, for vice-president. Mr.

White obtained the electoral votes of Tennessee and Georgia, twenty-six in all, but Mr. Tyler made a better showing; he carried, besides these two states, Maryland and South Carolina, making forty-seven votes in all. The unevenness of the results was such that the election of a vice-president devolved upon the senate, which chose Mr. Johnson. In the course of the year preceding the election an incident occurred which emphasized more than ever Mr. Tyler's hostility to the Jackson party. Benton's famous resolutions for expunging the vote of censure upon the president were before the senate, and the Democratic legislature of Virginia instructed the two senators from that state to vote in the affirmative. As to the binding force of such instructions Mr. Tyler had long ago, in the case of Giles and Brent, above mentioned, placed himself unmistakably upon

record. His colleague, Benjamin Watkins Leigh, was known to entertain similar views. On receiving the instructions, both senators refused to obey them. Both voted against the Benton resolutions, but Mr. Leigh kept his seat, while Mr. Tyler resigned and returned home, 29 Feb., 1836. About this time the followers of Calhoun were bringing forward what was known as the "gag resolution" against all petitions and motions relating in any way to the abolition of slavery. Mr. Tyler's resignation occurred before this measure was adopted, but his opinions on the subject were clearly pronounced. He condemned the measure as impolitic, because it yoked together the question as to the right of petition and the question as to slavery, and thus gave a distinct moral advantage to the Abolitionists. On the seventh anniversary of the Virginia colonization society, 10 Jan., 1838, he was chosen its president. In the spring election of that year he was returned to the Virginia legislature. In January, 1839, his friends put him forward for re-election to the U. S. senate, and in the memorable contest that ensued, in which William C. Rives was his principal competitor, the result was a deadlock, and the question was indefinitely postponed before any choice had been made.

Meanwhile the financial crisis of 1837—the most severe, in many respects, that has ever been known in this country—had wrecked the administration of President Van Buren. The causes of that crisis, indeed, lay deeper than any acts of any administration. The primary cause was the sudden development of wild speculation in western lands, consequent upon the rapid building of railroads, which would probably have brought about a general prostration of credit, even if President Jackson had never made war upon the United States bank. But there is no doubt that some measures of Jackson's administration—such as the removal of the deposits and their lodgment in the so-called "pet banks," the distribution of the surplus followed by the sudden stoppage of distribution, and the sharpness of the remedy supplied by the specie circular—had much to do with the virulence of the crisis. For the moment it seemed to many people that all the evil resulted from the suppression of the bank, and that the proper cure was the reinstatement of the bank, and because President Van Buren was too wise and clear-sighted to lend his aid to such a policy, his chances for re-election were ruined. The cry for the moment was that the hard-heart-

ed administration was doing nothing to relieve the distress of the people, and there was a general combination against Van Buren. For the single purpose of defeating him, all differences of policy were for the moment subordinated. In the Whig convention at Harrisburg, 4 Dec., 1839, no platform of principles was adopted. Gen. Harrison was again nominated for the presidency, as a candidate fit to conciliate the anti-Masons and National Republicans whom Clay had offended, and Mr. Tyler was nominated for the vice-presidency in order to catch the votes of such Democrats as were dissatisfied with the administration. In the uproarious canvass that followed there was probably less appeal to sober reason and a more liberal use of clap-trap than in any other presidential contest in our history. Borne upon a great wave of popular excitement, "Tippecanoe, and Tyler too," were carried to the White House. By the death of President Harrison, 4 April, 1841, just a month after the inauguration, Mr. Tyler became president of the United States. The situation thus developed was not long in producing startling results. Although no platform had been adopted in the nominating convention, it soon appeared that Mr. Clay and his friends intended to use their victory in support of the old National Republican policy of a national bank, a high tariff, and internal improvements. Unquestionably many people who voted for Harrison did so in the belief that his election meant the victory of Clay's doctrines and the re-establishment of the United States bank. Mr. Clay's own course, immediately after the inauguration, showed so plainly that he regarded the election as his own victory that Gen. Harrison felt called upon to administer a rebuke to him. "You seem to forget, sir," said he, "that it is I who am president."

Tyler, on the other hand, regarded the Whig triumph as signifying the overthrow of what he considered a corrupt and tyrannical faction led by Jackson, Van Buren, and Benton; he professed to regard the old National Republican doctrines as virtually postponed by the alliance between them and his own followers. In truth, it was as ill-yoked an alliance as ever was made. The elements of a fierce quarrel were scarcely concealed, and the removal of President Harrison was all that was needed to kindle the flames of strife. "Tyler dares not resist," said Clay; "I'll drive him before me." On the other hand, the new president declared: "I pray you to believe that my back

is to the wall, and that, while I shall deplore the assaults, I shall, if practicable, beat back the assailants"; and he was as good as his word. Congress met in extra session, 31 May, 1841, the senate standing 28 Whigs to 22 Democrats, the house 133 Whigs to 108 Democrats. In his opening message President Tyler briefly recounted the recent history of the United States bank, the sub-treasury system, and other financial schemes, and ended with the precautionary words: "I shall be ready to concur with you in the adoption of such system as you may propose, reserving to myself the ultimate power of rejecting any measure which may, in my view of it, conflict with the constitution or otherwise jeopard the prosperity of the country, a power which I could not part with, even if I would, but which I will not believe any act of yours will call into requisition." Congress disregarded the warning. The ground was cleared for action by a bill for abolishing Van Buren's sub-treasury system, which passed both houses and was signed by the president. But an amendment offered by Mr. Clay, for the repeal of the law of 1836 regulating the deposits in the state banks, was defeated by the votes of a small party led by William C. Rives. The great question then came up. On constitutional grounds, Mr. Tyler's objection to the United States bank had always been that congress had no power to create such a corporation within the limits of a state without the consent of the state ascertained beforehand. He did not deny, however, the power of congress to establish a district bank for the District of Columbia, and, provided the several states should consent, there seemed to be no reason why this district bank should not set up its branch offices all over the country. Mr. Clay's so-called "fiscal bank" bill of 1841 did not make proper provision for securing the assent of the states, and on that ground Mr. Rives proposed an amendment substituting a clause of a bill suggested by Thomas Ewing, secretary of the treasury, to the effect that such assent should be formally secured. Mr. Rives's amendment was supported not only by several "state-rights Whigs," but also by senators Richard H. Bayard and Rufus Choate, and other friends of Mr. Webster. If adopted, its effect would have been conciliatory, and it might perhaps have averted for a moment the rupture between the ill-yoked allies. The Democrats, well aware of this, voted against the amendment, and it was lost. The bill incorporating the fiscal

bank of the United States was then passed by both houses, and on 16 Aug. was vetoed. An attempt to pass the bill over the veto failed of the requisite two-third majority.

The Whig leaders had already shown a disposition to entrap the president. Before the passage of Mr. Clay's bill, John Minor Botts was sent to the White House with a private suggestion for a compromise. Mr. Tyler refused to listen to the suggestion except with the understanding that, should it meet with his disapproval, he should not hear from it again. The suggestion turned out to be a proposal that congress should authorize the establishment of branches of the district bank in any state of which the legislature at its very next session should not expressly refuse its consent to any such proceeding; and that, moreover, in case the interests of the public should seem to require it, even such expressd refusal might be disregarded and overridden. By this means the obnoxious institution might first be established in the Whig states, and then forced upon the Democratic states in spite of themselves. The president indignantly rejected the suggestion as "a contemptible subterfuge, behind which he would not skulk." The device, nevertheless, became incorporated in Mr. Clay's bill, and it was pretended that it was put there in order to smooth the way for the president to adopt the measure, but that in his unreasonable obstinacy he refused to avail himself of the opportunity. After his veto of 16 Aug. these tortuous methods were renewed. Messengers went to and fro between the president and members of his cabinet on the one hand, and leading Whig members of congress on the other, conditional assurances were translated into the indicative mood, whispered messages were magnified and distorted, and presently appeared upon the scene an outline of a bill that it was assumed the president would sign. This new measure was known as the "fiscal corporation" bill. Like the fiscal bank bill, it created a bank in the District of Columbia, with branches throughout the states, and it made no proper provision for the consent of the states. The president had admitted that a "fiscal agency" of the United States government, established in Washington for the purpose of collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public revenue, was desirable if not indispensable; a regular bank of discount, engaged in commercial transactions throughout the states, and having the United States government as its princi-



pal share-holder and Federal officers exerting a controlling influence upon its directorship, was an entirely different affair—something, in his opinion, neither desirable nor permissible. In the “fiscal corporation” bill an attempt was made to hoodwink the president and the public by a pretence of forbidding discounts and loans and limiting the operations of the fiscal agency exclusively to exchanges. While this project was maturing, the Whig newspapers fulminated with threats against the president in case he should persist in his course; private letters warned him of plots to assassinate him, and Mr. Clay in the senate referred to his resignation in 1836, and asked why, if constitutional scruples again hindered him from obeying the will of the people, did he not now resign his lofty position and leave it for those who could be more compliant? To this it was aptly replied by Mr. Rives that “the president was an independent branch of the government as well as congress, and was not called upon to resign because he differed in opinion with them.” Some of the Whigs seem really to have hoped that such a storm could be raised as would browbeat the president into resigning, whereby the government would be temporarily left in the hands of William L. Southard, then president *pro tempore* of the senate. But Mr. Tyler was neither to be hoodwinked nor bullied. The “fiscal corporation” bill was passed by the senate on Saturday, 4 Sept., 1841; on Thursday, the 9th, the president’s veto message was received; on Saturday, the 11th, Thomas Ewing, secretary of the treasury, John Bell, secretary of war, George E. Badger, secretary of the navy, John J. Crittenden, attorney-general, and Francis Granger, post-master-general, resigned their places.\* The adjournment of

---

\* John Tyler, Jr., the son and private secretary of President Tyler, speaking to a friend of his father’s hold-over cabinet, said: “When my father succeeded to the presidency he continued Harrison’s cabinet in office until he found that they were working against him. His first cabinet meeting was held on the day succeeding the death of President Harrison, and it was perhaps the most remarkable cabinet meeting in history. When all the members were present and the doors were closed Daniel Webster, the secretary of state, arose and addressed my father, saying: ‘Mr. President, I suppose you intend to carry out the ideas and customs of your predecessor, and that this administration, inaugurated by President Harrison, will continue in the same line of policy on which it has begun. Am I right?’

“My father, much astonished, nodded his head almost involuntarily and

Congress had been fixed for Monday, the 13th, and it was hoped that, suddenly confronted by a unanimous resignation of the cabinet and confused by want of time in which to appoint a new cabinet, the president would give up the game. But the resignation was not unanimous, for Daniel Webster, secretary of state, remained at his post, and on Monday morning the president nominated Walter Forward, of Pennsylvania, for secretary of the treasury; John McLean, of Ohio, for secretary of war; Abel P. Upshur, of Virginia, for secretary of the navy; Hugh S. Legaré, of South Carolina, for attorney-general; and Charles A. Wickliffe, of Kentucky, for postmaster-general. These appointments were duly confirmed.

Whether the defection of Mr. Webster at this moment would have been so fatal to the president as some of the Whigs were inclined to believe, may well be questioned, but there can be no doubt that his adherence to the president was of great value. By remaining in the cabinet Mr. Webster showed himself too clear-sighted to contribute to a victory of which the whole profit would be reaped by his rival, Mr. Clay, and the president was glad to retain his hold upon so strong an element in the north as that which Mr. Webster represented. Some of the leading Whig members of congress now issued addresses to the people, in which they loudly condemned the conduct of the president and declared that "all political con-

---

looked at Mr. Webster with wonder. Daniel Webster straightened himself up at this and continued:

"Mr. President, it was the custom in our cabinet meetings of President Harrison that he should preside over them. All measures relating to the administration were to be brought before the cabinet and their settlement was to be decided by the majority of votes, each member of the cabinet and the president having but one vote."

"My father was always courteous, but he was also firm. He rose to his feet, and looking about the cabinet apartment he said: 'Gentlemen, I am very proud to have in my cabinet such able statesmen as you have proved yourselves to be. I shall be pleased to avail myself of your counsel and advice, but I can never consent to being dictated to as to what I shall or shall not do. I am the president, and I shall be held responsible for my administration. I hope I shall have your hearty co-operation in carrying out its measures. So long as you see fit to do this I shall be glad to have you with me. When you think otherwise I will be equally glad to receive your resignation.' This," concluded Mr. Tyler, "settled the question, and there was no further trouble as to who was the head of the cabinet."—EDITOR.

nection between them and John Tyler was at an end from that day forth." It was open war between the two departments of government. Although many Whig members, like Preston, Talmadge, Johnson, and Marshall, really sympathized with Mr. Tyler, only a few, commonly known as "the corporal's guard," openly recognized him as their leader. But the Democratic members came to his support as an ally against the Whigs. The state elections of 1841 showed some symptoms of a reaction in favor of the president's views, for in general the Whigs lost ground in them. As the spectre of the crisis of 1837 faded away in the distance, the people began to recover from the sudden and overmastering impulse that had swept the country in 1840, and the popular enthusiasm for the bank soon died away. Mr. Tyler had really won a victory of the first magnitude, as was conclusively shown in 1844, when the presidential platform of the Whigs was careful to make no allusion whatever to the bank. On this crucial question the doctrines of paternal government had received a crushing and permanent defeat. In the next session of congress the strife with the president was renewed; but it was now tariff, not bank, that furnished the subject of discussion. Diminished importations, due to the general prostration of business, had now diminished the revenue until it was insufficient to meet the expenses of government. The Whigs accordingly carried through congress a bill continuing the protective duties of 1833, and providing that the surplus revenue, which was thus sure soon to accumulate, should be distributed among the states. But the compromise act of 1833, in which Mr. Tyler had played an important part, had provided that the protective policy should come to an end in 1842. Both on this ground, and because of the provision for distributing the surplus, the president vetoed the new bill. Congress then devised and passed another bill, providing for a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, but still contemplating a distribution of the surplus, if there should be any. The president vetoed this bill. Congress received the veto message with great indignation, and in the motion of ex-President John Q. Adams it was referred to a committee, which condemned it as an unwarrantable assumption of power, and after a caustic summary of Mr. Tyler's acts since his accession to office, concluded with a reference to impeachment. This report called forth from the

president a formal protest; but the victory was already his. The Whigs were afraid to go before the country in the autumn elections with the tariff question unsettled, and the bill was accordingly passed by both houses, without the distributing clause, and was at once signed by the president. The distributing clause was then passed in a separate bill, but a "pocket veto" disposed of it. Congress adjourned on 31 Aug., 1842, and in the elections the Whig majority of twenty-five in the house of representatives gave place to a Democratic majority of sixty-one.

On the remaining question of National Republican policy, that of internal improvements, the most noteworthy action of President Tyler was early in 1844, when two river-and-harbor bills were passed by congress, the one relating to the eastern, the other to the western states. Mr. Tyler vetoed the former, but signed the latter, on the ground that the Mississippi river, as a great common highway for the commerce of the whole country, was the legitimate concern of the national government in a sense that was not true of any other American river. An unsuccessful attempt was made to pass the other bill over the veto. The rest of Mr. Tyler's administration was taken up with the Ashburton treaty with Great Britain, the Oregon question, and the annexation of Texas. Texas had won its independence from Mexico in 1836, and its governor, as well as the majority of its inhabitants, were citizens of the United States. From a broad national standpoint it was in every way desirable that Texas, as well as Oregon, should belong to our Federal Union. In the eastern states there was certainly a failure to appreciate the value of Oregon, which was nevertheless claimed as indisputably our property. On the other hand, it was felt, by a certain element in South Carolina, that if the northern states were to have ample room for expansion beyond the Rocky mountains, the southern states must have Texas added to their number as a counterpoise, or else the existence of slavery would be imperilled, and these fears were strengthened by the growth of anti-slavery sentiment at the north. The Whigs, who by reason of their tariff policy found their chief strength at the north, were disposed to avail themselves of this anti-slavery sentiment, and accordingly declared themselves opposed to the annexation of Texas. In the mean time the political pressure brought to bear upon Mr. Webster in Massachusetts induced resignation of his portfolio, and he was succeeded in the state



I am truly engaged in reading a large  
crop of wheat. Shall I be permitted to reap it  
at its maturity in Peace. Time will decide.  
We are all well. Gardie and Maria write  
to Julia, whom I return home with to look  
for with much solicitude during the next  
week. Be pleased to present my kindest  
greetings to your wife and all. and be  
assured of my constant good wishes and  
affectionate esteem -

Truly yrs

John Tyler

Col. Gardener

department by Hugh S. Legaré, 9 May, 1843. In a few weeks Legaré was succeeded by Mr. Upshur, after whose death, on 28 Feb., 1844, the place was filled by John C. Calhoun. After a negotiation extending over two years, a treaty was concluded, 12 April, 1844, with the government of Texas, providing for annexation. The treaty was rejected by the senate, by a vote of 35 to 16, all the Whigs and seven Democrats voting in the negative. Thus by the summer of 1844 the alliance between the Whig party and Mr. Tyler's wing of the Democrats had passed away. At the same time the division among the Democrats, which had become marked during Jackson's administration, still continued; and while the opposition to Mr. Tyler was strong enough to prevent his nomination in the Democratic national convention, which met at Baltimore on 27 May, 1844, on the other hand he was able to prevent the nomination of Mr. Van Buren, who had declared himself opposed to the immediate annexation of Texas. The result was the nomination of James K. Polk, as a kind of compromise candidate, in so far as he belonged to the "loco-foco" wing of the party, but was at the same time in favor of annexation. On the same day, 27 May, another convention at Baltimore nominated Mr. Tyler for a second term. He accepted the nomination in order to coerce the Democrats into submitting to him and his friends a formal invitation to re-enter the ranks; and accordingly a meeting of Democrats at the Carleton house, New York, on 6 Aug., adopted a series of resolutions commending the principal acts of his administration, and entreating that in the general interests of the opposition he should withdraw. In response to this appeal, Mr. Tyler accordingly withdrew his name. The northern opposition to the annexation of Texas seemed to have weakened the strength of the Whigs in the south, and their candidate, Henry Clay, declared himself willing to see Texas admitted at some future time. But this device cut both ways; for while it was popular in the south, and is supposed to have acquired for Clay many pro-slavery votes, carrying for him Tennessee, North Carolina, Delaware, and Maryland by bare majorities, it certainly led many anti-slavery Whigs to throw away their votes upon the "Liberty" candidate, James G. Birney, and thus surrender New York to the Democrats. The victory of the Democrats in November was reflected in the course pursued in the ensuing congress. One of the party

watchwords, in reference to the Oregon question, had been "fifty-four forty, or fight," and the house of representatives now proceeded to pass a bill organizing a territorial government for Oregon up to that parallel of latitude. The senate, however, laid the bill upon the table, because it prohibited slavery in the territory. A joint resolution for the annexation of Texas was passed by both houses. Proposals for prohibiting slavery there were defeated, and the affair was arranged by extending the Missouri compromise-line westward through the Texan territory to be acquired by the annexation. North of that line slavery was to be prohibited; south of it the question was to be determined by the people living on the spot. The resolutions were signed by President Tyler, and instructions in accordance therewith were despatched by him to Texas on the last day of his term of office, 3 March, 1845. The friends of annexation defended the constitutionality of this proceeding, and the opponents denounced it.

After leaving the White House, Mr. Tyler took up his residence on an estate that he had purchased three miles from Greenway, on the bank of James river. To this estate he gave the name of "Sherwood Forest," and there he lived the rest of his life. (See illustration on page 202.) In a letter published in the Richmond "Enquirer" on 17 Jan., 1861, he recommended a convention of border states—including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, as well as Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri—for the purpose of devising some method of adjusting the difficulties brought on by the secession of South Carolina. The scheme adopted by this convention was to be submitted to the other states, and, if adopted, was to be incorporated into the Federal constitution. In acting upon Mr. Tyler's suggestion, the Virginia legislature enlarged it into a proposal of a peace convention to be composed of delegates from all the states. At the same time Mr. Tyler was appointed a commissioner to President Buchanan, while Judge John Robertson was appointed commissioner to the state of South Carolina, the object being to persuade both parties to abstain from any acts of hostility until the proposed peace convention should have had an opportunity to meet and discuss the situation. In discharge of this mission Mr. Tyler arrived on 23 Jan. in Washington. President Buchanan declined to give any assurances, but in his



message to congress, on 28 Jan., he deprecated a hasty resort to hostile measures. The peace convention, consisting of delegates from thirteen northern and seven border states, met at Washington on 4 Feb. and chose Mr. Tyler as its president. Several resolutions were adopted and reported to congress, 27 Feb.; but on 2 March they were rejected in the senate by a vote of 28 to 7, and two days later the house adjourned without having taken a vote upon them. On 28 Feb., anticipating the fate of the resolutions in congress, Mr. Tyler made a speech on the steps of the Exchange hotel in Richmond, and declared his belief that no arrangement could be made, and that nothing was left for Virginia but to act promptly in the exercise of her powers as a sovereign state. The next day he took his seat in the State convention, where he advocated the immediate passing of an ordinance of secession. His attitude seems to have been substantially the same that it had been twenty-eight years before, when he disapproved the heresy of nullification, but condemned with still greater emphasis the measures taken by President Jackson to suppress that heresy. This feeling that secession was inadvisable, but coercion wholly indefensible, was shared by Mr. Tyler with many people in the border states. On the removal of the government of the southern Confederacy from Montgomery to Richmond, in May, 1861, he was unanimously elected a member of the provisional congress of the Confederate states. In the following autumn he was elected to the permanent congress, but he died before taking his seat. He was buried in Hollywood Cemetery, Richmond, where as yet his grave, near that of James Monroe, is, strange to say, unmarked.\* His biography has been ably written by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, "The Letters and Times of the Tylers" (2 vols., Richmond, 1884-'5). See also "Seven Decades of the Union," by Henry A. Wise (Philadelphia, 1872).

---

\* Mr. Tyler was interred with great honors in what is known as the Presidents' Section, being about ten yards to the east of the grave of Monroe. When the writer visited the cemetery, in 1893, no stone marked his own or Mrs. Julia Tyler's grave. Before the war Virginia passed resolutions authorizing the governor to erect an appropriate monument from the funds of the state, but owing to the condition of her finances this has not yet been done. By his will Mr. Tyler's remains were to be buried at his home, Sherwood Forest, in Charles City County, and but for Virginia's interposition his family would long since have erected a suitable monument to his memory.—EDITOR.

His wife, LETITIA CHRISTIAN, born at Cedar Grove, New Kent co., Va., 12 Nov., 1790; died in Washington, D. C., 9 Sept., 1842, was the daughter of Robert Christian, a planter in New Kent county, Va. She married Mr. Tyler on 29 March, 1813, and removed with him to his home in Charles City county. When he became president she accompanied him to Washington; but her health was delicate, and she died shortly afterward. Mrs. Tyler was unable to assume any social cares, and the duties of mistress of the White House devolved upon her daughter-in-law, Mrs. Robert Tyler. She possessed great beauty of person and of character, and, before the failure of her health, was especially fitted for a social life.

Their son, ROBERT, born in New Kent county, Va., in 1818; died in Montgomery, Ala., 3 Dec., 1877, was educated at William and Mary, and adopted the profession of law. He married Priscilla, a daughter of Thomas Apthorpe Cooper, the tragedian, in 1839, and when his father became president his wife assumed the duties of mistress of the White House till after Mrs. John Tyler's death, when they devolved upon her daughter, Mrs. Letitia Semple. Mr. Tyler removed to Philadelphia in 1843, practised law there, and held several civil offices. In 1844 he was elected president of the Irish repeal association. A little later he became prothonotary of the supreme court of Pennsylvania, and in 1858 he was chairman of the Democratic executive committee of the state. He removed to Richmond at the beginning of the civil war, and was appointed register of the treasury. After the war he edited the "Mail and Advertiser" in Montgomery, Ala. He published "Ahasuerus," a poem (New York, 1842); "Death, or Medora's Dream," a poem (1843); "Is Virginia a Repudiating State? and the States' Guarantee," two letters (Richmond, Va., 1858).

President Tyler's second wife, JULIA GARDINER, born on Gardiner's island, near Easthampton, N. Y., 4 May, 1820; died in Richmond, Va., 10 July, 1889, was a descendant of the Gardiners of Gardiner's island. She was educated at the Chegary institute, New York city, spent several months in Europe, and in the winter of 1844 accompanied her father to Washington, D. C. A few weeks afterward he was killed by the explosion of a gun on the war-steamer "Princeton," which occurred dur-

ing a pleasure excursion in which he and his daughter were of the presidential party. His body was taken to the White House, and Miss Gardiner, being thrown in the society of the president under these peculiar circumstances, became the object of his marked attention, which resulted in their marriage in New York city, 26 June, 1844. For the succeeding eight months she presided over the White House with dignity and grace, her residence there terminating with a birth-night ball on 22 Feb., 1845. Mrs. Tyler retired with her husband to "Sherwood Forest" in Virginia at the conclusion of his term, and after the civil war resided for several years at her mother's residence on Castleton Hill, Staten island, and subsequently in Richmond, Va. She was a convert to Roman Catholicism, was devoted to the charities of that church, and is buried by the side of her husband in Hollywood Cemetery.




*Julia G. Tyler*

Her son, LYON GARDINER, born in Charles City county, Va., 12 Aug. 1853, was graduated at the University of Virginia in 1875, and then studied law. During his college course he was elected orator of the Jefferson society, and obtained a scholarship as best editor of the "Virginia University Magazine." In January, 1877, he was elected professor of belles-lettres in William and Mary college, which place he held until November, 1878, when he became head of a high-school in Memphis, Tenn. He settled in Richmond, Va., in 1882, and entered on the practice of law, also taking an active interest in politics. He was a candidate for the house of delegates in 1885, and again in 1887, when he was elected. In that body he advocated the bills to establish a labor bureau, to regulate child labor, and to aid William and Mary college. In 1888 he was elected president of the college, which office he now fills. He has published "The Letters and Times of the Tylers" (2 vols., Richmond, 1884-'5); "Parties and Patronage in the United States" (New York, 1891); and he is the editor of the "William and Mary College Quarterly," established in 1892.

## JAMES K. POLK.

JAMES KNOX POLK, eleventh president of the United States, born in Mecklenburg county, N. C., 2 Nov., 1795; died in Nashville, Tenn., 15 June, 1849. He was a son of Samuel Polk, whose father, Ezekiel, was a brother of Col. Thomas, grandson of Robert Polk, or Pollock, who was born in Ireland and emigrated to the United States. His mother was Jane, daughter of James Knox, a resident of Iredell county, N. C., and a captain in the war of the Revolution. His father, Samuel, a farmer, removed in the autumn of 1806 to the rich valley of Duck river, a tributary of the Tennessee, and made a new home in a section that was erected the following year into the county of Maury. Besides cultivating the tract of land he had purchased, Samuel at intervals followed the occupation of a surveyor, acquired a fortune equal to his wants, and lived until 1827. His son James was brought up on the farm, and not only assisted in its management, but frequently accompanied his father in his surveying expeditions, during which they were often absent for weeks. He was inclined to study, often busied himself with his father's mathematical calculations, and was fond of reading. He was sent to school, and had succeeded in mastering the English branches when ill health compelled his removal. He was then placed with a merchant, but having a strong dislike to commercial pursuits, he obtained permission to return home after a few weeks' trial, and in July, 1813, was given in charge of a private tutor. In 1815 he entered the sophomore class at the University of North Carolina, of which institution his cousin, William, was a trustee. As a student young Polk was correct, punctual, and industrious. At his graduation in 1818 he was officially acknowledged to be the best scholar in both the classics and mathematics, and delivered the Latin salutatory. In 1847 the university conferred upon him the degree of LL. D. In 1819 he entered the law-



*James A. Folk*



office of Felix Grundy, who was then at the head of the Tennessee bar. While pursuing his legal studies he attracted the attention of Andrew Jackson, who soon afterward was appointed governor of the territory of Florida. An intimacy was thus begun between the two men that in after-years greatly influenced the course of at least one of them. In 1820 Mr. Polk was admitted to the bar, and established himself at Columbia, the county-seat of Maury county. Here he attained such immediate success as falls to the lot of few, his career at the bar only ending with his election to the governorship in 1839. At times he practised alone, while at others he was associated successively with several of the leading practitioners of the state. Among the latter may be mentioned Aaron V. Brown and Gideon J. Pillow.

Brought up as a Jeffersonian, and early taking an interest in politics, Mr. Polk was frequently heard in public as an exponent of the views of his party. So popular was his style of oratory that his services soon came to be in great demand, and he was not long in earning the title of the "Napoleon of the Stump." He was, however, an argumentative rather than a rhetorical speaker, and convinced his hearers by plainness of statement and aptness of illustration, ignoring the *ad-captandum* effects usually resorted to in political harangues. His first public employment was that of chief clerk to the Tennessee house of representatives, and in 1823 he canvassed the district to secure his own election to that body. During his two years in the legislature he was regarded as one of its most promising members. His ability and shrewdness in debate, his business tact, combined with his firmness and industry, secured for him a high reputation. While a member of the general assembly he obtained the passage of a law to prevent the then common practice of duelling, and, although he resided in a community where that mode of settling disputes was generally approved, he was never concerned in an "affair of honor," either as principal or as second. In August, 1825, he was elected to congress from the Duck river district, in which he resided, by a flattering majority, and re-elected at every succeeding election until 1839, when he withdrew from the contest to become a candidate for governor. On taking his seat as a member of the 19th congress, he found himself, with one or two exceptions, the youngest member of that body. The same habits of laborious applica-

tion that had previously characterized him were now displayed on the floor of the house and in the committee-room. He was prominently connected with every leading question, and upon all he struck what proved to be the key-note for the action of his party. During the whole period of President Jackson's administration he was one of its leading supporters, and at times, on certain issues of paramount importance, its chief reliance. His maiden speech was made in defence of the proposed amendment to the constitution, giving the choice of president and vice-president directly to the people. It was distinguished by clearness and force, copiousness of research, wealth of illustration, and cogency of argument, and at once placed its author in the front rank of congressional debaters. During the same session Mr. Polk attracted attention by his vigorous opposition to the appropriation for the Panama mission. President Adams had appointed commissioners to attend a congress proposed to be held at Panama by delegates appointed by different Spanish-American states, which, although they had virtually achieved their independence, were still at war with the mother-country. Mr. Polk, and those who thought with him, contended that such action on the part of this government would tend to involve us in a war with Spain, and establish an unfortunate precedent for the future. In December, 1827, he was placed on the committee on foreign affairs, and some time afterward was also appointed chairman of the select committee to which was referred that portion of the message of President Adams calling the attention of congress to the probable accumulation of a surplus in the treasury after the anticipated extinguishment of the national debt. At the head of the latter committee, he made a report denying the constitutional power of congress to collect from the people for distribution a surplus beyond the wants of the government, and maintaining that the revenue should be reduced to the requirements of the public service. Early in 1833, as a member of the ways and means committee, he made a minority report unfavorable to the Bank of the United States, which aroused a storm of opposition, a meeting of the friends of the bank being held at Nashville. During the entire contest between the bank and President Jackson, caused by the removal of the deposits in October, 1833, Mr. Polk, now chairman of the committee, supported the executive. His speech in opening the debate summarized the material facts



and arguments on the Democratic side of the question. George McDuffie, leader of the opposition, bore testimony in his concluding remarks to the boldness and manliness with which Mr. Polk had assumed the only position that could be judiciously taken. Mr. Polk was elected speaker of the house of representatives in December, 1835, and held that office till 1839. He gave to the administration of Martin Van Buren the same unhesitating support he had accorded to that of President Jackson, and, though taking no part in the discussions, he approved of the leading measures recommended by the former, including the cession of the public lands to the states, the pre-emption law, and the proposal to establish an independent treasury, and exerted his influence to secure their adoption. He was the speaker during five sessions, and it was his fortune to preside over the house at a period when party feelings were excited to an unusual degree. Notwithstanding the fact that during the first session more appeals were taken from his decisions than were ever known before, he was uniformly sustained by the house, and frequently by leading members of the Whig party. Although he was opposed to the doctrines of the anti-slavery reformers, we have the testimony of their leader in the house, John Quincy Adams, to the effect that Speaker Polk uniformly extended to him "every kindness and courtesy imaginable." On leaving congress, Mr. Polk became the candidate of the Democrats of Tennessee for governor. They had become disheartened by a series of disasters and defeats caused primarily by the defection of John Bell and Judge Hugh L. White. Under these circumstances it was evident that no one but the strongest man in the party could enter the canvass with the slightest prospect of success, and it was doubtful whether even he could carry off the prize. On being asked, Mr. Polk at once cheerfully consented to allow his name to be used. He was nominated in the autumn of 1838, but, owing to his congressional duties, was unable fairly to enter upon the canvass until the spring of 1839. His opponent was Newton Cannon, also a Democrat, who then held the office. The contest was spirited, and Mr. Polk was elected by over 2,500 majority. On 14 Oct. he took the oath of office. In his inaugural address he touched upon the relations of the state and Federal governments, declared that the latter had no constitutional power to incorporate a national bank, took strong ground against the creation of a

surplus Federal revenue by taxation, asserted that "the agitation of the Abolitionists can by no possibility produce good to any portion of the Union, but must, if persisted in, lead to incalculable mischief," and discussed at length other topics, especially bearing upon the internal policy of Tennessee. In 1841 Mr. Polk was again a candidate for the governorship, although his defeat was a foregone conclusion in view of the political whirlwind that had swept over the country in 1840 and resulted in the election of William Henry Harrison to the presidency. In Tennessee the Harrison electoral ticket had received more than 12,000 majority. Although to overcome this was impossible, Mr. Polk entered upon the canvass with his usual energy and earnestness. He could not secure the defeat of James C. Jones, the opposing Whig candidate, one of the most popular members of his party in the state, but he did succeed in cutting down the opposition majority to about 3,000. In 1843 Mr. Polk was once more a candidate; but this time Gov. Jones's majority was nearly 4,000.

In 1839 Mr. Polk had been nominated by the legislature of Tennessee as its candidate for vice-president on the ticket with Martin Van Buren, and other states had followed the example; but Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, seemed to be the choice of the great body of the Democratic party, and he was accordingly nominated. From the date of Van Buren's defeat in 1840 until within a few weeks of the meeting of the National Democratic convention at Baltimore in 1844, public opinion in the party undoubtedly pointed to his renomination, but when in April of the latter year President Tyler concluded a treaty between the government of the United States and the republic of Texas, providing for the annexation of the latter to the Union, a new issue was introduced into American politics that was destined to change not only the platforms of parties, but the future history and topography of the country itself. On the question whether Texas should be admitted, the greatest divergence of opinion among public men prevailed. The Whig party at the north opposed annexation, on the grounds that it would be an act of bad faith to Mexico, that it would involve the necessity of assuming the debt of the young republic, amounting to ten or twelve millions of dollars, and that it would further increase the area of slave territory. At the south the Whigs were divided, one section advocating the new policy,

while the other concurred with their party friends at the north on the first two grounds of objection. The Democrats generally favored annexation, but a portion of the party at the north, and a few of its members residing in the slave-states, opposed it. Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Clay agreed very nearly in their opinions, being in favor of annexation if the American people desired it, provided that the consent of Mexico could be obtained, or at least that efforts should be made to obtain it. In this crisis Mr. Polk declared his views in no uncertain tones. It being understood that he would be a candidate for vice-president, a letter was addressed to him by a committee of the citizens of Cincinnati, asking for an expression of his sentiments on the subject. In his reply, dated 22 April, 1844, he said: "I have no hesitation in declaring that I am in favor of the immediate reannexation of Texas to the government and territory of the United States. The proof is fair and satisfactory to my own mind that Texas once constituted a part of the territory of the United States, the title to which I regard to have been as indisputable as that to any portion of our territory." He also added that "the country west of the Sabine, and now called Texas, was [in 1819] most unwisely ceded away"; that the people and government of the republic were most anxious for annexation, and that, if their prayer was rejected, there was danger that she might become "a dependency if not a colony of Great Britain." This letter, strongly in contrast with the hesitating phrases contained in that of ex-President Van Buren of 20 April on the same subject, elevated its author to the presidency. When the Baltimore convention met on 27 May, it was found that, while Mr. Van Buren could not secure the necessary two-third vote, his friends numbered more than one third of the delegates present, and were thus in a position to dictate the name of the successful candidate. As it was also found that they were inflexibly opposed to Messrs. Cass, Johnson, Buchanan, and the others whose names had been presented, Mr. Polk was introduced as the candidate of conciliation, and nominated with alacrity and unanimity. George M. Dallas was nominated for vice-president. In his letter of acceptance, Mr. Polk declared that, if elected, he should enter upon "the discharge of the high and solemn duties of the office with the settled purpose of not being a candidate for re-election." After an exciting canvass, Mr. Polk was elected over

his distinguished opponent, Henry Clay, by about 40,000 majority, on the popular vote, exclusive of that of South Carolina, whose electors were chosen by the legislature of the state; while in the electoral college he received 175 votes to 105 that were cast for Mr. Clay.

On 4 March, 1845, Mr. Polk was inaugurated. In his inaugural address, after recounting the blessings conferred upon the nation by the Federal Union, he said: "To perpetuate them, it is our sacred duty to preserve it. Who shall assign limits to the achievements of free minds and free hands under the protection of this glorious Union? No treason to mankind, since the organization of society, would be equal in atrocity to that of him who would lift his hand to destroy it. He would overthrow the noblest structure of human wisdom which protects himself and his fellow-man. He would stop the progress of free government and involve his country either in anarchy or in despotism." In selecting his cabinet, the new president was singularly fortunate. It comprised several of the most distinguished members of the Democratic party, and all sections of the Union were represented. James Buchanan, fresh from his long experience in the senate, was named secretary of state; Robert J. Walker, also an ex-senator and one of the best authorities on the national finances, was secretary of the treasury; to William L. Marcy, ex-governor of New York, was confided the war portfolio; literature was honored in the appointment of George Bancroft as secretary of the navy; Cave Johnson, a prominent son of Tennessee, was made postmaster-general; and John Y. Mason, who had been a member of President Tyler's cabinet, was first attorney-general and afterward secretary of the navy. When congress met in the following December there was a Democratic majority in both branches. In his message the president condemned all anti-slavery agitation, recommended a sub-treasury and a tariff for revenue, and declared that the annexation of Texas was a matter that concerned only the latter and the United States, no foreign country having any right to interfere. Congress was also informed that the American army under Gen. Zachary Taylor had been ordered to occupy, and had occupied, the western bank of Nueces river, beyond which Texas had never hitherto exercised jurisdiction. On 29 Dec., Texas was admitted into the Union, and two days later an act was passed extending the United

convinced how from the Sheriff of Mecklenburg,  
to turn the crisis into an affair proper.  
To save the labor of meetings, doubtless better  
I shall send all my letters to Mr. H. unless  
you to you. You will of course opening  
read them, and thus send for him of deliver  
them to him. —

I go tomorrow to Pickensville where I will  
be on Monday. — I will write you again  
from Seepers on Wednesday next. —

Your affectionate & devoted

Samuel A. Linn



States revenue system over the doubtful territory beyond the Nueces. Even these measures did not elicit a declaration of war from the Mexican authorities, who still declared their willingness to negotiate concerning the disputed territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. These negotiations, however, came to nothing, and the president, in accordance with Gen. Taylor's suggestion, ordered a forward movement, in obedience to which that officer advanced from his camp at Corpus Christi toward the Rio Grande, and occupied the district in debate. Thus brought face to face with Mexican troops, he was attacked early in May with 6,000 men by Gen. Arista, who was badly beaten at Palo Alto with less than half that number. The next day Taylor attacked Arista at Resaca de la Palma, and drove him across the Rio Grande.

On receipt of the news of these events in Washington, President Polk sent a message to congress, in which he declared that Mexican troops had at last shed the blood of American citizens on American soil, and asked for a formal declaration of war. A bill was accordingly introduced and passed by both houses, recognizing the fact that hostilities had been begun, and appropriating \$10,000,000 for its prosecution. Its preamble read as follows: "Whereas, by the act of the republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that government and the United States." The Whigs protested against this statement as untrue, alleging that the president had provoked retaliatory action by ordering the army into Mexican territory, and Abraham Lincoln introduced in the house of representatives what became known as the "spot resolutions," calling upon the president to designate the spot of American territory whereon the outrage had been committed. Nevertheless, the Whigs voted for the bill and generally supported the war until its conclusion. On 8 Aug. a second message was received from the president, asking for money with which to purchase territory from Mexico, that the dispute might be settled by negotiation. A bill appropriating \$2,000,000 for this purpose at once brought up the question of slavery extension into new territory, and David Wilmot, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of many northern Democrats, offered an amendment applying to any newly acquired territory the provision of the ordinance of 1781, to the effect that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist in any part of said territory except for crime, where-


of the party shall first be duly convicted." The Whigs and northern Democrats united secured its passage, but it was sent to the senate too late to be acted upon.

During the same session war with England regarding the Oregon question seemed imminent. By the treaties of 1803 with France, and of 1819 with Spain, the United States had acquired the rights of those powers on the Pacific coast north of California. The northern boundary of the ceded territory was unsettled. The United States claimed that the line of  $54^{\circ} 40'$  north latitude was such boundary, while Great Britain maintained that it followed the Columbia river. By the convention of 1827 the disputed territory had been held jointly by both countries, the arrangement being terminable by either country on twelve months' notice. The Democratic convention of 1844 had demanded the reoccupation of the whole of Oregon up to  $54^{\circ} 40'$ , "with or without war with England," a demand popularly summarized in the campaign rallying-cry of "Fifty-four-forty or fight!" The annexation of Texas having been accomplished, the Whigs now began to urge the Democrats to carry out their promise regarding Oregon, and, against the votes of the extreme southern Democrats, the president was directed to give the requisite twelve months' notice. Further negotiations ensued, which resulted in the offer by Great Britain to yield her claim to the unoccupied territory between the 49th parallel and Columbia river, and acknowledged that parallel as the northern boundary. As the president had subscribed to the platform of the Baltimore convention, he threw upon the senate the responsibility of deciding whether the claim of the United States to the whole of Oregon should be insisted upon, or the compromise proposed by her majesty's government accepted. The senate, by a vote of 41 to 14, decided in favor of the latter alternative, and on 15 June, 1846, the treaty was signed.

Two other important questions were acted upon at the first session of the 39th congress, the tariff and internal improvements. The former had been a leading issue in the presidential contest of 1844. The act of 1842 had violated the principles of the compromise bill of 1833, and the opinions of the two candidates for the presidency, on this issue, were supposed to be well defined previous to the termination of their congressional career. Mr. Polk was committed to the policy of a tariff for revenue, and Mr. Clay, when the compromise act was



under discussion, had pledged the party favorable to protection to a reduction of the imports to a revenue standard. Previous to his nomination, Mr. Clay made a speech at Raleigh, N. C., in which he advocated discriminating duties for the protection of domestic industry. This was followed by his letter in September, 1844, in which he gave in his adhesion to the tariff of 1842. Probably alarmed at the prospect of losing votes at the south through his opposition to the annexation of Texas, and seeing defeat certain unless he could rally to his support the people of the north, Mr. Clay made one conces-



sion after another, until he had virtually abandoned the ground he occupied in 1833, and made himself amenable to his own rebuke uttered at that time: "What man," he had then asked, "who is entitled to deserve the character of an American statesman, would stand up in his place in either house of congress and disturb the treaty of peace and amity?" Mr. Polk, on the other hand, had courted criticism by his Kane letter, dated 19 June, 1844, which was so ambiguously worded as to give ground for the charge that his position was identical with that held by Henry Clay. In his first annual message, however, he explained his views with precision and ability. The principles that would govern his administration were proclaimed with great boldness, and the objectionable features of the tariff of 1842 were investigated and exposed, while congress was urged to substitute ad valorem for specific and minimum duties. "The terms 'protection to American industry,'" he went on to say, "are of popular import, but they should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer, or planter, who toils yearly in his fields, is engaged in 'domestic industry,' and is as much entitled to have his labor 'protected' as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator, or the mechanic, who are engaged also in 'domestic industry' in their different pursuits. The joint labors of all these classes constitute the aggregate of the 'domestic industry' of the nation,

and they are equally entitled to the nation's 'protection.' No one of them can justly claim to be the exclusive recipients of 'protection,' which can only be afforded by increasing burdens on the 'domestic industry' of others." In accordance with the president's views, a bill providing for a purely revenue tariff, and based on a plan prepared by Sec. Walker, was introduced in the house of representatives on 15 June. After an unusually able discussion, a vote was reached on 3 July, when the measure was adopted by 114 ayes to 95 nays. But it was nearly defeated in the senate, where the vote was tied, and only the decision of Vice-President Dallas in its favor saved the bill. The occasion was memorable, party spirit ran high, and a crowded senate-chamber hung on the lips of that official as he announced the reasons for his course. In conclusion he said: "If by thus acting it be my misfortune to offend any portion of those who honored me with their suffrages, I have only to say to them, and to my whole country, that I prefer the deepest obscurity of private life, with an unwounded conscience, to the glare of official eminence spotted by a sense of moral delinquency!"

Regarding the question of internal improvements, Mr. Polk's administration was signalized by the struggle between the advocates of that policy and the executive. A large majority in both houses of congress, including members of both parties, were in favor of a lavish expenditure of the public money. On 24 July, 1846, the senate passed the bill known as the river-and-harbor improvement bill precisely as it had passed the house the previous March, but it was vetoed by the president in a message of unusual power. The authority of the general government to make internal improvements within the states was thoroughly examined, and reference was made to the corruptions of the system that expended money in particular sections, leaving other parts of the country without government assistance. Undaunted by the opposition of the executive, the house of representatives, on 20 Feb., 1847, passed, by a vote of 89 to 72, a second bill making appropriations amounting to \$600,000 for the same purpose. It was carried through the senate on the last day of the second session. Although the president could have defeated the objectionable measure by a "pocket veto," in spite of the denunciations with which he was assailed by the politicians and the press, he again

boldly met the question, and sent in a message that, for thoroughness of investigation, breadth of thought, clearness and cogency of argument, far excels any of the state papers to which he has put his name.

The conflict between the friends and opponents of slavery was also a prominent feature of President Polk's administration, and was being constantly waged on the floor of congress. During the second session of the 39th congress the house attached the Wilmot proviso to a bill appropriating \$3,000,000 for the purchase of territory from Mexico, as it had been appended to one appropriating \$2,000,000 for the same purpose at the previous session. The senate passed the bill without the amendment, and the house was compelled to concur. A bill to organize the territory of Oregon, with the proviso attached, passed by the latter body, was not acted upon by the senate. A motion made in the house of representatives by a southern member to extend the Missouri compromise-line of 36° 30' to the Pacific was lost by a sectional vote, north against south, 81 to 104. A treaty of peace having been signed with Mexico, 2 Feb., 1848, after a series of victories, a bill was passed by the senate during the first session of the 30th congress, establishing territorial governments in Oregon, New Mexico, and California, with a provision that all questions concerning slavery in those territories should be referred to the U. S. supreme court for decision. It received the votes of the members from the slave-states, but was lost in the house. A bill was finally passed organizing the territory of Oregon without slavery. During the second session a bill to organize the territories of New Mexico and California with the Wilmot proviso was passed by the house, but the senate refused to consider it. Late in the session the latter body attached a bill permitting such organization with slavery to the general appropriation bill as a "rider," but, as the house objected, was compelled to strike it off. In his message to congress approving the Oregon territorial bill Mr. Polk said: "I have an abiding confidence that the sober reflection and sound patriotism of all the states will bring them to the conclusion that the dictate of wisdom is to follow the example of those who have gone before us, and settle this dangerous question on the Missouri compromise or some other equitable compromise which would respect the rights of all, and prove satisfactory to

the different portions of the Union." President Polk was not a slavery propagandist, and consequently had no pro-slavery policy. On the contrary, in the settlement of the Oregon question, he did all in his power to secure the exclusion of slavery from that territory, and, although the final vote was not taken until within a few days after his retirement, the battle was fought and the decision virtually reached during his able administration.

Mr. Polk, in a letter dated 19 May, 1848, reiterated his decision not to become a candidate again for the presidency, and retired at the close of his term of office to his home in Nashville with the intention not to re-enter public life. His health, never robust, had been seriously impaired by the unavoidable cares of office and his habit of devoting too much time and strength to the execution of details. Within a few weeks after his permanent return to Tennessee he fell a prey to a disease that would probably have only slightly affected a man in ordinary health, and a few hours sufficed to bring the attack to a fatal termination. Thus ended the life of one of whose public career it may still be too soon to judge with entire impartiality. Some of the questions on which he was called upon to act are still, nearly forty-five years after his death, party issues. Polk evidently believed with Mr. Clay that a Union all slave or all free was an impossible Utopia, and that there was no good reason why the north and the south should not continue to live for many years to come as they had lived since the adoption of the constitution. He deprecated agitation of the slavery question by the Abolitionists, and believed that the safety of the commonwealth lay in respecting the compromises that had hitherto furnished a *modus vivendi* between the slave and the free states. As to the annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico, his policy was undoubtedly the result of conviction, sincerity, and good faith. He believed, with John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, that Texas had been unwisely ceded to Spain in 1819, and that it was desirable, from a geographical point of view, that it should be re-annexed, seeing that it formed a most valuable part of the valley of the Mississippi. He was also of opinion that in a military point of view its acquisition was desirable for the protection of New Orleans, the great commercial mart of the southwestern section of the Union, which in time of war would be endangered by the close

proximity of a hostile power having control of the upper waters of Red river. Holding these views and having been elevated to the presidency on a platform that expressly demanded that they should be embodied in action, and Texas again made a part of the national domain, he would have indeed been recreant to his trust had he attempted to carry out as president any policy antagonistic to that he had advocated when a candidate for that office. The war in which he became involved in carrying out these views was a detail that the nation was compelled to leave largely to his judgment. The president believed that the representations and promises of the Mexican authorities could not be trusted, and that the only argument to which they would pay attention was that of force. Regarding his famous order to Gen. Taylor to march toward the Rio Grande, it was suggested by that officer himself, and for his gallant action in the war the latter was elected the successor of President Polk. The settlement of the Oregon boundary-line was made equally obligatory upon the new president on taking office. He offered Great Britain the line that was finally accepted; but when the British minister hastily rejected the offer, the entire country applauded his suggestion to that power of what the boundary might possibly be in case of war.

But whatever the motives of the executive as to Texas and Oregon, the results of the administration of James K. Polk were brilliant in the extreme. He was loyally upheld by the votes of all parties in congress, abundantly supplied with the sinews of war, and seconded by gallant and competent officers in the field. For \$15,000,000, in addition to the direct war expenses, the southwestern boundary of the country was carried to the Rio Grande, while the provinces of New Mexico and Upper California were added to the national domain. What that cession meant in increased wealth it is perhaps even yet too soon to compute. Among the less dazzling but still solid advantages conferred upon the nation during Mr. Polk's term of office was the adoption by congress, on his recommendation, of the public warehousing system that has since proved so valuable an aid to the commerce of the country; the negotiation of the 35th article of the treaty with Grenada, ratified 10 June, 1848, which secured for our citizens the right of way across the Isthmus of Panama; the postal treaty of 15 Dec., 1848, with Great Britain, and the negotiation of commercial treaties with

the secondary states of the Germanic confederation by which reciprocal relations were established and growing markets reached upon favorable terms.

Mr. George Bancroft, the last surviving member of Polk's cabinet, who carefully revised and enlarged this article, in a communication to the editor, dated Washington, 8 March, 1888, says: "One of the special qualities of Mr. Polk's mind was his clear perception of the character and doctrines of the two great parties that then divided the country. Of all our public men—I say, distinctly, of all—Polk was the most thoroughly consistent representative of his party. He had no equal. Time and again his enemies sought for grounds on which to convict him of inconsistency, but so consistent had been his public career that the charge was never even made. Never fanciful or extreme, he was ever solid, firm, and consistent. His administration, viewed from the standpoint of results, was perhaps the greatest in our national history, certainly one of the greatest. He succeeded because he insisted on being its centre, and in overruling and guiding all his secretaries to act so as to produce unity and harmony. Those who study his administration will acknowledge how sincere and successful were his efforts, as did those who were contemporary with him."

Mr. Polk, who was a patient student and a clear thinker, steadfast to opinions once formed, and not easily moved by popular opinion, labored faithfully, from his entrance into public life until the day when he left the White House, to disseminate the political opinions in which he had been educated, and which commended themselves to his judgment. His private life was upright and blameless. Simple in his habits to abstemiousness, he found his greatest happiness in the pleasures of the home circle rather than in the gay round of public amusements. A frank and sincere friend, courteous and affable in his demeanor with strangers, generous and benevolent, the esteem in which he was held as a man and a citizen was quite as high as his official reputation. In the words of his friend and associate in office, Vice-President Dallas, he was "temperate but not unsocial, industrious but accessible, punctual but patient, moral without austerity, and devotional though not bigoted." See "Eulogy on the Life and Character of the Late James K. Polk," by George M. Dallas (Philadelphia, 1849); "Eulogy on the Life and Character of James Knox Polk," by

A. O. P. Nicholson (Nashville, 1849); "James K. Polk," by John S. Jenkins (Buffalo, 1850); "History of the Administration of James K. Polk," by Lucien B. Chase (New York, 1850); and Bancroft's large MSS. collection of Polk's letters and extracts from his diary, extending to twenty-two quarto volumes, now in the possession of the Lenox Library, New York. Referring to these type-written copies, made for him in 1887 with a view to the preparation of the president's life, Mr. Bancroft wrote to a friend: "His character shines out in them just exactly as the man was, prudent, farsighted, bold, exceeding any Democrat of his day in his undeviatingly correct exposition of democratic principles; and, in short, as I think, judging of him as I knew him, and judging of him by the results of his administration, one of the very foremost of our public men, and one of the very best, most honest, and most successful presidents the country ever had."

His wife, SARAH CHILDRESS, born near Murfreesboro, Rutherford co., Tenn., 4 Sept., 1803; died in Nashville, Tenn., 14 Aug., 1891, was the daughter of Joel and Elizabeth Childress. Her father, a farmer in easy circumstances, sent her to the Moravian institute at Salem, N. C., where she was educated. On returning home, she married Mr. Polk, who was then a member of the legislature of Tennessee. The following year he was elected to congress, and during his fourteen sessions in Washington Mrs. Polk's courteous manners, sound judgment, and many attainments gave her a high place in society. On her return as the wife of the president, having no children, Mrs. Polk devoted herself entirely to her duties as mistress of the White House. She held weekly receptions, and abolished the custom of giving refreshments to the guests. She also forbade dancing, as out of keeping with the character of these entertainments. In spite of her reforms, Mrs. Polk was extremely popular. "Madam," said a prominent South Carolinian, at one of her receptions, "there is a woe pronounced against you in the Bible." On



*Sarah C. Polk*

her inquiring his meaning, he added: "The Bible says, 'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.'" An English lady visiting Washington thus described the president's wife: "Mrs. Polk is a very handsome woman. Her hair is very black, and her dark eyes and complexion remind one of the Spanish donnas. She is well read, has much talent for conversation, and is highly popular. Her excellent taste in dress preserves the subdued though elegant costume that characterizes the lady." Mrs. Polk became a communicant of the Presbyterian church in 1834, and maintained her connection with that denomination until the close of her long life. After the death of her husband she continued to reside at Nashville, in the house seen in the illustration on another page and known as "Polk Place." In the foreground is the tomb of her husband, by whose side she was buried. The courts, in 1891, having decided that Mr. Polk's will, leaving his estate "to the worthiest of the name forever," was void, as constituting a perpetuity, the tomb, with the remains of President and Mrs. Polk, were removed by the State and reinterred with appropriate public ceremonies on Capitol Hill, Nashville, 19 Sept., 1893, with a view to the division of the land among the heirs.







Engraved by H. B. Hill, New York.

*Zachary Taylor.*

## ZACHARY TAYLOR.

ZACHARY TAYLOR, twelfth president of the United States, born in Orange county, Va., 24 Sept., 1784; died in the executive mansion, Washington, D. C., 9 July, 1850. He was fifth in descent from James Taylor, who came to this country from Carlisle, on the English border, in 1658. His father, Col. Richard Taylor, an officer in the war of the Revolution, was conspicuous for zeal and daring among men in whom personal gallantry was the rule. After the war he retired to private life, and in 1785 removed to Kentucky, then a sparsely occupied county of Virginia, and made his home near the present city of Louisville, where he died. Zachary was the third son. Brought up on a farm in a new settlement, he had few scholastic opportunities; but in the thrift, industry, self-denial, and forethought required by the circumstances, he learned such lessons as were well adapted to form the character illustrated by his eventful career. Yet he had also another form of education. The liberal grants of land that Virginia made to her soldiers caused many of them, after the peace of 1783, to remove to the west; thus Col. Taylor's neighbors included many who had been his fellow-soldiers, and these often met around his wide hearth. Their conversation would naturally be reminiscences of their military life, and all the sons of Col. Taylor, save one, Hancock, entered the U. S. army. The rapid extension of settlements on the border was productive of frequent collision with the Indians, and almost constantly required the protection of a military force.

In 1808, on the recommendation of President Jefferson, congress authorized the raising of five regiments of infantry, one of riflemen, one of light artillery, and one of light dragoons. From the terms of the act it was understood that this was not to be a permanent increase of the U. S. army, and many of

the officers of the "old army" declined to seek promotion in the new regiments. At this period questions had arisen between the United States and Great Britain which caused serious anticipations of a war with that power, and led many to regard the additional force authorized as a preliminary step in preparation for such a war. Zachary Taylor, then in his twenty-fourth year, applied for a commission, and was appointed a 1st lieutenant in the 7th infantry, one of the new regiments, and in 1810 was promoted to the grade of captain in the same regiment, according to the regulations of the service. He was happily married in 1810 to Miss Margaret Smith, of Calvert county, Md., who shared with him the privations and dangers of his many years of frontier service, and survived him but a short time. The troubles on the frontier continued to increase until 1811, when Gen. William H. Harrison, afterward president of the United States, marched against the stronghold of the Shawnees and fought the battle of Tippecanoe.

In June, 1812, war was declared against England, and this increased the widespread and not unfounded fears of Indian invasion in the valley of the Wabash. To protect Vincennes from sudden assault, Capt. Taylor was ordered to Fort Harrison, a stockade on the river above Vincennes, and with his company of infantry, about fifty strong, made preparations to defend the place. He had not long to wait. A large body of Indians, knowing the smallness of the garrison, came, confidently counting on its capture; but as it is a rule in their warfare to seek by stratagem to avoid equal risk and probable loss, they tried various expedients, which were foiled by the judgment, vigilance, and courage of the commander, and when the final attack was made, the brave little garrison repelled it with such loss to the assailants that when, in the following October, Gen. Hopkins came to support Fort Harrison, no Indians were to be found thereabout. For the defence of Fort Harrison, Capt. Taylor received the brevet of major, an honor that had seldom, if ever before, been conferred for service in Indian war. In the following November, Maj. Taylor, with a battalion of regulars, formed a part of the command of Gen. Hopkins in the expedition against the hostile Indians at the head-waters of the Wabash. In 1814, with his separate command, he being then a major by commission, he made a campaign against the hostile Indians and their British allies on Rock river, which was sc

successful as to give subsequent security to that immediate frontier. In such service, not the less hazardous or indicative of merit because on a small scale, he passed the period of his employment on that frontier until the treaty of peace with Great Britain disposed the Indians to be quiet.

After the war, 3 March, 1815, a law was enacted to fix the military peace establishment of the United States. By this act the whole force was to be reduced to 10,000 men, with such proportions of artillery, infantry, and riflemen as the president should judge proper. The president was to cause the officers and men of the existing army to be arranged, by unrestricted transfers, so as to form the corps authorized by the recent act, and the supernumeraries were to be discharged. Maj. Taylor had borne the responsibilities and performed the duties of a battalion commander so long and successfully that when the arranging board reduced him to the rank of captain in the new organization he felt the injustice, but resigned from the army without complaint, returned home, and proceeded, as he said in after-years, "to make a crop of corn." Influences that were certainly not employed by him, and are unknown to the writer of this sketch, caused his restoration to the grade of major, and he resumed his place in the army, there to continue until the voice of the people called him to the highest office within their gift. Under the rules that governed promotion in the army, Maj. Taylor became lieutenant-colonel of the 1st infantry, and for a period commanded at Fort Snelling, then the advanced post in the northwest.

In 1832 he became colonel of the 1st infantry, with headquarters at Fort Crawford, Prairie du Chien. The barracks were unfinished, and his practical mind and conscientious attention to every duty were manifest in the progress and completion of the work. The second Black Hawk campaign occurred this year, and Col. Taylor, with the greater part of his regiment, joined the army commanded by Gen. Henry Atkinson, and with it moved from Rock Island up the valley of Rock river, following Black Hawk, who had gone to make a junction with the Pottawattamie band of the Prophet, a nephew of Black Hawk. This was in violation of the treaty he had made with Gen. Edmund P. Gaines in 1831, by which he was required to remove to the west of the Mississippi, relinquishing all claim to the Rock river villages. It was assumed that his

purpose in returning to the east side of the river was hostile, and, from the defenceless condition of the settlers and the horror of savage atrocity, great excitement was created, due rather to his fame as a warrior than to the number of his followers. If, as he subsequently declared, his design was to go and live peaceably with his nephew, the Prophet, rather than with the Foxes, of whom Keokuk was the chief, that design may have been frustrated by the lamentable mistake of some mounted volunteers in hastening forward in pursuit of Black Hawk, who with his band—men, women, and children—was going up on the south side of the Rock river. The pursuers fell into an ambuscade, and were routed with some loss and in great confusion. The event will be remembered by the men of that day as "Stillman's run."

The vanity of the young Indians was inflated by their success, as was shown by some exultant messages; and the sagacious old chief, whatever he may have previously calculated upon, now saw that war was inevitable and immediate. With his band, recruited by warriors from the Prophet's band, he crossed to the north side of Rock river, and, passing through the swamp Koshkenong, fled over the prairies west of the Four Lakes, toward Wisconsin river. Gen. Henry Dodge, with a battalion of mounted miners, overtook the Indians while they were crossing the Wisconsin and attacked their rear-guard, which, when the main body had crossed, swam the river and joined the retreat over the Kickapoo hills toward the Mississippi. Gen. Atkinson, with his whole army, continued the pursuit, and, after a toilsome march, overtook the Indians north of Prairie du Chien, on the bank of the Mississippi, to the west side of which they were preparing to cross in bark canoes made on the spot. That purpose was foiled by the accidental arrival of a steamboat with a small gun on board. The Indians took cover in a willow marsh, and there was fought the battle of the Bad Axe. The Indians were defeated and dispersed, and the campaign ended. In the mean time, Gen. Winfield Scott, with troops from the east, took chief command and established his headquarters at Rock Island, and thither Gen. Atkinson went with the regular troops, except that part of the 1st infantry which constituted the garrison of Fort Crawford. With these Col. Taylor returned to Prairie du Chien. When it was reported that the Indians were on an island above the prairie, he

sent a lieutenant with an appropriate command to explore the island, where unmistakable evidence was found of the recent presence of the Indians and of their departure. Immediately thereafter a group of Indians appeared on the east bank of the river under a white flag, who proved to be Black Hawk, with a remnant of his band and a few friendly Winnebagoes. The lieutenant went with them to the fort, where Col. Taylor received them, except the Winnebagoes, as prisoners. A lieutenant and a guard were sent with them, sixty in number—men, women, and children—by steamboat, to Rock Island, there to report to Gen. Scott for orders in regard to the prisoners. Col. Taylor actively participated in the campaign up to its close, and to him was surrendered the chief who had most illustrated the warlike instincts of the Indian race, to whom history must fairly accord the credit of having done much under the most disadvantageous circumstances. In 1836 Col. Taylor was ordered to Florida for service in the Seminole war, and the next year he defeated the Indians in the decisive battle of Okechobee, for which he received the brevet of brigadier-general, and in 1838 was appointed to the chief command in Florida. In 1840 he was assigned to command the southern division of the western department of the army. Though Gen. Taylor had for many years been a cotton-planter, his family had lived with him at his military station, but, when ordered for an indefinite time on field service, he made his family home at Baton Rouge, La.

Texas having been annexed to the United States in 1845, Mexico threatened to invade Texas with the avowed purpose to recover the territory, and Gen. Taylor was ordered to defend it as a part of the United States. He proceeded with all his available force, about 1,500 men, to Corpus Christi, where he was joined by re-enforcements of regulars and volunteers. Discussion had arisen as to whether the Nueces or the Rio Grande was the proper boundary of Texas. His political opinions, whatever they might be, were subordinate to the duty of a soldier to execute the orders of his government, and, without uttering it, he acted on the apophthegm of Decatur: "My country, right or wrong, my country." Texas claimed protection for her frontier, the president recognized the fact that Texas had been admitted to the Union with the Rio Grande as her boundary, and Gen. Taylor was instructed to advance to

that river. His force had been increased to about 4,000, when, on 8 March, 1846, he marched from Corpus Christi. He was of course conscious of the inadequacy of his division to resist such an army as Mexico might send against it, but when ordered by superior authority it was not his to remonstrate. Gen. Gaines, commanding the western department, had made requisitions for a sufficient number of volunteers to join Taylor, but the secretary of war countermanded them, except as to such as had already joined. Gen. Taylor, with a main depot at Point Isabel, advanced to the bank of the Rio Grande, opposite to Matamoras, and there made provision for defence of the place called Fort Brown. Soon after his arrival, Ampudia, the Mexican general at Matamoras, made a threatening demand that Gen. Taylor should withdraw his troops beyond the Nueces, to which he replied that his position had been taken by order of his government, and would be maintained. Having completed the intrenchment, and being short of supplies, he left a garrison to hold it, and marched with an aggregate force of 2,288 men to obtain additional supplies from Point Isabel, about thirty miles distant. Gen. Arista, the new Mexican commander, availing himself of the opportunity to interpose, crossed the river below Fort Brown with a force estimated at 6,000 regular troops, 10 pieces of artillery, and a considerable amount of auxiliaries. In the afternoon of the second day's march from Point Isabel these were reported by Gen. Taylor's cavalry to be in his front, and he halted to allow the command to rest and for the needful dispositions for battle. In the evening a request was made that a council of war should be held, to which Gen. Taylor assented. The prevalent opinion was in favor of falling back to Point Isabel, there to intrench and wait for reinforcements. After listening to a full expression of views, the general announced: "I shall go to Fort Brown or stay in my shoes," a western expression equivalent to "or die in the attempt." He then notified the officers to prepare to attack the enemy at dawn of day. In the morning of 8 May the advance was made by columns until the enemy's batteries opened, when line of battle was formed and Taylor's artillery, inferior in number but otherwise superior, was brought fully into action and soon dispersed the mass of the enemy's cavalry. The chaparral, dense copses of thorn-bushes, served both to conceal the position of the enemy and to impede the movements





Col. Thomas & his madame, as well as best  
regards to Mr. & Mrs. E. H. Taylor Esqrs.  
& Govt. School as well as to any other enqui-  
ring friends, and wishing you & yours  
continued health & prosperity through  
a long life. I remain

Your Friend

Truly & Sincerely  
J Taylor

of the attacking force. The action closed at night, when the enemy retired, and Gen. Taylor bivouacked on the field. Early in the morning of 9 May he resumed his march, and in the afternoon encountered Gen. Arista in a strong position with artillery advantageously posted. Taylor's infantry pushed through the chaparral lining both sides of the road, and drove the enemy's infantry before them; but the batteries held their position, and were so fatally used that it was an absolute necessity to capture them. For this purpose the general ordered a squadron of dragoons to charge them. The enemy's gunners were cut down at their pieces, the commanding officer was captured, and the infantry soon made the victory complete. The Mexican loss in the two battles was estimated at a thousand; the American, killed, forty-nine. The enemy precipitately recrossed the Rio Grande, leaving the usual evidence of a routed army. Gen. Taylor then proceeded to Fort Brown. During his absence it had been heavily bombarded, and the commander, Maj. Brown, had been killed. The Mexicans evacuated Matamoras, and Gen. Taylor took possession, 18 May.


The Rio Grande, except at time of flood, offered little obstacle to predatory incursions, and it was obviously sound policy to press the enemy back from the border. Gen. Taylor, therefore, moved forward to Camargo, on the San Juan, a tributary of the Rio Grande. This last-named river rose so as to enable steamboats to transport troops and supplies, and by September a sufficiently large force of volunteers had reported at Gen. Taylor's headquarters to justify a further march into the interior, but the move must be by land, and for that there was far from adequate transportation. Hiring Mexican packers to supplement the little transportation on hand, he was able to add one division of volunteers to the regulars of his command, and with a force of 6,625 men of all arms he marched against Monterey, a fortified town of great natural strength, garrisoned by 10,000 men under Gen. Ampudia. On 19 Sept. he encamped before the town, and on the 21st began the attack. On the third day Gen. Ampudia proposed to surrender, commissioners were appointed, and terms of capitulation agreed upon, by which the enemy were to retire beyond a specified line, and the United States forces were not to advance beyond that line during the next eight weeks or until the pleasure of the respective governments should be known. By some strange

misconception, the U. S. government disapproved the arrangement, and ordered that the armistice should be terminated, by which we lost whatever had been gained in the interests of peace by the generous terms of the capitulation, and got nothing, for, during the short time that remained unexpired, no provision had been or could be made to enable Gen. Taylor to advance into the heart of Mexico. Presuming that such must be the purpose of the government, he assiduously strove to collect the means for that object. When his preparations were well-nigh perfected, Gen. Scott was sent to Mexico with orders that enabled him at discretion to strip Gen. Taylor of both troops and material of war, to be used on another line of operations. The projected campaign against the capital of Mexico was to be from Vera Cruz, up the steppes, and against the fortifications that had been built to resist any probable invasion, instead of from Saltillo, across the plains to the comparatively undefended capital. The difficulty on this route was the waterless space to be crossed, and against that Gen. Taylor had ingeniously provided. According to instructions, he went to Victoria, Mexico, turned over his troops, except a proper escort to return through a country of hostiles to Monterey, and then went to Agua Nueva, beyond Saltillo, where he was joined by Gen. Wool with his command from Chihuahua.

Gen. Santa-Anna saw the invitation offered by the withdrawal of Gen. Taylor's troops, and with a well-appointed army, 20,000 strong, marched with the assurance of easily recovering their lost territory. Gen. Taylor fell back to the narrow pass in front of the hacienda of Buena Vista, and here stood on the defensive. His force was 5,400 of all arms; but of these only three batteries of artillery, one squadron of dragoons, one mounted company of Texans, and one regiment of Mississippi riflemen had ever been under fire. Some skirmishing occurred on 22 Feb., and a general assault along the whole line was made on the morning of the 23d. The battle, with varying fortune, continued throughout the day; at evening the enemy retired, and during the night retreated by the route on which he had advanced, having suffered much by the casualties of battle, but still more by desertions. So Santa-Anna returned with but a remnant of the regular army of Mexico, on which reliance had been placed to repel invasion, and thenceforward peace was undisturbed in the valley of the Rio Grande. At

that time Gen. Taylor's capacity was not justly estimated, his golden silence being often misunderstood. His reply to Sec. Marcy's strictures in regard to the capitulation of Monterey exhibited such vigor of thought and grace of expression that many attributed it to a member of his staff who had a literary reputation. It was written by Gen. Taylor's own hand, in the open air, by his camp-fire at Victoria, Mexico.

Many years of military routine had not dulled his desire for knowledge; he had extensively studied both ancient and modern history, especially the English. Unpretending, meditative, observant, and conclusive, he was best understood and most appreciated by those who had known him long and intimately. In a campaign he gathered information from all who approached him, however sinister their motive might be. By comparison and elimination he gained a knowledge that was often surprising as to the position and designs of the enemy. In battle he was vigilantly active, though quiet in bearing; calm and considerate, though stern and inflexible; but when the excitement of danger and strife had subsided, he had a father's tenderness for the wounded, and none more sincerely mourned for those who had bravely fallen in the line of their duty.




Before his nomination for the presidency Gen. Taylor had no political aspirations and looked forward to the time when he should retire from the army as the beginning of a farmer's life. He had planned for his retreat a stock-farm in the hills of Jefferson county, behind his cotton-plantation on the Mississippi river. In his case, as in some other notable instances, the fact of not desiring office rather increased than diminished popular confidence, so that unseeking he was sought. From early manhood he had served continually in the U. S. army. His duties had led him to consider the welfare of the country as one and indivisible, and his opinions were free from party or sectional intensity. Conscious of his want of knowledge of

the machinery of the civil service, he formed his cabinet to supplement his own information. They were men well known to the public by the eminent civil stations they had occupied, and were only thus known to Gen. Taylor, who as president had literally no friends to reward and no enemies to punish. The cabinet was constituted as follows: John M. Clayton, of Delaware, secretary of state; William M. Meredith, of Pennsylvania, secretary of the treasury; George W. Crawford, of Georgia, secretary of war; W. Ballard Preston, of Virginia, secretary of the navy; Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, attorney-general; Alexander H. H. Stuart, of Virginia, secretary of the interior. All these had served in the U. S. senate or the house of representatives, and all were lawyers. Taylor was the popular hero of a foreign war which had been victoriously ended, bringing to the United States a large acquisition of territory with an alluring harvest of gold, but, all unheeded, bringing also a large addition to the elements of sectional contention. These were soon developed, and while the upper air was calm and the sun of prosperity shone brightly on the land, the attentive listener could hear the rumbling sound of approaching convulsion. President Taylor, with the keen watchfulness and intuitive perception that had characterized him as a commander in the field, easily saw and appreciated the danger; but before it had reached the stage for official action he died. His party and local relations, being a Whig and a southern planter, gave him the vantage-ground for the exercise of a restraining influence in the threatened contest. His views, matured under former responsibilities, were tersely given to confidential friends, but as none of his cabinet are living (Stuart was the last survivor), their consultations cannot be learned unless from preserved manuscript. During the brief period of his administration the rules that would govern it were made manifest, and no law for civil-service reform was needful for his guidance. With him the bestowal of office was a trust held for the people; it was not to be gained by proof of party zeal and labor. The fact of holding Democratic opinions was not a disqualification for the office. Nepotism had with him no quarter. Gen. Winfield Scott related to the writer an anecdote that may appropriately close this sketch. He said he had remarked to his wife that Gen. Taylor was an upright man, to which she replied: "He is not"; that he insisted his long

acquaintance should enable him to judge better than she. But she persisted in her denial, and he asked: "Then what manner of man is he?" when she said: "He is a downright man."

As president he had purity, patriotism, and discretion to guide him in his new field of duty, and had he lived long enough to stamp his character on his administration, it would have been found that the great soldier was equally fitted to be the head of a government. He was buried in the family cemetery, five miles from Louisville. The accompanying illustration is a representation of his monument. It is a granite shaft surmounted by a marble statue, in full uniform, and was erected by the State of Kentucky. The height, including the statue, is thirty-seven feet. The illustration on page 241 is a picture of Gen. Taylor's home, and the birthplace



of several of his children. Gen. Taylor's life was written by Joseph R. Fry and Robert T. Conrad (Philadelphia, 1848), by John Frost (New York, 1848), and by Gen. O. O. Howard, in the "Great Commanders" series (1892).

His wife, MARGARET, born in Calvert county, Md., in 1790; died near Pascagoula, La., 18 Aug., 1852, was the daughter of Walter Smith, a Maryland planter. He was descended from Richard Smith, who was appointed Attorney-General of Maryland by Oliver Cromwell. She received a home education, married early in life, and, until her husband's election to the presidency, resided with him chiefly in garrisons or on the frontier. During the Florida war she established herself at Tampa bay, and did good service among the sick and wounded in the hospitals there. Mrs. Taylor was without social ambition, and when Gen. Taylor became president she reluctantly accepted her responsibilities, regarding the office as a "plot to deprive her of her husband's society and to shorten his life by unnecessary care." She surrendered to her youngest daughter the superintendence of the household, and took no part in

social duties. Her eldest daughter, ANN, married Dr. Robert Wood, Assistant-Surgeon-General of the Army. Another daughter, SARAH KNOX, became the wife of Jefferson Davis, the marriage taking place near Louisville, Ky., the bride's uncle, Hancock Taylor, acting for her father, who was then with his command on the frontier.

Another daughter, ELIZABETH, born in Jefferson county, Ky., in 1824, was educated in Philadelphia, married Maj. William W. S. Bliss in her nineteenth year, and, on her father's inauguration, became mistress of the White House. Mrs. Bliss, or Miss Betty, as she was popularly called, was a graceful and accomplished hostess, and, it is said, "did the honors of the establishment with the artlessness of a rustic belle and the grace of a duchess." After the death of her distinguished father in 1850, and her husband in 1853, she spent several years in retirement, subsequently marrying Philip Pendleton Dandridge, of Winchester, Va., whom she survives.

His only son, RICHARD, soldier, born in Jefferson county, Ky., 27 Jan., 1826; died in New York city, 12 April, 1879, was sent to Edinburgh when thirteen years old, where he spent three years in studying the classics, and then a year in France. He entered the junior class at Yale in 1843, and was graduated there in 1845. He was a wide and voracious though a desultory reader. From college he went to his father's camp on the Rio Grande, and he was present at Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma. His health then became impaired, and he returned home. He resided on a cotton-plantation in Jefferson county, Miss., until 1849, when he removed to a sugar-estate in St. Charles parish, Louisiana, about twenty miles above New Orleans, where he was residing when the civil war began. He was in the state senate from 1856 to 1860, was a delegate to the Charleston Democratic convention in 1860, and afterward to that at Baltimore, and was a member of the Secession convention of Louisiana. As a member of the military committee, he aided the governor in organizing troops, and in June, 1861, went to Virginia as colonel of the 9th Louisiana volunteers. The day he reached Richmond he left for Manassas, arriving there at dusk on the day of the battle. In the autumn he was made a brigadier-general, and in the spring of 1862 he led his



brigade in the valley campaign under "Stonewall" Jackson. He distinguished himself at Front Royal, Middletown, Winchester, Strasburg, Cross Keys, and Port Republic, and Jackson recommended him for promotion. Taylor was also with Jackson in the seven days' battles before Richmond. He was promoted to major-general, and assigned to the command of Louisiana. The fatigues and exposures of his campaigns there brought on a partial and temporary paralysis of the lower limbs; but in August he assumed command. The only communication across the Mississippi retained by the Confederates was between Vicksburg and Port Hudson; but Taylor showed great ability in raising, organizing, supplying, and handling an army, and he gradually won back the state west of the Mississippi from the National forces. He had reclaimed the whole of this when Vicksburg fell, 4 July, 1863, and was then compelled to fall back west of Berwick's bay. Gen. Taylor's principal achievement during the war was his defeat of Gen. Nathaniel P. Banks at Sabine Cross-Roads, near Mansfield, De Soto parish, La., 8 April, 1864. With 8,000 men he attacked the advance of the northern army and routed it, capturing twenty-two guns and a large number of prisoners. He followed Banks, who fell back to Pleasant Hill, and on the next day again attacked him, when Taylor was defeated, losing the fruits of the first day's victory. These two days' fighting have been frequently compared to that of Shiloh—a surprise and defeat on the first day, followed by a substantial victory of the National forces on the second. In the summer of 1864 Taylor was promoted to be a lieutenant-general, and ordered to the command of the Department of Alabama, Mississippi, etc. Here he was able merely to protract the contest, while the great armies decided it. After Lee and Johnston capitulated there was nothing for him, and he surrendered to Gen. Edward R. S. Canby, at Citronelle, 8 May, 1865. The war left Taylor ruined in fortune, and he soon went abroad. Returning home, he took part in politics as an adviser, and his counsel was held in esteem by Samuel J. Tilden in his presidential canvass. During this period he wrote his memoir of the war, entitled "Destruction and Reconstruction" (New York, 1879).

## MILLARD FILLMORE.

MILLARD FILLMORE, thirteenth president of the United States, born in the township of Locke (now Summerhill), Cayuga county, N. Y., 7 Feb., 1800; died in Buffalo, N. Y., 7 March, 1874. The name of Fillmore is of English origin, and at different periods has been variously written. Including the son of the ex-president, the family can be traced through six generations, and, as has been said of that of Washington, its history gives proof "of the lineal and enduring worth of race." The first of the family to appear in the New World was a certain John Fillmore, who, in a conveyance of two acres of land dated 24 Nov., 1704, is described as a "mariner of Ipswich," Mass. His eldest son, of the same name, born two years before the purchase of the real estate in Beverly, also became a sea-faring man, and while on a voyage in the sloop "Dolphin," of Cape Ann, was captured with all on board by the pirate Capt. John Phillips. For nearly nine months Fillmore and his three companions in captivity were compelled to serve on the pirate ship and to submit, during that long period, to many hardships and much cruel treatment. After watching and waiting for an opportunity to obtain their freedom, their hour at length came. While Fillmore sent an axe crashing through the skull of Burrall, the boatswain, the captain and other officers were despatched by his companions, and the ship was won. They sailed her into Boston harbor, and the same court which condemned the brigands of the sea presented John Fillmore with the captain's silver-hilted sword and other articles, which are preserved to this day by his descendants. The sword was inherited by his son, Nathaniel, and was made good use of in both the French and Revolutionary wars. Lieut. Fillmore's second son, who also bore the name Nathaniel, and who was the father of the president, went with his young wife, Phebe



Millard Fillmore



Millard, to what at the close of the past century was the "far west," where he and a younger brother built a log cabin in the wilderness, and there his second son, Millard, was born. Nathaniel Fillmore was one of "God Almighty's gentlemen," whose creed was contained in two words, "do right," and who lived to see his son elevated to the highest position in his native land. Of the president's mother, who died in the summer of 1831, little is known beyond the fact that she was a sensible and, in her later years, a sickly woman; with a sunny nature that enabled her to endure uncomplainingly the many hardships of a frontier life, and that her closing days were gladdened by the frequent visits of her son, who was then in public life, with every prospect of a successful professional and political career.

From a brief manuscript autobiography prepared by "worthy Mr. Fillmore," as Washington Irving described him, we learn that, owing to a defective title, his father lost his property on what was called the "military tract," and removed to another part of the same county, now known as Niles, where he took a perpetual lease of 130 acres, wholly unimproved and covered with heavy timber. It was here that the future president first knew anything of life. Working for nine months on the farm, and attending such primitive schools as then existed in that neighborhood for the other three months of the year, he had an opportunity of forgetting during the summer what he acquired in the winter, for in those days there were no newspapers and magazines to be found in pioneers' cabins, and his father's library consisted of but two books—the Bible and a collection of hymns. He never saw a copy of "Shakespeare" or "Robinson Crusoe," a history of the United States, or even a map of his own country, till he was nineteen years of age! Nathaniel Fillmore's misfortunes in losing his land through a defective title, and again in taking another tract of exceedingly poor soil, gave him a distaste for farming, and made him desirous that his sons should follow other occupations. As his means did not justify him or them in aspiring to any profession, he wished them to learn trades, and accordingly Millard, then a sturdy youth of fourteen, was apprenticed for a few months on trial to the business of carding wool and dressing cloth. During his apprenticeship he was, as the youngest, treated with great injustice, and on one occasion his employer,

for some expression of righteous resentment, threatened to chastise him, when the young woodsman, burning with indignation, raised the axe with which he was at work, and told him the attempt would cost him his life. Most fortunate for both, the attempt was not made, and at the close of his term he shouldered his knapsack, containing a few clothes and a supply of bread and dried venison, and set out on foot and alone for his father's house, a distance of something more than a hundred miles through the primeval forests. Mr. Fillmore in his autobiography remarks: "I think that this injustice—which was no more than other apprentices have suffered and will suffer—had a marked effect on my character. It made me feel for the weak and unprotected, and to hate the insolent tyrant in every station of life."

In 1815 the youth again began the business of carding and cloth-dressing, which was carried on from June to December of each year. The first book that he purchased or owned was a small English dictionary, which he diligently studied while attending the carding machine. In 1819 he conceived the design of becoming a lawyer. Fillmore, who had yet two years of his apprenticeship to serve, agreed with his employer to relinquish his wages for the last year's services, and promised to pay thirty dollars for his time. Making an arrangement with a retired country lawyer, by which he was to receive his board in payment for his services in the office, he began the study of law, a part of the time teaching school, and so struggling on, overcoming almost insurmountable difficulties, till at length, in the spring of 1823, he was, at the intercession of several leading members of the Buffalo bar, whose confidence he had won, admitted as an attorney by the court of common pleas of Erie county, although he had not completed the course of study usually required. The writer has recently seen the dilapidated one-story building in Buffalo where Mr. Fillmore closed his career as a school-master, and has also conversed with one of his pupils of sixty-five years ago. The wisdom of his youth and early manhood gave presage of all that was witnessed and admired in the maturity of his character. Nature laid on him, in the kindly phrase of Wordsworth, "the strong hand of her purity," and even then he was remarked for that sweet courtesy of manner which accompanied him through life. Millard Fillmore began practice at Aurora, where his

father then resided, and fortunately won his first case and a fee of four dollars. In 1827 he was admitted as an attorney, and two years later as counsellor of the supreme court of the state. In 1830 he removed to Buffalo, and after a brief period formed a partnership with Nathan K. Hall, to which Solomon G. Haven was soon afterward admitted.

By hard study and the closest application, combined with honesty and fidelity, Mr. Fillmore soon became a sound and successful lawyer, attaining a highly honorable position in the profession. The law-firm of Fillmore, Hall & Haven, which continued till 1847, was perhaps the most prominent in western New York, and was usually engaged in every important suit occurring in that portion of the state. In 1853, while still in Washington, Mr. Fillmore made an arrangement with Henry E. Davies to renew, on retiring from the presidency, the practice of his profession in New York in partnership with that gentleman, who, after occupying a judge's seat in the court of appeals, returned to the bar. Family afflictions, however, combined with other causes, induced the ex-president to abandon his purpose. There were doubtless at that time men of more genius and greater eloquence at the bar of the great city; but we can not doubt that Mr. Fillmore's solid legal learning, and the weight of his personal character, would have won for him the highest professional honors in the new field of action.

Mr. Fillmore's political career began and ended with the birth and extinction of the great Whig party. In 1828 he was elected by Erie county to the state legislature of New York, serving for three terms, and retiring with a reputation for ability, integrity, and a conscientious performance of his public duties. He distinguished himself by his advocacy of the act to abolish imprisonment for debt, which was passed in 1831. The bill was drafted by Fillmore, excepting the portion relative to proceedings in courts of record, which were drawn by John C. Spencer. In 1832 he was elected to congress, and, after serving for one term, retired until 1836, when he was re-elected, and again returned in 1838 and 1840, declining a renomination in 1842. In the 27th congress Mr. Fillmore, as chairman of the committee on ways and means—a committee performing at that period not only the duties now devolving upon it, but those also which belong to the committee on appropriations—had herculean labors to perform. Day after day, for weeks and

months, Fillmore had to encounter many of the ablest debaters of the house, but on all occasions he proved himself equal to the emergency. It should not be forgotten that, in the opinion of John Quincy Adams, there were more men of talent and a larger aggregate of ability in that congress than he had ever known. Although Mr. Fillmore did not claim to have discovered any original system of revenue, still the tariff of 1842 was a new creation, and he is most justly entitled to the distinction of being its author. It operated successfully, giving immediate life to our languishing industries and national credit. At the same time Mr. Fillmore, with great labor, prepared a digest of the laws authorizing all appropriations reported by him to the house as chairman of the committee on ways and means, so that on the instant he could produce the legal authority for every expenditure which he recommended. Sensible that this was a great safeguard against improper expenditures, he procured the passage of a resolution requiring the departments, when they submitted estimates of expenses, to accompany them with a reference to the laws authorizing them in each and every instance. This has ever since been the practice of the United States government.

Mr. Fillmore retired from congress in 1843, and was a candidate for the office of vice-president, supported by his own and several of the western states, in the Whig convention that met at Baltimore in May, 1844. In the following September he was nominated by acclamation for governor, but was defeated by Silas Wright, his illustrious contemporary, Henry Clay, being vanquished at the same time in the presidential contest by James K. Polk. In 1847 Fillmore was elected comptroller of the state of New York, an office which then included many duties now distributed among other departments. In his report of 1 Jan., 1849, he suggested that a national bank, with the stocks of the United States as the sole basis upon which to issue its currency, might be established and carried on, so as to prove a great convenience to the government, with perfect safety to the people. This idea involves the essential principle of our present system of national banks.

In June, 1848, Millard Fillmore was nominated by the Whig national convention for vice-president, with Gen. Taylor, who had recently won military renown in Mexico, as president, and was in the following November elected, making, with the late



occupant of the office, seven vice-presidents of the United States from New York, a greater number than has been yet furnished by any other state. In February, 1849, Fillmore resigned the comptrollership, and on 5 March he was inaugurated as vice-president. In 1826 Calhoun, of South Carolina, then vice-president, established the rule that that officer had no authority to call senators to order. During the heated controversies in the sessions of 1849-'50, occasioned by the application of California for admission into the Union, the vexed question of slavery in the new territories, and that of the rendition of fugitive slaves, in which the most acrimonious language was used, Mr. Fillmore, in a forcible speech to the senate, announced his determination to maintain order, and that, should occasion require, he should resume the usage of his predecessors upon that point. This announcement met with unanimous approval of the senate, which directed the vice-president's remarks to be entered in full on its journal. He presided during the exciting controversy on Clay's "omnibus bill" with his usual impartiality, and so perfectly even did he hold the scales that no one knew which policy he approved excepting the president, to whom he privately stated that, should he be required to deposit a casting vote, it would be in favor of Henry Clay's bill. More than seven months of the session had been exhausted in angry controversy, when, on 9 July, 1850, the country was startled by the news of President Taylor's death. He passed away in the second year of his presidency, suddenly and most unexpectedly, of a violent fever, which was brought on by long exposure to the excessive heat of a fourth of July sun, while he was attending the public ceremonies of the day.

It was a critical moment in the history of our country when Millard Fillmore was on Wednesday, 10 July, 1850, made president of the United States. With great propriety he reduced the ceremony of his inauguration to an official act to be marked by solemnity without joy; and so, with an absence of the usual heralding of trumpet and shawm, he was unostentatiously sworn into his great office in the hall of representatives, in the presence of both houses. The chief justice of the circuit court of the District of Columbia—the venerable William Cranch, appointed fifty years before by President John Adams—administered the oath, which being done, the new president bowed and retired, and the ceremony was at an end. Mr. Fill-

more was then in the prime of life, possessing that which to the heathen philosopher seemed the greatest of all blessings—a sound mind in a sound body. The accompanying vignette portrait was taken at this time, while the large steel engraving



*Millard Fillmore*

is from a picture made some twenty years later. Of Fillmore's keen appreciation of the responsibility devolving on him we have the evidence of letters written at that time, in which he says he should despair but for his humble reliance on God to help him in the honest, fearless, and faithful discharge of his great duties. President Taylor's cabinet immediately resigned, and a new and exceedingly able one was selected by Mr. Fillmore, with Daniel Webster as secretary of

state; Thomas Corwin, secretary of the treasury; William A. Graham, secretary of the navy; Charles M. Conrad, secretary of war; Alexander H. H. Stuart, secretary of the interior; John J. Crittenden, attorney-general; and Nathan K. Hall, postmaster-general.\* Of these, Mr. Webster died, and Messrs. Graham and Hall retired in 1852, and were respectively replaced by Edward Everett, John P. Kennedy, and Samuel D. Hubbard. Stuart, of Virginia, who died 13 Feb., 1891, was the last survivor of the illustrious men who aided Mr. Fillmore in guiding the ship of state during the most appalling political tempest, save one, which ever visited this fair land.

It is certainly not the writer's wish to reawaken party feelings or party prejudice or to recall those great questions of pith and moment which so seriously disturbed congress and the country in the first days of Fillmore's administration, but

---

\* Buffalo enjoys the distinction of being the only city in the United States that has given the country two presidents. It is a singular coincidence that both these chief magistrates should appoint their former law partners to the office of postmaster-general. Mr. Fillmore selected his partner, Judge Nathan Kelsey Hall, for that office. Judge Hall studied law in the office of Mr. Fillmore at Aurora. He was admitted to the bar in 1832, and became a copartner with his preceptor, who in the meantime had removed to Buffalo. For postmaster-general in his second administration, Mr. Cleveland selected Wilson Shannon Bissell, for many years his law partner in Buffalo.

yet, even in so cursory a glance as we are now taking of his career, some comment would seem to be called for in respect to those public acts connected with slavery which appear to have most unreasonably and unjustly lost him the support of a large proportion of his party in the northern states. Whatever the wisdom of Mr. Fillmore's course may have been, it is impossible to doubt his patriotism or his honest belief that he was acting in accordance with his oath to obey the constitution of his country. The president's dream was peace—to preserve without hatred and without war tranquillity throughout the length and breadth of our broad land, and if in indulging this delusive dream he erred, it was surely an error that leaned to virtue's side. There is a legend that “he serves his party best who serves his country best.” In Mr. Fillmore's action it is confidently believed that he thought not of party or of personal interests, but only of his bounden duty to his country and her sacred constitution.

One of the president's earliest official acts was to send a military force to New Mexico to protect that territory from invasion by Texas on account of its disputed boundary. Then followed the passage by a large majority of the celebrated compromise measures, including the fugitive-slave law. The president referred to the attorney-general the question of its constitutionality, and that officer in a written opinion decided that it was constitutional. Fillmore and the strong cabinet that he had called around him concurred unanimously in this opinion, and the act was signed, together with the other compromise measures. The fugitive-slave law was exceedingly obnoxious to a large portion of the Whig party of the north, as well as to the anti-slavery men, and its execution was resisted. Slaves in several instances were rescued from the custody of the United States marshals, and a few citizens of Christiana, in Pennsylvania, were killed. Although it was admitted that Fillmore's administration as a whole was able, useful, and patriotic, although his purity as a public man was above suspicion, and no other act of his administration could be called unpopular, still, by the signing and attempted enforcement of the fugitive-slave law and some of its unfortunate provisions, of which even Mr. Webster did not approve, the president, as has been already stated, lost the friendship and support of a large portion of his party in the north.

Mr. Fillmore's administration being in a political minority in both houses of congress, many wise and admirable measures recommended by him failed of adoption; nevertheless we are indebted to him for cheap postage; for the extension of the national capitol, the corner-stone of which he laid 4 July, 1851; for the Perry treaty, opening the ports of Japan, and for various valuable exploring expeditions. When South Carolina in one of her indignant utterances took Mr. Fillmore to task for sending a fleet to Charleston harbor, and he was officially questioned as to his object and authority, the answer came promptly and to the purpose, "By authority of the constitution of the United States, which has made the president commander-in-chief of the army and navy, and who recognizes no responsibility for his official action to the governor of South Carolina." With stern measures he repressed filibustering, and with equal firmness exacted from other countries respect for our flag. Mr. Fillmore carried out strictly the doctrine of non-intervention in the affairs of foreign nations, and frankly stated his policy to the highly-gifted Kossuth, who won all hearts by his surpassing eloquence. At the same time, however, it was clearly shown how little the administration sympathized with Austria by the celebrated letter addressed to her ambassador, Hulse-mann, by Daniel Webster, who died soon after. His successor as secretary of state was Edward Everett, whose brief term of office was distinguished by his letter declining the proposition for a treaty by which England, France, and the United States were to disclaim then and for the future all intention to obtain possession of Cuba. In his last message, however, the president expressed an opinion against the incorporation of the island with this Union.

Nothing in Mr. Fillmore's presidential career was, during the closing years of his life, regarded by himself with greater satisfaction than the suppressed portion of his last message of 6 Dec., 1852. It was suppressed by the advice of the cabinet, all of whom concurred in the belief that, if sent in, it would precipitate an armed collision, and he readily acquiesced in their views. It related to the great political problem of the period—the balance of power between the free and the slave states. He fully and clearly appreciated the magnitude of the then approaching crisis, and in the document now under consideration proposed a judicious scheme of rescuing the country

from the horrors of a civil war, which soon after desolated so large a portion of the land. His perfectly practicable plan was one of African colonization, somewhat similar to one seriously entertained by his successor, Mr. Lincoln. Had President Fillmore's scheme been adopted, there are some who think that it would have been successful, and that our country might have been blessed with peace and prosperity, in lieu of the late war with its loss of half a million of precious lives and a debt of more than double the amount of the estimated cost of his plan of colonization. Mr. Fillmore retired from the presidency, 4 March, 1853, leaving the country at peace with other lands and within her own borders, and in the enjoyment of a high degree of prosperity in all the various departments of industry. In his cabinet there had never been a dissenting voice in regard to any important measure of his administration, and, upon his retiring from office, a letter was addressed to him by all its members, expressing their united appreciation of his ability, his integrity, and his single-hearted and sincere devotion to the public service.

The last surviving member of Fillmore's cabinet, who also sat in the 27th congress with him, in a communication, with which he favored the writer, says: "Mr. Fillmore was a man of decided opinions, but he was always open to conviction. His aim was truth, and whenever he was convinced by reasoning that his first impressions were wrong, he had the moral courage to surrender them. But, when he had carefully examined a question and had satisfied himself that he was right, no power on earth could induce him to swerve from what he believed to be the line of duty. . . . There were many things about Mr. Fillmore, aside from his public character, which often filled me with surprise. While he enjoyed none of the advantages of early association with cultivated society, he possessed a grace and polish of manner which fitted him for the most refined circles of the metropolis. You saw, too, at a glance, that there was nothing in it which was assumed, but that it was the natural outward expression of inward refinement and dignity of character. I have witnessed, on several occasions, the display by him of attributes apparently of the most opposite character. When assailed in congress he exhibited a manly self-reliance and a lofty courage which commanded the admiration of every spectator, and yet no one ever manifested deeper sensibility, or more

tender sympathy, with a friend in affliction. . . . He seemed to have the peculiar faculty of adapting himself to every position in which he was called to serve his country. When he was chairman of the committee of ways and means, members of congress expressed their sense of his fitness by declaring that he was born to fill it. When he was elected vice-president, it was predicted that he would fail as the presiding officer of the senate, yet he acquitted himself in this new and untried position in such a manner as to command the applause of senators. And when advanced to the highest office of our country, he so fulfilled his duties as to draw forth the commendation of the ablest men of the opposite party. . . . For the last two years of my official association with Mr. Fillmore," adds Mr. Stuart, "our relations, both personal and political, were of an intimate and confidential character. He knew that I was his steadfast friend, and he reciprocated the feeling. He talked with me freely and without reserve about men and measures, and I take pleasure in saying that in all my intercourse with him I never knew him to utter a sentiment or do an act which, in my judgment, would have been unworthy of Washington."

His gifted contemporary, Henry Clay, thought highly of Fillmore's moderation and wisdom, said his administration was an able and honorable one, and on his death-bed recommended his nomination for the presidency (by the Baltimore convention of 1852), as being a statesman of large civil experience, and one in whose career there was nothing inconsistent with the highest purity and patriotism. After leaving Washington for the last time, Webster said to a friend that Fillmore's administration—leaving out of the question his own share of its work—was no doubt the ablest the country had possessed for many years. The same great statesman, in his speech at the laying of the corner-stone of the capitol extension, said: "President Fillmore, it is your singularly good fortune to perform an act such as that which the earliest of your predecessors performed fifty-eight years ago. You stand where he stood; you lay your hand on the corner-stone he laid. Changed, changed is everything around. The same sun, indeed, shone upon his head which shines upon yours. The same broad river rolled at his feet, and now bathes his last resting-place, which now rolls at yours. But the site of this city was then mainly an open field. Streets and avenues have since been laid out and completed, squares

Buffalo, May 13. '72

My Dear Sir

Your favor of the 8th has just come to hand, as I am on the point of leaving with Mrs. G. for New York; where I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you, and then I shall be very happy to do any thing for you in my power. I shall stop at the 5th Avenue Hotel.

In haste truly yours

Millard F. Johnson





and public grounds inclosed and ornamented, until the city, which bears his name, although comparatively inconsiderable in numbers and wealth, has become quite fit to be the seat of government of a great and united people. Sir, may the consequences of the duty which you perform so auspiciously to-day equal those which flowed from his act. Nor this only: may the principles of your administration and the wisdom of your political conduct be such that the world of the present day and all history hereafter may be at no loss to perceive what example you made your study."

It should be stated as a part of Mr. Fillmore's public record that he was a candidate for nomination as president at the Whig convention of 1852; but although his policy, the fugitive-slave law included, was approved by a vote of 227 against 60; he could not command 20 votes from the free states. Four years later, while at Rome, he received the news of his nomination for the presidency by the American party. He accepted the nomination, but before the close of the campaign it became evident that the real struggle was between the Republicans and Democrats. Many, with whom Fillmore was the first choice for president, cast their votes for Gen. Frémont or James Buchanan, believing that there was no hope of his election, and, although he received the support of large numbers in all the states, Maryland alone gave him her electoral vote. In the summer of 1864 Col. Ogle Tayloe, of Washington, wrote to Mr. Fillmore on the subject of the presidential nomination, and his response was: "I can assure you in all sincerity that I have no desire ever to occupy that exalted station again, and more especially at a time like this." Apropos of letters, the writer had the privilege of perusing a collection of confidential correspondence written by President Fillmore during a score of years while in public life; and, after a most careful examination, failed to find a single passage that would not stand the light of day, not a word of ignoble office-seeking, no paltry tricks to gain notoriety, no base designs of fattening upon public plunder.

Having thus glanced at the professional and political career of Mr. Fillmore, it now only remains to allude very briefly to his private life from 1853 onward. "The circles of our felicities make short arches." Who shall question the wise axiom of Sir Thomas Browne, the brave old knight of Norwich, a

favorite author with the president? Three weeks after the close of his administration he sustained a severe affliction in the loss of his wife, Abigail Powers, the daughter of a clergyman, whom he married 5 Feb., 1826, and who was emphatically her husband's "right-hand." She had long been a sufferer from ill health and was looking forward most eagerly to a return to her old home, when she was taken away to those temples not made with hands. Irving says that she received her death-warrant while standing by his side on the cold marble terrace of the capitol, listening to the inaugural address of Mr. Fillmore's successor. To this Christian lady the White House is



*Abigail Fillmore.*

indebted for the books which to-day make the library one of the most attractive rooms in the presidential mansion. In the following year their only daughter, who had grown to womanhood, also passed away, leaving a memory precious to all who had the privilege of her acquaintance. His home, now lonely from the loss of those who spread around it sunshine and happiness, induced Mr. Fillmore to carry out a long-cherished project of visiting the Old World, and in May, 1855,

he sailed in the steamer "Atlantic." During his visit to England he received numerous and gratifying attentions from the queen and her cabinet ministers, and was proffered the degree of D. C. L. by the University of Oxford, through its chancellor, the Earl of Derby, the gifted orator who was known as the "Rupert of debate." This honor he however declined, as did Charles Francis Adams a few years later while American minister to the court of St. James. They were alike indisposed to submit to the scenes usual on such occasions.

We can not dwell as we could wish on Mr. Fillmore's patriotic attitude during the early years of the late war; of his warm interest in all the charitable Christian work of the city in which he passed nearly half a century; of his establishing the Buffalo historical society; how, as the first citizen of Buffalo, he was called upon to welcome distinguished visitors, including Mr. Lincoln, when on his way to Washington in 1861, and frequently to preside over conventions and other public gather-

ings, for the control of which he was so admirably qualified by his thorough parliamentary abilities, his widely extended knowledge, his broad views, and a personal urbanity which nothing could disturb; of the method and exactness, the precision and punctuality, with which he conducted his private affairs, as in earlier years he had performed his professional and public duties; of another visit to Europe in 1866, accompanied by his second wife, Caroline C. McIntosh, who survived him for seven years; of his manner of life in dignified retirement, surrounded by all the comfort and luxuries of a beautiful and well-appointed mansion, including a large library, and with an attached wife to share his happy home (see accompanying illustration). In a letter written to his friend Mr. Corcoran, of Washington, but a few weeks before the inevitable hour came, he remarks: "I am happy to say that my health is perfect. I eat, drink, and sleep as well as ever, and take a deep but silent interest in public affairs, and if Mrs. Fillmore's health can be restored, I should feel that I was in the enjoyment of an earthly paradise."

The ex-president accepted an invitation to meet the surviving members of his cabinet and a few other valued friends at the residence of Mr. Corcoran. The month of January, 1874, was designated as the date of the meeting, but was afterward changed to April, by Mr. Fillmore's request. Before that time he was no longer among the living. After a short illness, at ten minutes past eleven o'clock, on Sunday evening, 8 March, Millard Fillmore

"Gave his honors to the world again,  
His blessed part to heaven, and slept in peace."

He was gathered to his fathers at the ripe age of seventy-four years, and passed away without the knowledge that his former partner, Judge Hall, with whom he had been so long and so closely united in the bonds of friendship, as well as in professional and political life, had also, a few days previous, rested from his labors, and was then lying in the Forest Lawn cemetery, where the ex-president now sleeps by his side.

A phenomenal instance of literary vandalism occurred in the city of Buffalo, early in 1891, when all the valuable letters and documents relating to the administration of Millard Fillmore were destroyed by the executor of the ex-president's only son, Millard Powers Fillmore, whose will contained a mandate to

that effect. Why he should have wished in this way to destroy an important part of the history of his country, as well as of his father's honorable career, or why any intelligent lawyer should have consigned to the flames thousands of papers by Webster



and other illustrious men without at least causing copies of the most valuable of them to be made, is entirely beyond the comprehension of ordinary mortals. To the writer, in pointing out his carefully preserved papers, contained in the library of his beautiful home in Buffalo, represented in the accompanying vignette, the ex-president said: "In those cases can be found every important letter and document which I received during my administration, and which will enable the future historian or biographer to prepare an authentic account of that period of our country's

history." The only opportunity probably that ever would present itself for properly defending and explaining the signing of the fugitive-slave bill; the existence of an unquestioned and strong public sentiment in favor of the president's doing so; the recommendations that the act be done, made by Mr. Fillmore's most eminent advisers—the proof of all these things unquestionably would have been presented by the letters and documents referred to; and now every one of these is gone.

Among the chief magistrates of our country there appear more brilliant names than Fillmore's, yet none who more wisely led on the nation to progress and prosperity, making her name great and preserving peace in most perilous times, without invoking the power of the sword, or one who could more truthfully say, "These hands are clean." Without being a genius like Webster or Hamilton, he was a safe and sagacious statesman. He possessed a mind so nicely adjusted and well balanced that he was fitted for the fulfilment of any duty which he was called to perform. He was always ready to give up everything but conviction when once convinced. A single public act honestly and unflinchingly performed cost him his popularity. Posterity, looking from a distance, will perhaps be

more just. All his acts, whether daily and common or deliberate and well-considered, were marked with modesty, justice, and sincerity. What Speaker Onslow said of Sir Robert Walpole was equally true of President Fillmore: "He was the best man from the goodness of his heart, to live with and under, of any great man I ever knew." His was an eminently kindly nature, and the last time the writer saw him, in 1873, he was relieving, with a liberal hand, the necessities of an old and unfortunate friend. He was a sound, practical Christian "without knowing it," as Pope remarked of a contemporary. His temper was perfect, and it is doubtful if he left an enemy on earth. Frederick the Great announced with energy that "Peter the First of Russia, to govern his nation, worked upon it like aquafortis upon iron." Fillmore, to win his way, like Lincoln and Garfield, from almost hopeless poverty to one of the most eminent positions of the world, showed equal determination, oftentimes working, for weeks and months together, till long past midnight, which happily his powers of physical endurance permitted him to do with impunity, and affording a fine illustration of the proud boast of our country, that its loftiest honors are the legitimate objects of ambition to the humblest in the land, as well as to those favored by the gifts of fortune and high birth. See Chamberlain's "Biography of Millard Fillmore" (Buffalo, 1856); Benton's "Abridgment of the Debates of Congress from 1789 to 1856," vol. xvi. (New York, 1861); Thompson's "The Presidents and their Administrations" (Indianapolis, 1873); Address before the Buffalo Historical Society, by James Grant Wilson (Buffalo, 1878); Von Holst's "Constitutional and Political History of the United States," vol. iv. (Chicago, 1885).

## FRANKLIN PIERCE.

FRANKLIN PIERCE, fourteenth president of the United States, born in Hillsborough, N. H., 23 Nov., 1804; died in Concord, N. H., 8 Oct., 1869. His father, Benjamin Pierce (born in Chelmsford, Mass., 25 Dec., 1757; died in Hillsborough, N. H., 1 April, 1839), on the day of the battle of Lexington enlisted in the patriot army and served until its disbandment in 1784, attaining the rank of captain and brevet major. He had intense political convictions, was a Republican of the school of Jefferson, an ardent admirer of Jackson, and the leader of his party in New Hampshire, of which he was elected governor in 1827 and 1829. He was a farmer, and trained his children in his own simple and laborious habits. Discerning signs of future distinction in his son Franklin, he gave him an academical education in well-known institutions at Hancock, Frankestown, and Exeter, and in 1820 sent him to Bowdoin college, Brunswick, Me. His college-mates there were John P. Hale, his future political rival, Prof. Calvin E. Stowe, Sergeant S. Prentiss, the distinguished orator, Henry W. Longfellow, and Nathaniel Hawthorne, his future biographer and life-long personal friend. His ambition was then of a martial cast, and as an officer in a company of college students he enthusiastically devoted himself to the study of military tactics. This is one reason why he found himself at the foot of his class at the end of two years in college. Stung by a sense of disgrace, he devoted the two remaining years to hard study, and when he was graduated in 1824 he was third in his class. While in college, like many other eminent Americans, he taught in winter. After taking his degree he began the study of law at Portsmouth, in the office of Levi Woodbury, where he remained about a year. He afterward spent two years in the law-school at Northampton, Mass., and in the office of Judge Edmund Parker at Am-



Hawley

H.B. Hall

*Franklin Pierce*

D. Appleton & Co.





herst, N. H. In 1827 he was admitted to the bar and began practice in his native town. Soon afterward he argued his first jury cause in the court-house at Amherst. This effort (as is often the case with eminent orators) was a failure. But he was not despondent. He replied to the sympathetic expressions of a friend: "I will try nine hundred and ninety-nine cases, if clients continue to trust me, and if I fail just as I have to-day, I will try the thousandth. I shall live to argue cases in this court-house in a manner that will mortify neither myself nor my friends."

With his popular qualities it was inevitable that he should take a prominent part in the sharp political contests of his native state. He espoused the cause of Gen. Jackson with ardor, and in 1829 was elected to represent his native town in the legislature, where, by three subsequent elections, he served four years, the last two as speaker, for which office he received three fourths of all the votes of the house. In 1833 he was elected to represent his native district in the lower house of congress, where he remained four years. He served on the judiciary and other important committees, but did not participate largely in the debates. That could not be expected of so young a man in a body containing so many veteran politicians and statesmen who had already acquired a national reputation. But in February, 1834, he made a vigorous and sensible speech against the Revolutionary claims bill, condemning it as opening the door to fraud. In December, 1835, he spoke and voted against receiving petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In June, 1836, he spoke against a bill making appropriations for the military academy at West Point. He contended that that institution was aristocratic in its tendencies, that a professional soldiery and standing armies are always dangerous to the liberties of the people, and that in war the republic must rely upon her citizen militia. His experience in the Mexican war afterward convinced him that such an institution is necessary, and he frankly acknowledged his error. It is hardly necessary to add that while in congress Mr. Pierce sustained President Jackson in opposing the so-called internal improvement policy. In 1837 he was elected to the U. S. senate. He was the youngest member of that body, and had barely arrived at the legal age for that office when he took his seat. In January, 1840, he spoke upon the Indian war

in Florida, defending the secretary of war from the attacks of his political opponents. In December of the same year he advocated and carried through the senate a bill granting a pension to an aged woman whose husband, Isaac Davis, had been among the first to fall at Concord bridge on 19 April, 1775. In July, 1841, he spoke against the fiscal bank bill, and in favor of an amendment prohibiting members of congress from borrowing money of the bank. At the same session he made a strong speech against the removal of government officials for their political opinions, in violation of the pledges to the contrary which the Whig leaders had given to the country in the canvass of 1840. During the five years that he remained in the senate it numbered among its members Benton, Buchanan, Clay, Calhoun, Webster, Woodbury, and Silas Wright, an array of veteran statesmen and intellectual giants who had long been party leaders, and who occupied the whole field of debate. Among such men the young, modest, and comparatively obscure member from New Hampshire could not, with what his biographer calls "his exquisite sense of propriety," force himself into a conspicuous position. There is abundant proof, however, that he won the friendship of his eminent associates.

In 1842 he resigned his seat in the senate, with the intention of permanently withdrawing from public life. He again returned to the practice of law, settling in Concord, N. H., whither he had removed his family in 1838, and where he ever afterward resided. In 1845 he was tendered by the governor of New Hampshire, but declined, an appointment to the U. S. senate to fill the vacancy occasioned by the appointment of Levi Woodbury to the U. S. supreme bench. He also declined the nomination for governor tendered to him by the Democratic state convention. He declined, too, an appointment to the office of U. S. attorney-general, offered to him in 1845 by President Polk, by a letter in which he said that when he left the senate he did so "with the fixed purpose never again to be voluntarily separated from his family for any considerable time, except at the call of his country in time of war." But while thus evincing his determination to remain in private life, he did not lose his interest in political affairs. In the councils of his party in New Hampshire he exercised a very great influence. He zealously advocated the annexation of Texas, declaring that, while he preferred it free, he would take it with

slavery rather than not have it at all. When John P. Hale, in 1845, accepted a Democratic renomination to congress, in a letter denouncing annexation, the Democratic leaders called another convention, which repudiated him and nominated another candidate. Through the long struggle that followed, Pierce led the Democrats of his state with great skill and unfaltering courage, though not always to success. He found in Hale a rival worthy of his steel. A debate between the two champions, in the old North church at Concord, aroused the



keenest interest throughout the state. Each party was satisfied with its own advocate; but to contend against the rising anti-slavery sentiment of the north was a hopeless struggle. The stars in their courses fought against slavery. Hale was elected to the U. S. senate in 1846 by a coalition of Whigs and Free-soilers, and several advocates of free-soil principles were elected to congress from New Hampshire before 1850.

In 1846 the war with Mexico began, and New Hampshire was called on for a battalion of troops. Pierce's military ardor was rekindled. He immediately enrolled himself as a private in a volunteer company that was organized at Concord, enthusiastically began studying tactics and drilling in the ranks, and was soon appointed colonel of the 9th regiment of infantry. On 3 March, 1847, he received from President Polk the commission of brigadier-general in the volunteer army. On 27 March, 1847, he embarked at Newport, R. I., in the bark "Kepler," with Col. Ransom, three companies of the 9th regiment of infantry, and the officers of that detachment, arriving at Vera Cruz on 28 June. Much difficulty was experienced in procuring mules for transportation, and the brigade was detained in that unhealthy locality, exposed to the ravages of yellow fever, until 14 July, when it began its march to join the main army under Gen. Winfield Scott at Puebla. The junction was effected (after a toilsome march and several encounters with guerillas) on 6 Aug., and the next day Gen. Scott began

his advance on the city of Mexico. On 19 Aug. the battle of Contreras was fought. The Mexican General Valencia, with 7,000 troops, occupied a strongly intrenched camp. Gen. Scott's plan was to divert the attention of the enemy by a feigned attack on his front, while his flank could be turned and his retreat cut off. But the flanking movement being much delayed, the attack in front (in which Gen. Pierce led his brigade) became a desperate struggle, in which 4,000 raw recruits, who could not use their artillery, fought 7,000 disciplined soldiers, strongly intrenched and raining round shot and shells upon their assailants. To reach the enemy, the Americans who attacked in front were obliged to cross the pedregal, or lava-bed, the crater of an extinct volcano, bristling with sharp, jagged, splintered rocks, which afforded shelter to the Mexican skirmishers. Gen. Pierce's horse stepped into a cleft between two rocks and fell, breaking his own leg and throwing his rider, whose knee was seriously injured. Though suffering severely, and urged by the surgeon to withdraw, Gen. Pierce refused to leave his troops. Mounting the horse of an officer who had just been mortally wounded, he rode forward and remained in the saddle until eleven o'clock at night. The next morning Gen. Pierce was in the saddle at daylight, but the enemy's camp was stormed in the rear by the flanking party, and those of its defenders who escaped death or capture fled in confusion toward Churubusco, where Santa-Anna had concentrated his forces. Though Gen. Pierce's injuries were intensely painful, and though Gen. Scott advised him to leave the field, he insisted on remaining. His brigade and that of Gen. James Shields, in obeying an order to make a detour and attack the enemy in the rear, struck the Mexican reserves, by whom they were largely outnumbered, and a bloody and obstinate struggle followed. By this diversion Gens. Worth and Pillow were enabled to carry the head of the bridge at the front, and relieve Pierce and Shields from the pressure of overwhelming numbers. In the advance of Pierce's brigade his horse was unable to cross a ditch or ravine, and he was compelled to dismount and proceed on foot. Overcome by the pain of his injured knee, he sank to the ground, unable to proceed, but refused to be taken from the field, and remained under fire until the enemy were routed. After these defeats, Santa-Anna, to gain time, opened negotiations for peace, and Gen. Scott appointed Gen.

Pierce one of the commissioners to agree upon terms of armistice. The truce lasted a fortnight, when Gen. Scott, discovering Santa-Anna's insincerity, again began hostilities. The sanguinary battles of Molino del Rey and Chapultepec soon followed, on 14 Sept., 1847, the city of Mexico capitulated, and the war was virtually over. Though Gen. Pierce had little opportunity to distinguish himself as a general in this brief war, he displayed a personal bravery and a regard for the welfare of his men that won him the highest credit. He also gained the ardent friendship of those with whom he came in contact, and that friendship did much for his future elevation. On the return of peace in December, 1847, Gen. Pierce returned to his home and to the practice of his profession. Soon after this the New Hampshire legislature presented him, in behalf of the state, with a fine sword.

In 1850 Gen. Pierce was elected to represent the city of Concord in a constitutional convention, and when that body met he was chosen its president by a nearly unanimous vote. During its session he made strenuous and successful efforts to procure the adoption of an amendment abolishing the religious test that made none but Protestants eligible to office. But that amendment failed of adoption by the people, though practically and by common consent the restriction was disregarded. From 1847 till 1852 Gen. Pierce was arduously engaged in his profession. As an advocate he was never surpassed, if ever equalled, at the New Hampshire bar. He had the external advantages of an orator, a handsome, expressive face, an elegant figure, graceful and impressive gesticulation, and a clear, musical voice, which kindled the blood of his hearers like the notes of a trumpet, or melted them to tears by its pathos. His manner had a courtesy that sprang from the kindness of his heart and contributed much to his political and professional success. His perceptions were keen, and his mind seized at once the vital points of a case, while his ready command of language enabled him to present them to an audience so clearly that they could not be misunderstood. He had an intuitive knowledge of human nature, and the numerous illustrations that he drew from the daily lives of his strong-minded auditors made his speeches doubly effective. He was not a diligent student, nor a reader of many books, yet the keenness of his intellect and his natural

capacity for reasoning often enabled him, with but little preparation, to argue successfully intricate questions of law.

The masses of the Democratic party in the free states so strongly favored the exclusion of slavery from the territory ceded by Mexico that their leaders were compelled to yield, and from 1847 till 1850 their resolutions and platforms advocated free-soil principles. This was especially the case in New Hampshire, and even Gen. Pierce's great popularity could not stem the tide. But in 1850 the passage of the so-called "compromise measures" by congress, the chief of which were the fugitive-slave law and the admission of California as a free state, raised a new issue. Adherence to those measures became to a great extent a test of party fidelity in both the Whig and Democratic parties. Gen. Pierce zealously championed them in New Hampshire, and at a dinner given to him and other personal friends by Daniel Webster at his farm-house in Franklin, N. H., Pierce, in an eloquent speech, assured the great Whig statesman that if his own party rejected him for his 7th of March speech, the Democracy would "lift him so high that his feet would not touch the stars." Finally the masses of both the great parties gave to the compromise measures a sullen acquiescence, on the ground that they were a final settlement of the slavery question. The Democratic national convention met at Baltimore, 12 June, 1852. After thirty-five ballotings for a candidate for president, in which Gen. Pierce's name did not appear, the Virginia delegation brought it forward, and on the 49th ballot he was nominated by 282 votes to 11 for all others. James Buchanan, Stephen A. Douglas, Lewis Cass, and William L. Marcy were his chief rivals. Gen. Winfield Scott, the Whig candidate, was unsatisfactory both to the north and to the south. Webster and his friends leaned toward Pierce, and in the election in November, Scott carried only Massachusetts, Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, with 42 votes, while Pierce carried all the other states with 254 votes. The Whig party had received its death-stroke, and dissolved.

In his inaugural address, 4 March, 1853, President Pierce maintained the constitutionality of slavery and the fugitive-slave law, denounced slavery agitation, and hoped that "no sectional or ambitious or fanatical excitement might again threaten the durability of our institutions, or obscure the light of our prosperity." On 7 March he announced as his cabinet



My dear Sir -

I think the  
facts stated in the  
case of the vessel at  
Cape Town ~~shows that~~  
~~she~~ call for a change.

Will you send me  
a commission for Mrs  
Guthrie

Yr friend

Wm M. P. P. P.

Yr M. a. - { May 23, 1855  
Secretary }



William L. Marcy, of New York, secretary of state; James Guthrie, of Kentucky, secretary of the treasury; Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, secretary of war; James C. Dobbin, of North Carolina, secretary of the navy; Robert McClelland, of Michigan, secretary of the interior; James Campbell, of Pennsylvania, postmaster-general; and Caleb Cushing, of Massachusetts, attorney-general. This cabinet was one of eminent ability, and is the only one in our history that remained unchanged for four years. In 1853 a boundary dispute arose between the United States and Mexico, which was settled by negotiation and resulted in the acquisition of a part of the territory, which was organized under the name of Arizona in 1863. Proposed routes for a railroad to the Pacific were explored and voluminous reports thereon published under the direction of the war department. A controversy with Great Britain respecting the fisheries was adjusted by mutual concessions. The affair of Martin Koszta, a Hungarian refugee, who was seized at Smyrna by an Austrian vessel and given up on the demand of the captain of an American ship-of-war, excited great interest in Europe and redounded to the credit of our government. In 1854 a treaty was negotiated at Washington between the United States and Great Britain providing for commercial reciprocity for ten years between the former country and the Canadian provinces. That treaty and one negotiated by Com. Matthew C. Perry with Japan, which opened the ports of that hitherto unknown country to commerce, were ratified at the same session of the senate. In the spring of 1854, Greytown in Nicaragua was bombarded and mostly burned by the U. S. frigate "Cyane," in retaliation for the refusal of the authorities to make reparation for the property of American citizens residing there, which had been stolen. In the following year William Walker, with a party of filibusters, invaded Nicaragua, and in the autumn of 1856 won an ephemeral success, which induced President Pierce to recognize the minister sent by him to Washington. In the winter of 1854-'5, and in the spring of the latter year, by the sanction of Mr. Crampton, the British minister at Washington, recruits for the British army in the Crimea were secretly enlisted in this country. President Pierce demanded Mr. Crampton's recall, which being refused, the president dismissed not only the minister, but also the British consuls at New York, Philadelphia, and


Cincinnati, for their complicity in such enlistments. The difficulty was finally adjusted by negotiation, and a new British legation was sent to Washington. In 1855 President Pierce signed bills to reorganize the diplomatic and consular system of the United States, to organize the court of claims, to provide a retired list for the navy, and to confer the title of lieutenant-general on Winfield Scott. President Pierce adhered to that strict construction of the constitution which Jefferson and Jackson had insisted on. In 1854 he vetoed a bill making appropriations for public works, and another granting 10,000,000 acres of public lands to the states for relief of indigent insane. In February, 1855, he vetoed a bill for payment of the French spoliation claims, and in the following month another increasing the appropriation for the Edward K. Collins line of Atlantic steamers.

The policy of Pierce's administration upon the question of slavery evoked an extraordinary amount of popular excitement, and led to tremendous and lasting results. That policy was based on the theory that the institution of slavery was imbedded in and guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, and that therefore it was the duty of the National government to protect it. The two chief measures in support of such a policy, which originated with and were supported by Pierce's administration, were the conference of American diplomatists that promulgated the "Ostend manifesto," and opening of the the territories of Kansas and Nebraska to slavery. Filibustering expeditions from the United States to Cuba under Lopez, in 1850 and 1851, aroused anxiety in Europe as to the attitude of our government toward such enterprises. In 1852 Great Britain and France proposed to the United States a tripartite treaty by which the three powers should disclaim all intention of acquiring Cuba, and discountenance such an attempt by any power. On 1 Dec., 1852, Edward Everett, who was then secretary of state, declined to act, declaring, however, that our government would never question Spain's title to the island. On 16 Aug., 1854, President Pierce directed James Buchanan, John Y. Mason, and Pierre Soule, the American ministers to Great Britain, France, and Spain, to meet and discuss the Cuban question. They met at Ostend, 9 Oct., and afterward at Aix la Chapelle, and sent to their government that famous despatch known as the "Ostend manifesto." It declared that if Spain

should obstinately refuse to sell Cuba, self-preservation would make it incumbent on the United States to wrest it from her and prevent it from being Africanized into a second Santo Domingo. But the hostile attitude of the great European powers, and the Kansas and Nebraska excitement, shelved the Cuban question till 1858, when a feeble and abortive attempt was made in congress to authorize its purchase for \$30,000,000.

President Pierce, in his first message to congress, December, 1853, spoke of the repose that had followed the compromises of 1850, and said: "That this repose is to suffer no shock during my official term if I have power to prevent it, those who placed me here may be assured." Doubtless such was then his hope and belief. In the following January, Mr. Douglas, chairman of the senate committee on the territories, introduced a bill to organize the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, which permitted slavery north of the parallel of 36° 30' in a region from which it had been forever excluded by the Missouri compromise of 1820. That bill was Mr. Douglas's bid for the presidency. Southern politicians could not reject it and retain their influence at home. Northern politicians who opposed it gave up all hope of national preferment, which then seemed to depend on southern support. The defeat of the bill seemed likely to sever and destroy the Democratic organization, a result which many believed would lead to civil war and the dissolution of the Union. Borne onward by the aggressive spirit of slavery, by political ambition, by the force of party discipline, and the dread of sectional discord, the bill was passed by congress, and on 31 May received the signature of the president. Slavery had won, but there never was a more costly victory. The remainder of Pierce's term was embittered by civil war in Kansas and the disasters of his party in the free states. In 1854, with a Democratic majority in both houses of the New Hampshire legislature, the influence of the national administration could not secure the election of a Democratic U. S. senator, and at the next election in 1855 the Democracy lost control of the state. The repeal of the Missouri compromise was soon followed by organized efforts in the free states to fill Kansas with anti-slavery settlers. To such movements the south responded by armed invasions. On 30 March, 1855, a territorial legislature was elected in Kansas by armed bands from Missouri, who crossed the border to vote and then returned to their

homes. That initiative gave to the pro-slavery men a technical advantage, which the Democratic leaders were swift to recognize. The pro-slavery legislature thus elected met at Pawnee on 2 July, 1855, and enacted an intolerant and oppressive slave code, which was mainly a transcript of the laws of Missouri. The free-state settlers thereupon called a constitutional convention, which met on 23 Oct., 1855, and framed a state constitution, which was adopted by the people by a vote of 1,731 to 46. A general assembly was then elected under such constitution, which, after passing some preliminary acts, appointed a committee to frame a code of laws, and took measures to apply to congress for the admission of Kansas into the Union as a state. Andrew H. Reeder was elected by the free-state men their delegate to congress. A majority of the actual settlers of Kansas were in favor of her admission into the Union as a free state; but all their efforts to that end were treated by their opponents in the territory, and by the Democratic national administration, as rebellion against lawful authority.



This conflict kept the territory in a state of confusion and bloodshed, and excited party feeling throughout the country to fever heat. It remained unsettled, to vex Buchanan's administration and further develop the germs of disunion and sanguinary civil war.

On 2 June, 1856, the National Democratic convention met at Cincinnati to nominate a candidate for president. On the first ballot James Buchanan had 135 votes, Pierce 122, Douglas 33, Cass 6, Pierce's vote gradually diminished, and on the 17th ballot Buchanan was nominated unanimously. In August the house of representatives attached to the army appropriation bill a proviso that no part of the army should be employed to enforce the laws of the Kansas territorial legislature until congress should have declared its validity. The senate refused to concur, and congress adjourned without passing the bill. It was immediately convened by proclamation, and passed the bill without the proviso. The president's message in December following was mainly devoted to Kansas affairs, and was intensely hostile to the free-state party. His term ended on 4

March, 1857, and he returned to his home in Concord. Soon afterward he visited Madeira, and extended his travels to Great Britain and the continent of Europe. He remained abroad nearly three years, returning to Concord early in 1860. In the presidential election of that year he took no active part, but his influence was cast against Stephen A. Douglas and in favor of John C. Breckinridge.

In a letter addressed to Jefferson Davis, under date of 6 Jan., 1860, he wrote: "Without discussing the question of right, of abstract power to secede, I have never believed that actual disruption of the Union can occur without bloodshed; and if, through the madness of northern Abolitionists, that dire calamity must come, the fighting will not be along Mason and Dixon's line merely. It will be within our own borders, in our own streets, between the two classes of citizens to whom I have referred. Those who defy law and scout constitutional obligations will, if we ever reach the arbitrament of arms, find occupation enough at home. . . . I have tried to impress upon our own people, especially in New Hampshire and Connecticut, where the only elections are to take place during the coming spring, that, while our Union meetings are all in the right direction and well enough for the present, they will not be worth the paper upon which their resolutions are written unless we can overthrow abolitionism at the polls and repeal the unconstitutional and obnoxious laws which in the cause of 'personal liberty' have been placed upon our statute-books." On 21 April, 1861, nine days after the disunionists had begun civil war by firing on Fort Sumter, he addressed a Union mass-meeting at Concord, and urged the people to sustain the government against the southern Confederacy. From that time until his death he lived in retirement at Concord. To the last he retained his hold upon the hearts of his personal friends, and the exquisite urbanity of his earlier days. His wife and his three children had preceded him to the tomb.

Some years after Pierce's death the legislature of New Hampshire, in behalf of the state, placed his portrait beside the speaker's desk in the hall of the house of representatives at Concord. Time has softened the harsh judgment that his political foes passed upon him in the heat of party strife and civil war. His generosity and kindness of heart are gratefully remembered by those who knew him, and particularly by the

younger members of his profession, whom he was always ready to aid and advise. It is remembered that in his professional career he was ever willing, at whatever risk to his fortune or popularity, to shield the poor and obscure from oppression and injustice. It is remembered, too, that he sought in public life no opportunities for personal gain. His integrity was above suspicion. After nine years' service in congress and in the senate of the United States, after a brilliant and successful professional career and four years in the presidency, his estate hardly amounted to \$72,000. In his whole political career he always stood for a strict construction of the constitution, for economy and frugality in public affairs, and for a strict accountability of public officials to their constituents. No political or personal influence could induce him to shield those whom he believed to have defrauded the government. Pierce had ambition, but greed for public office was foreign to his nature. Few, if any, instances can be found in our history where a man of thirty-eight, in the full vigor of health, voluntarily gave up a seat in the U. S. senate, which he was apparently sure to retain as long as he wished. His refusal at the age of forty-one to leave his law-practice for the place of attorney-general in Polk's cabinet is almost without a parallel. Franklin Pierce, too, was a true patriot and a sincere lover of his country. The Revolutionary services of a father whom he revered were constantly in his thoughts. Two of his brothers, with that father's consent, took an honorable part in the war of 1812. His only sister was the wife of Gen. John H. McNeil, as gallant an officer as ever fought for his country. To decline a cabinet appointment and enlist as a private soldier in the army of his country were acts which one who knew his early training and his chivalrous character might reasonably expect of him. But for slavery and the questions growing out of it, his administration would have passed into history as one of the most successful in our national life. To judge him justly, his political training and the circumstances that environed him must be taken into account. Like his honored father, he believed that the statesmen of the Revolution had agreed to maintain the legal rights of the slave-holders, and that without such agreement we should have had no Federal constitution or Union. He believed that good faith required that agreement to be performed. In that belief all or nearly all the leaders of

both the great parties concurred. However divided on other questions, on that the south was a unit. The price of its political support was compliance with its demands, and both the old parties (however reluctantly) paid the price. Political leaders believed that, unless it was paid, civil war and disunion would result, and their patriotism re-enforced their party spirit and personal ambition. Among them all there were probably few whose conduct would have been essentially different from that of Pierce had they been in the same situation. He gave his support to the repeal of the Missouri compromise with great reluctance, and in the belief that the measure would satisfy the south and thus avert from the country the doom of civil war and disunion. See the lives by Nathaniel Hawthorne (Boston, 1852) and David W. Bartlett (Auburn, 1852), and "Review of Pierce's Administration," by Arthur E. Carroll (Boston, 1856). The steel plate is from a portrait by George P. A. Healy. The vignette on page 265 is a view of President Pierce's birthplace, and that on page 272 represents his grave, which is in the Minot cemetery at Concord, N. H.

His wife JANE MEANS APPLETON, born in Hampton, N. H., 12 March, 1806; died in Andover, Mass., 2 Dec., 1863, was a daughter of the Rev. Jesse Appleton, D. D., president of Bowdoin college. She was brought up in an atmosphere of cultivated and refined Christian influences, was thoroughly educated, and grew to womanhood surrounded by most congenial circumstances. She was married in 1834. Public observation was extremely painful to her, and she always preferred the quiet of her New England home to the glare and glitter of fashionable life in Washington. A friend said of her: "How well she filled her station as wife, mother, daughter, sister, and friend, those only can tell who knew her in these private relations. In this quiet sphere she found her joy, and here her gentle but powerful influence was deeply and constantly felt, through wise counsels and delicate suggestions, the purest, finest tastes, and a devoted life." She was the mother of three children, all boys, but none survived




*Jane M. Pierce*

her. Two died in early youth, and the youngest, Benjamin, was killed in an accident on the Boston and Maine railroad while travelling from Andover to Lawrence, Mass., on 6 Jan., 1853, only two months before his father's inauguration as president. Mr. and Mrs. Pierce were with him at the time, and the boy, a bright lad of thirteen years, had been amusing them with his conversation just before the accident. The car was thrown from the track and dashed against the rocks, and the lad met his death instantly. Both parents were long deeply affected by the shock of the accident, and Mrs. Pierce never recovered from it. The sudden bereavement shattered the small remnant of her remaining health, yet she performed her task at the White House nobly, and sustained the dignity of her husband's office. Mrs. Robert E. Lee wrote in a private letter: "I have known many of the ladies of the White House, none more truly excellent than the afflicted wife of President Pierce. Her health was a bar to any great effort on her part to meet the expectations of the public in her high position, but she was a refined, extremely religious, and well-educated lady." She was buried by the side of her three children, in the cemetery at Concord, New Hampshire.







H. B. Hall, Jr.

*James Buchanan*

## JAMES BUCHANAN.

JAMES BUCHANAN, fifteenth president of the United States, born near Mercersburg, Pa., 23 April, 1791; died in Lancaster, Pa., 1 June, 1868. The days of his youth were those of the nation's youth; his public career of forty years saw all our great extensions of boundary on the south and west, acquired from foreign powers, the admission of thirteen new states, the development of many important questions of internal and foreign policy, and the gradual rise and final culmination of a great and disastrous insurrection. He was educated at a school in Mercersburg and at Dickinson college, Pa., where he was graduated in 1809. He began to practise law in Lancaster in 1812. His early political principles were those of the federalists, who disapproved of the war; yet, as he himself said, "he thought it was the duty of every patriot to defend the country, while the war was raging, against a foreign enemy." His first public address was made at the age of twenty-three, on the occasion of a popular meeting in Lancaster after the capture of Washington by the British in 1814. He urged the enlistment of volunteers for the defence of Baltimore, and was among the first to enroll his name. In October of the same year he was elected to the house of representatives in the legislature of Pennsylvania for Lancaster county. Peace was proclaimed early in 1815, and on 4 July Mr. Buchanan delivered an oration before the Washington association of Lancaster. In it he spoke of the war as "glorious, in the highest degree, to the American character, but disgraceful in the extreme to the administration." The speech excited much criticism, and in later life he said that "it contained many sentiments which he regretted, but that at the same time it could not be denied that the country was wholly unprepared for war at the period of its declaration, and the attempt to carry it on by means of loans,

without any resort to taxation, had well nigh made the government bankrupt." He was again elected to the legislature in October, 1815, and at the close of that session he retired to the practice of his profession, in which he gained early distinction, especially in the impeachment of a judge, whom he successfully defended. His intention at this time was not to re-enter public life, but the death of a young lady to whom he was engaged caused him to seek change and distraction of thought, and he accepted a nomination to congress, and was elected in 1820 for a district composed of the counties of Lancaster, York, and Dauphin, taking his seat in December, 1821. He was called a federalist, but the party distinctions of that time were not very clearly defined, and Mr. Buchanan's political principles, as a national statesman, were yet to be formed. Mr. Monroe had become president in 1817, and held that office during two terms, his administration being called "the era of good feeling." The excitement and animosities of the war of 1812 had subsided, and when Mr. Buchanan entered congress there was no sectionalism to disturb the repose of the country. Questions of internal policy soon arose, however, and he took an able part in many important debates. Mr. Monroe's veto of a bill imposing tolls for the support of the Cumberland road, for which Mr. Buchanan had voted, produced a strong effect upon the latter's constitutional views. It was the first time that his mind had been brought sharply to the consideration of the question in what mode "internal improvements" can be effected by the general government, and consequently he began to perceive the dividing line between the federal and the state powers. Mr. Buchanan remained in the house of representatives ten years—during Mr. Monroe's second term, through the administration of John Quincy Adams, and during the first two years of Jackson's administration. In December, 1829, he became chairman of the judiciary committee of the house, and as such introduced a bill to amend and extend the judicial system of the United States, by including in the circuit-court system six new states, and by increasing the number of judges of the supreme court to nine. His speech in explanation of this measure—which was not adopted at the time—was as important as any that has been made upon the subject. Another measure, evincing a thorough knowledge and very accurate views of the nature of our mixed system of government, was a

minority report, presented by him as chairman of this committee, against a proposition to repeal the 25th section of the Judiciary act of 1789, which gave the supreme court appellate jurisdiction, by writ of error to the state courts, in cases where the constitution, treaties, and laws of the United States are drawn in question. This report caused the rejection of the bill by a vote of 138 to 51. During Mr. Adams's term the friends of the administration began to take the name of national republicans, while the opposing party assumed the name of democrats. Mr. Buchanan was one of the leaders of the opposition in the house of representatives. He was always a strong supporter and warm personal friend of Gen. Jackson.

At the close of the 21st congress in March, 1831, it was Buchanan's wish to retire from public life, but, at the request of Gen. Jackson (who had become president in 1829), he accepted the mission to Russia. He embarked from New York in a sailing-vessel on 8 April, 1832, and arrived at St. Petersburg about the middle of June. The chief objects of his mission were the negotiation of a commercial treaty that should promote an increase of the commerce between Russia and the United States by regulating the duties to be levied on the merchandise of each country by the other so far as to prevent undue discrimination in favor of the products of other countries; to provide for the residence and functions of consuls, etc.; and also the negotiation of a treaty respecting the maritime rights of neutral nations on the principle that "free ships make free goods." The Russian minister for foreign affairs at this time was Count Nesselrode. He favored the treaty of commerce, and, though there was much opposition to it from some members of the Russian ministry, it was finally concluded on 18 Dec., 1832. The negotiation concerning a treaty on maritime rights was not successful, because, as Mr. Buchanan wrote, "Russia is endeavoring to manage England at present, and this is an unpropitious moment to urge her to adopt principles of public law which would give offence to that nation, and which would in any way abridge her own belligerent rights." His attractive manners and evident sincerity of character produced their effect on the Russians, especially the emperor and empress; and he wrote home: "I flatter myself that a favorable change has been effected in his [the emperor's] feelings toward the United States since my arrival"; and at his

audience of leave the emperor told him to tell Gen. Jackson to send him another minister exactly like himself. He wrote to President Jackson: "Your foreign policy has had no small influence on public opinion throughout Europe." Of Russia and the emperor Mr. Buchanan wrote: "There is no freedom of the press, no public opinion, and but little political conversation, and that very much guarded; in short, we live in the calm of despotism, though the Emperor Nicholas [I.] is one of the best of despots. Coming abroad can teach an American no other lesson but to love his country, its institutions, and its laws better, much better than he did before. I have not yet learned to submit patiently to the drudgery of etiquette. Foreign ministers must drive a carriage and four with a postilion." He left St. Petersburg on 8 Aug., 1833, spent a short time in Paris and London, and reached home in November. The next year was spent in private occupations in Lancaster, except that he was one of the commissioners appointed by Pennsylvania to arrange with commissioners from New Jersey concerning the use of the waters of Delaware river. On 6 Dec., 1834, the legislature of Pennsylvania elected him to the U. S. senate to succeed Mr. Wilkins, who had been appointed minister to Russia. This office was acknowledged by Mr. Buchanan afterward to be "the only public station he desired to occupy." He took his seat 15 Dec. He held very strongly the doctrine of instruction—that is, the right of a state legislature to direct the vote of a senator of the state in congress, and the duty of the senator to obey. There has never been a period in the history of the senate when more real power of debate was displayed, or when public measures were more thoroughly considered, than at this time. President Jackson's celebrated proclamation against nullification, and his removal of the public deposits from the bank of the United States into certain selected state banks, had been made during Mr. Buchanan's residence abroad. Jackson enjoyed great popularity and influence throughout the country, but a large majority of the senate were opposed to his financial measures. This opposing party, the old "national republicans" of John Quincy Adams's administration, were now called whigs, and included Mr. Clay, Mr. Webster, Mr. Clayton, of Delaware, Mr. Ewing, of Ohio, and Mr. Frelinghuysen and Mr. Southard, of New Jersey. Among the Jackson men, or democrats, were Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Wright, of

New York, Mr. Benton, of Missouri, and Mr. King, of Alabama. Mr. Calhoun stood apart from both the political parties, a great and powerful debater who had been vice-president, and who was now senator from the "nullifying" state of South Carolina. One of the first debates in which Mr. Buchanan took part in the senate (and one that has not yet lost its interest) was upon a bill requiring the president, when making a nomination to fill a vacancy occasioned by the removal of any officer, to state the fact of such removal and to render reasons for it. Mr. Buchanan opposed it. He contended that the constitution only made the consent of the senate necessary in the appointment of officers by the executive, not in their removal, that, if such consent were required, long and dangerous delays might occur when the senate was not in session; and that, if the president must assign reasons for removals, these reasons must be investigated, much time would be consumed, and the legislative branch of the government would thus exercise functions to which it has no claim. Another great discussion into which Mr. Buchanan entered related to the refusal of the legislative chambers of France to pay a certain sum that had been promised in 1831 by a convention between the United States and the government of King Louis Philippe for the liquidation of certain claims of American citizens against France. The United States waited three years in vain for the payment of this money; and finally, in January, 1836, the president recommended to congress a partial non-intercourse with France. Mr. Buchanan made a long and earnest speech, contending against Webster and Clay, in support of this measure, insisting that "there is a point in the intercourse between nations at which diplomacy must end and a nation must either consent to abandon her rights or assert them by force." There was some danger for a time of war with France, but eventually Great Britain made an offer of mediation and the difficulty was amicably adjusted. In January, 1837, Mr. Buchanan delivered a speech that may be regarded as his ablest effort in the senate. It was in support of Col. Benton's "expunging" resolution, which proposed to cancel in the journal of the senate Mr. Clay's resolution of censure against President Jackson for his removal of the public deposits from the bank of the United States. In this argument Mr. Buchanan separated, in a remarkable degree, that which was personal and

partisan in the controversy from the serious questions involved. He contended that the censure passed by the senate in 1834 upon the president was unjust, because he had violated no law; and that the senate, in recording such a mere censure, adopted in its legislative capacity, had rendered itself incompetent to perform its high judicial function of impeachment. He concluded with a very ingenious and elaborate criticism of the word "expunge." The "expunging" resolution was adopted by a party vote.

Toward the end of Jackson's administration the subject of slavery began to be pressed upon the attention of congress by petitions for its abolition in the District of Columbia. One memorial on this subject was presented by Mr. Buchanan himself from some Quakers in his own state. Mr. Calhoun and others objected to the reception of these petitions. Mr. Buchanan, though he disapproved of slavery, yet contended that congress had no power under the constitution to interfere with slavery within those states where it existed, and that it would be very unwise to abolish it in the District of Columbia—"a district carved out of two slave-holding states and surrounded by them on all sides"; but, nevertheless, he also contended, in a long and forcible speech, for the people's right of petition and the duty of congress, save under exceptional circumstances, to receive their petitions. In June, 1836, Mr. Buchanan argued, against Mr. Webster, for a bill, introduced in conformity with a special recommendation from President Jackson, prohibiting the circulation through the mails of incendiary publications on the subject of slavery. In a very sarcastic speech against a bill to prevent the interference of certain federal officers with elections, even in conversation, Mr. Buchanan thus expressed his political faith: "I support the president because he is in favor of a strict and limited construction of the constitution, according to the true spirit of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions. I firmly believe that if this government is to remain powerful and permanent it can only be by never assuming doubtful powers which must necessarily bring it into collision with the states. I oppose the whig party, because, according to their reading of the constitution, congress possesses, and they think ought to exercise, powers which would endanger the rights of the states and the liberties of the people." The most important and far-reaching of Presi-



dent Jackson's executive measures was his veto in 1832 of a bill for renewing the charter of the bank of the United States. Jackson removed the national deposits into certain state banks, which produced financial distress throughout the land. Mr. Buchanan was conspicuous in the senate as a supporter of Jackson's financial policy throughout his administration and that of his successor, Mr. Van Buren, of the same party. Mr. Buchanan had been re-elected to the senate in January, 1837, by a very large vote and for a full term, his first election having been to a vacancy, and he was the first person that had ever received a second election from the legislature of Pennsylvania. In 1839 Mr. Van Buren offered Mr. Buchanan the attorney-generalship, which Mr. Grundy had resigned. Mr. Buchanan answered that he "preferred his position as a senator from Pennsylvania; that nothing could induce him to waive this preference except a sense of public duty, and that he felt that he could render a more efficient support to the principles" of the administration "on the floor of the senate than he could in an executive office." The great commercial distress of the country produced, in the elections of 1840, a political revolution, and on 4 March, 1841, the whigs came into power under President Harrison. His death in April placed in the executive chair Mr. Tyler, who proved to be opposed to a national bank, and vetoed two bills: the first for a national bank, and the second for a "Fiscal Corporation of the United States." Mr. Clay made frequent attacks upon Mr. Tyler's vetoes, and even proposed a joint resolution for an amendment of the constitution requiring but a bare majority, instead of two thirds, of each house of congress to pass a bill over the president's objections. Mr. Buchanan, on 2 Feb., 1842, replied to Mr. Clay in a speech that may be ranked very high as an exposition of one of the most important parts of our political system. He showed that the president's veto was the people's safeguard, through the officer who "more nearly represents a majority of the whole people than any other branch of the government," against the encroachments of the senate. The veto power "owes its existence," said he, "to a revolt of the people of Rome against the tyrannical decrees of the Roman senate. The president of the United States, elected by his fellow-citizens to the highest official trust in the country, is directly responsible to them for the manner in which he

shall discharge his duties ; and he will not array himself, by the exercise of the veto power, against a majority in both houses of congress, unless in extreme cases, where, from strong convictions of public duty, he may be willing to draw down upon himself their hostility." Mr. Buchanan was one of those that opposed the ratification of the treaty with England negotiated by Mr. Webster and Lord Ashburton in 1842. In 1843 he was elected to the senate for a third term, and in 1844 his name was brought forward as the democratic candidate of Pennsylvania for the presidential nomination ; but before the national convention met he withdrew in order that the whole strength of the party might be concentrated upon one candidate. James K. Polk was elected ; he asked Mr. Buchanan to become his secretary of state, and the invitation was accepted.

In this responsible position Mr. Buchanan had two very important questions to deal with, and they required the exercise of all his political tact and indefatigable industry. One was the settlement of the boundary between the territory of Oregon and the British possessions. The other was the annexation of Texas, which resulted in the Mexican war. Texas had been for nine years independent of Mexico, and now sought admission into our union. The difficulties that attended this question were, on the one hand, the danger of increasing the excitement, already considerable, against slavery (for Texas would be a slave-holding state) ; and, on the other, the danger of interference on the part of England if Texas should remain independent and resume her war with Mexico. The adoption by Texas of the basis of annexation proposed by the United States was followed by the refusal of the Mexican government to receive Mr. Slidell, sent by Mr. Polk as envoy extraordinary, with the object of avoiding a war and to settle all questions between the two countries, including the western boundary of Texas. The result of the Mexican war was the cession to the United States of California and New Mexico and the final settlement of the Texan boundary. The policy of Mr. Polk's administration toward the states of Central America and on the subject of the Monroe doctrine was shaped by Mr. Buchanan very differently from that adopted by the succeeding administration of Gen. Taylor, whose secretary of state was Mr. Clayton, the American negotiator of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty with Great Britain. Acting under Mr.


Buchanan's advice, President Polk, in his first annual message, in December, 1845, reasserted the Monroe doctrine that no European nation should henceforth be allowed by the United States to plant any colony on the American continent or to interfere in any way in American affairs. This declaration was intended to frustrate the attempts of England to obtain a footing in the then Mexican province of California by an extensive system of colonization. England's aims were defeated for the time. Two years afterward, when the Mexican war was drawing to a close, Mr. Buchanan turned the attention of President Polk to the encroachments of the British government in Central America, under the operation of a protectorate over the kingdom of the Mosquito Indians. Great disturbances followed in Yucatan, and the Indians began a war of extermination against the whites. If not actually incited by the British authorities, the savages were known to be supplied with British muskets. The whites were reduced to such extremities that the authorities of Yucatan offered to transfer the dominion and sovereignty of the peninsula to the United States, as a consideration for defending it against the Indians, at the same time giving notice that if this offer should be declined they would make the same proposition to England and Spain. The president recommended to congress the appeal of Yucatan, but declined to recommend the adoption of any measure with a view to acquire the dominion and sovereignty over the peninsula. In April, 1847, the United States appointed a chargé d'affaires to Guatemala, and Mr. Buchanan instructed him to "promote, by his counsel and advice, should suitable occasions offer, the reunion of the states that formed the federation of Central America; to cultivate the most friendly relations with Guatemala and the other states of Central America; and to communicate to the state department all the information obtainable concerning the British encroachments upon the Mosquito kingdom." The new chargé was prevented from reaching Guatemala until late in Mr. Polk's administration, and the plan wisely conceived by Mr. Buchanan was not carried out. In the mean time the British government seized upon the port of San Juan de Nicaragua, the only good harbor along the coast. Instead of carrying out the policy of President Polk and Mr. Buchanan, the administration of President Taylor, without consulting the states of Central America, entered in 1850 into the Clayton-

Bulwer treaty, the ambiguous language of which soon gave rise to such complications and misunderstandings between England and the United States that Mr. Buchanan was obliged to go, subsequently, as minister to London, to endeavor to unravel them. Instead of a simple provision requiring Great Britain absolutely to recede from the Mosquito protectorate, and to restore to Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica their respective territories, the treaty declared that neither of the parties should "make use of any protection which either affords or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have, to or with any state or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising any dominion over the same." It soon became the British construction of this clause that it recognized the existence of the Mosquito protectorate for all purposes other than those expressly prohibited; and down to the time when Mr. Buchanan was sent by President Pierce as minister to England this claim was still maintained.

On the accession of the whig party to power under Taylor, in March, 1849, Mr. Buchanan retired for a time from official life. His home, from the age of eighteen, had been the city of Lancaster, where he owned a house. In the autumn of 1848 he purchased a small estate of twenty-two acres, known as Wheatland, about a mile from the town. The house was a substantial brick mansion, and, on Mr. Buchanan's retirement from the cabinet, this became his permanent abode when he was not occupying an official residence in London or in Washington. Mr. Buchanan never married. The death of the lady whom he had intended to marry was a deep and lasting sorrow. The loss of his sister, Mrs. Lane, in 1839, and of her husband two years later, gave him the care of their four children; and the youngest of these, afterward widely known as Miss Harriet Lane, became an inmate of his household. James Buchanan Henry, the son of another sister, who died about the same time, was also taken into his family; and these two cousins were brought up by their uncle with the most wise and affectionate care. Mr. Buchanan's letters to his niece, begun when she was a school-girl, and, after Miss Lane had grown up, written almost daily during her absences from him, give a charming picture of his private life. During the few years of Mr. Buchanan's

unofficial life, passed chiefly at Wheatland, he does not appear to have devoted much time to the law. His correspondence was large; and this, with a constant and lively interest in public affairs, rendered him, even in retirement, very busy. He lent considerable influence to his party as a private individual; but his exertions were not marked by purely partisan feeling. He strenuously

opposed the Wilmot proviso, which aimed at excluding slavery from all newly acquired territory; and favored Mr. Clay's "Compromise Measures of 1850," which provided for the admission of California



as a free state, and the abolition of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia; but, by the fugitive slave law, secured the return to their owners of slaves that had escaped into free states. He wrote many influential public letters, in one of which he declared that "two things are necessary to preserve the union from danger: 1. Agitation in the north on the subject of southern slavery must be rebuked and put down by a strong and enlightened public opinion; 2. The fugitive slave law must be enforced in its spirit." In the presidential election of 1852 Mr. Buchanan was a candidate for the democratic nomination; but Gen. Franklin Pierce received the nomination and was elected. The most important service rendered by Mr. Buchanan to his party in this election—and with him a service to his party was alike a service to his country—was a speech made at Greensburgh, Pa., in October, 1852, in opposition to the election of Gen. Scott, the whig candidate. This speech exhibited in a very clear light the whole political history of that period, and asserted a principle which he said ought to be an article of democratic faith: "Beware of elevating to the highest civil trust the commander of your victorious armies," drawing a distinction between one "who had been a man of war, and nothing but a man of war from his youth upward," and such as had been "soldiers only in the day and hour of danger, when the country had demanded

their services, and who had already illustrated high civil appointments"; and then criticising exhaustively each of Gen. Scott's avowed political opinions, and quoting Mr. Thurlow Weed, "one of Gen. Scott's most able supporters," as acknowledging that "there was weakness in all Scott said or did about the presidency." When, in 1853, Franklin Pierce became president, he appointed Mr. Buchanan minister to England. Buchanan, though social in his nature, was a man of simple republican tastes, and the formality and etiquette of life at a foreign court, never agreeable, now, at the age of sixty-two, appeared to him particularly distasteful; besides, he considered that his duty to his young relatives as well as to his only surviving brother, a clergyman in delicate health, required his presence at home. But with Mr. Buchanan duty to his country always outweighed every other consideration, and Mr. Pierce's urgent appeal to him to accept what was at that time a very important mission, at length prevailed. Mr. Buchanan sailed for England from New York on 5 Aug., 1853, and landed in Liverpool on the 17th. There were three important questions to be settled with England at this time: the first related to the fisheries; the second was the desire of England to establish reciprocal free trade in certain enumerated articles between the United States and the British North American provinces, and thus preserve their allegiance and ward off the danger of their annexation to the United States; and this Mr. Buchanan was very desirous to use as a powerful lever to secure the third point, which the United States earnestly desired, viz., the withdrawal of all British dominion in Central America, and the recognition of the Monroe doctrine, which the Clayton-Bulwer treaty had not firmly established. President Pierce considered it best that the reciprocity and fishery questions should be settled at Washington; but Mr. Buchanan was intrusted with the negotiation of the Central American question in London. Mr. Buchanan's main object was to develop and ascertain the precise differences between the two governments in regard to the construction of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, but the Crimean war so long delayed the negotiations with this country that nothing could be accomplished while he remained in England. As the war approached and when it was finally declared, the principles of neutrality, privateering, and many other topics came within the range of the discussion; and it was very much

in consequence of the views expressed by Mr. Buchanan to Lord Clarendon, and by the latter communicated to the British cabinet, that the course of England toward neutrals during that war became what it was. When Lord Clarendon, in 1854, presented to Mr. Buchanan a *projet* for a treaty between Great Britain, France, and the United States, making it piracy for neutrals to serve on board of privateers cruising against the commerce of either of the three nations when such nation was a belligerent, the very impressive reasons that Mr. Buchanan opposed to it caused it to be abandoned. An American minister at the English court, at periods of exciting and critical questions between the two nations, is very likely to experience a considerable variation in the social barometer. But the strength of Mr. Buchanan's character, and the agreeable personal qualities which were in him united with the gravity of years and an experience of a very uncommon kind, overcame at all times any tendency to social unpleasantness that might have been caused by national feelings excited by temporary causes. Throughout his residence in England Mr. Buchanan was treated with marked attention, not only by society in general, but by the queen and the prince consort. Miss Lane joined him in the spring of 1854, and remained with him until the autumn of 1855.

Mr. Buchanan arrived in New York in April, 1856, and there met with a public reception from the authorities and people of the city, that evinced the interest that now began to be everywhere manifested in him as the probable future president. Prior to the meeting of the national democratic convention at Cincinnati in June, 1856, there was lack of organization on the part of Mr. Buchanan's political friends; and Mr. Buchanan himself, though willing to accept the nomination, made no efforts to secure it, and did not believe that he would receive it. The rival claimants were President Pierce and Senator Douglas, of Illinois. Chiefly through the efforts of Mr. Slidell, Mr. Buchanan was nominated. By this time the whig party had disappeared, the old party lines were obliterated, and the main political issue had come to be the question of slavery or no slavery in the territories. The anti-slavery party now called themselves republicans, and their candidate was Gen. Fremont. The result of the election shows, with great distinctness, the following facts: 1. That Mr. Buchanan was chosen president because he received the electoral votes of the

five free states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and California (sixty-two in all), and that without them he could not have been elected. 2. That his southern vote (that of every slave-holding state excepting Maryland) was partly given to him because of his conservative opinions and position, and partly because the candidate for the vice-presidency, Mr. Breckinridge, was a southern man. 3. That Gen. Fremont received the electoral vote of no southern state, and that this was due partly to the character of the republican party, and partly to the fact that the republican candidate for the vice-presidency, Mr. Dayton, of New Jersey, was a citizen of a non-slave-holding state. Gen. Fremont himself was nominally a citizen of California. This election, therefore, foreshadowed the sectional division that would be almost certain to happen in the next one if the four years of Mr. Buchanan's administration should not witness a subsidence in the sectional feelings between the north and the south. It would only be necessary for the republicans to wrest from the democratic party the five free states that had voted for Mr. Buchanan, and they would elect the president in 1860. Whether this was to happen would depend upon the ability of the democratic party to avoid a rupture into factions that would themselves be representatives of irreconcilable dogmas on the subject of slavery in the territories. Hence it is that Mr. Buchanan's course as president, for the first three years of his term, is to be judged with reference to the responsibility that was upon him so to conduct the government as to disarm, if possible, the antagonism of section to section. His administration of affairs after the election of Mr. Lincoln is to be judged simply by his duty as the executive in the most extraordinary and anomalous crisis in which the country had ever been placed.

Mr. Buchanan was inaugurated on 4 March, 1857. The cabinet, which was confirmed by the senate on 6 March, consisted of Lewis Cass, of Michigan, secretary of state; Howell Cobb, of Georgia, secretary of the treasury; John B. Floyd, of Virginia, secretary of war; Isaac Toucey, of Connecticut, secretary of the navy; Aaron V. Brown, of Tennessee, postmaster-general; Jacob Thompson, of Mississippi, secretary of the interior; and Jeremiah S. Black, of Pennsylvania, attorney-general. The internal affairs of the country during Buchanan's administration occupied so much of the public attention at the



time, and have since been a subject of so much interest, that his management of our foreign relations has been quite obscured. The wisdom displayed in this branch of his duties was such as might have been expected from one who had had his previous experience in the state department and in important diplomatic posts. His only equals in the executive office in this respect have been Mr. Jefferson and Mr. John Quincy Adams. During an administration fraught with the most serious hazards to the internal relations of the states with each other, he kept steadily in view the preservation of peace and good will between the United States and Great Britain, while he abated nothing from our just claims or our national dignity. He left to his successor no unsettled question between these two nations that was of any immediate importance, and he also left the feeling between them and their respective governments in a far better condition than he found it on his accession to the presidency. The long-standing and dangerous question of British dominion in Central America, in the hope of settling which Mr. Buchanan had accepted the mission to England, was still pending, but it was at length amicably and honorably settled, under his advice and approbation after he became president, by treaties between Great Britain and the two Central American states, in accordance with the American construction of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Another subject of contention that had long existed between the two countries was removed by President Buchanan in a summary and dignified way. The belligerent right of search had been exercised by Great Britain in the maritime war of 1812. In process of time she undertook to assert a right to detain and search, on the high seas, in time of peace, merchantmen suspected of being engaged in the slave-trade. In 1858 she despatched some cruisers with such orders to the coast of Cuba and the Gulf of Mexico. President Buchanan, always vigilant in protecting the commerce of the country, but mindful of the importance of preventing any necessity for war, remonstrated to the English government against this violation of the freedom of the seas. Then he sent a large naval force to the neighborhood of Cuba with instructions "to protect all vessels of the United States on the high seas from search or detention by the vessels of war of any other nation." The effect was most salutary. The British government receded, abandoned

the claim of the right of search, and recognized the principle of international law in favor of the freedom of the seas. During the whole of Mr. Buchanan's administration our relations with Mexico were in a complicated and critical position, in consequence of the internal condition of that country and of the danger of interference by European powers. Great outrages were committed in Mexico upon our citizens and their property, and their claims against that government exceeded \$10,000,000. Mr. Buchanan recommended to congress to send assistance to the constitutional government in Mexico, which had been forcibly superseded by military rule, but which still held the allegiance of the majority of the people, and to enforce redress for the wrongs of our citizens. He saw very clearly that, unless active measures should be taken by the government of the United States to reach a power with which a settlement of all claims and difficulties could be effected, some other nation would undertake to establish a government in Mexico, and the United States would then have to interfere, not only to secure the rights of their citizens, but to assert the principle of the Monroe doctrine. He also instructed the Mexican minister, Mr. McLane, to make a "Treaty of Transit and Commerce" and a "convention to enforce treaty stipulations, and to maintain order and security in the territory of the republics of Mexico and the United States." But congress took no notice of the president's recommendation, and refused to ratify the treaty and the convention. Mexico was left to the interference of Louis Napoleon; the establishment of an empire, under Maximilian, followed, for the embarrassment of President Lincoln's administration while we were in the throes of our civil war, and the claims of American citizens were to all appearance indefinitely postponed. Our relations with Spain were also in a very unsatisfactory condition at the beginning of Mr. Buchanan's term. There were many just claims of our citizens against the Spanish government for injuries received in Cuba, and Mr. Buchanan succeeded in having a "convention concluded at Madrid in 1860, establishing a joint commission for the final adjudication and payment of all the claims of the respective parties." The senate refused to ratify this convention also, probably because of the intense excitement against slavery, the convention having authorized the presenting before the commissioners of a Spanish claim against the United States for the value of certain

slaves. In the settlement of claims against the government of Paraguay the president's firm policy was seconded by congress, and he was authorized to send a commissioner to that country accompanied by "a naval force sufficient to exact justice should negotiation fail." This was entirely successful; full indemnification was obtained without any resort to arms. Mr. Buchanan's negotiations with China, conducted through William B. Reed as minister, were also successful; a treaty was concluded in 1858, which established very satisfactory commercial relations with that country and secured the liquidation of all claims. June 22, 1860, Mr. Buchanan vetoed a bill "to secure homesteads to actual settlers in the public domain, and for other purposes." The other purposes contemplated donations to the states. The ground of the veto was that the power "to dispose of" the territory of the United States did not authorize congress to donate public lands to the states for their domestic purposes. In the senate the bill failed to receive the two thirds majority necessary to pass it over the veto. In internal affairs the preceding administration of President Pierce had left a legacy of trouble to his successor in the repeal of the Missouri compromise, which was followed by a terrible period of lawlessness and bloodshed in Kansas, under what was called "squatter sovereignty," the slavery and the anti-slavery parties among the settlers struggling for supremacy. The pro-slavery party sustained the territorial government and obtained control of its legislature. The anti-slavery party repudiated this legislature and held a convention at Topeka to institute an opposition government. Congress had recognized the authority of the territorial government, and Mr. Buchanan, as president, had no alternative but to recognize and uphold it also. The fact that the legislature of that government was in the hands of the pro-slavery party made the course he adopted seem as if he favored their pro-slavery designs, while, in truth, he had no object to subserve but to sustain, as he was officially obliged to sustain, the government that congress had recognized as the lawful government of the territory. Now, throughout the north, the press and the pulpit began to teem with denunciations of the new president, who had not allowed revolutionary violence to prevail over the law of the land, and this was kept up throughout his administration. The anti-slavery party gained ground, and the election of 1860 resulted in the tri-

umph of Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Buchanan was a conservative and far-seeing man, who, though opposed to slavery, believed that the blind and fanatical interference of the northern abolitionists in the domestic affairs of the southern states would excite the latter in a manner dangerous to the peace and prosperity of the union. His messages constantly recommended conciliatory legislative measures; but congress paid no attention to his advice. Finally the election of Mr. Lincoln was seized upon as the signal in South Carolina for the breaking out of her old doctrine of secession. She passed her ordinance of secession on 20 Dec., 1860. Mr. Buchanan never for a moment admitted that a state had any power to secede from the union. South Carolina had once and forever adopted and ratified the constitution of the United States, and he maintained that she had by this act permanently resigned certain powers to the federal government, and that she could not, by her own will and without the consent of the other states, resume those powers and declare herself independent. She could, if actually oppressed by the general government, seek to redress her wrongs by revolution; but never by secession. He refused to receive, in their assumed official capacity, the commissioners sent by South Carolina, in December, 1860, to treat with him as with a foreign power. In October, 1860, before the election, Mr. Buchanan received from Gen. Scott, the general-in-chief of the army, a communication saying that, in the event of Mr. Lincoln's election, Gen. Scott anticipated that there would be a secession of one or more of the southern states; and that, from the general rashness of the southern character, there was danger of a "preliminary" seizure of certain southern forts. This paper became known as "General Scott's Views." It was the foundation, at a later period, of a charge that President Buchanan had been warned by Gen. Scott of the danger of leaving the southern forts without sufficient garrisons to prevent surprises, and that he had neglected this warning. Mr. Buchanan, who had publicly denied the right of secession, could not furnish the southern states with any justification of such a proceeding by prematurely re-enforcing the forts as if he anticipated secession. But, even if the president had wished to adopt such a measure, there were, as Gen. Scott himself said, but five companies of regular troops, or 400 men, available for the garrisoning of nine fortifications in six highly excited southern states. The remain-

der of the army was scattered over the western plains. Scott's views were clearly impracticable, and produced no impression upon the president's mind.

Mr. Buchanan has been often and severely reproached for a "temporizing policy" and a want of such vigor as might have averted the civil war; but the policy of Mr. Lincoln's administration, until after the attack on Fort Sumter, was identical with that of Mr. Buchanan. In his annual message of 5 Dec., 1860, Mr. Buchanan stated clearly and forcibly his denial of the right of secession, and also his conviction that if a state should adopt such an unconstitutional measure the federal government had no power, under the constitution, to make aggressive war upon her to compel her to remain in the union; but at the same time drawing a definite distinction between this and the right of the use of force against individuals, in spite of secession, in enforcing the execution of federal laws and in the preservation of federal property. This doctrine met the secessionists upon their own ground; for it denied that a state ordinance of secession could absolve its people from obeying the laws of the United States. Mr. Buchanan thus framed the only justifiable basis of a civil war, and left upon the records of the country the clear line of demarcation that would have to be observed by his successor and would make the use of force, if force must be used, a war, not of aggression, but of defence. In order to disarm all unreasonable opposition from the south, Mr. Buchanan urged upon congress the adoption of an "explanatory amendment" of the constitution, which should effectually secure to slave-holders all their constitutional rights. From all parts of the country, north and south, he received private letters approving, on various grounds, the tone of the message; but nearly the whole of the republican party saw fit to treat it as a denial by the president of any power to enforce the laws against the citizens of a state after secession, and even after actual rebellion; while this very power, emphatically stated as it was in the message, was made by the secessionists their ground of attack. It was the great misfortune of Mr. Buchanan's position that he had to appeal to a congress in which there were two sectional parties breathing mutual defiance; in which broad and patriotic statesmanship was confined to a small body of men, who could not win over to their views a sufficient number from either of the

parties to make up a majority upon any proposition whatever. In the hope of preventing the secession of South Carolina, the president sent Caleb Cushing to Charleston, with a letter to Gov. Pickens, urging the people of the state to await the action of congress.

After the actual secession of South Carolina, Mr. Buchanan's two great objects were: 1. To confine the area of secession, so that if there was to be a southern confederacy it might comprehend only the cotton states, which were most likely to act together. 2. To induce congress to prepare for a civil war in case one should be precipitated. While he made it apparent to congress that at that time he was without the necessary executive powers to enforce the collection of the revenue in South Carolina, he did not fail to call for the appropriate powers and means. But at no time during that session did a single republican senator (and the republicans had a majority in the senate), in any form whatever, give his vote or his influence for any measure that would strengthen the hands of the president either in maintaining peace or in executing the laws of the United States. Whatever was the governing motive for their inaction, it never can be said that they were not seasonably warned by the president that a policy of inaction would be fatal. That policy not only crippled him, but crippled his successor. When Mr. Lincoln came into office, seven states had already seceded, and not a single law had been put upon the statute-book that would enable the executive to meet such a condition of the union. Mr. Crittenden, of Kentucky, had introduced into the senate a resolution, which became known as the "Crittenden Compromise," providing in substance for a restoration of the Missouri compromise-line of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ ; and it was proposed that this question should be referred to a direct vote of the people in the several states. On 8 Jan., 1861, Mr. Buchanan sent a special message to congress, strongly recommending the adoption of this measure; but it produced no effect. During the last three months of his term there were several changes in his cabinet. Mr. Cobb resigned his portfolio on 8 Dec., 1860, and Mr. Thomas, who succeeded him as secretary of the treasury, also resigned on 11 Jan., their sympathies being with the secessionists. This department was then taken by Gen. John A. Dix. Mr. Thompson, secretary of the interior, resigned on 8 Jan., also because he

My dear Sir /

I send what I have

sketched for your supervision & correction or addition. You will oblige me much by attending to the business immediately. I have but little time. Y<sup>r</sup> friend

James Buchanan





was a southern man, and the duties of this office were subsequently performed by Moses Kelly, chief clerk. Gen. Cass and Gov. Floyd resigned their offices in December; Judge Black was transferred from the attorney-generalship to the state department, and Edwin M. Stanton became attorney-general. Joseph Holt succeeded Secretary Floyd in the war department.

The two critical questions which it was important that the president should correctly and consistently decide were, whether he was to receive in their assumed official character any commissioners sent by the southern states as to a foreign power, and whether re-enforcements should be sent to Maj. Anderson at Fort Sumter, or to any other southern fort. Mr. Buchanan always refused to receive both the South Carolina commissioners and also Mr. Crawford, the first of the commissioners from the confederate government at Montgomery, who arrived in Washington just before the close of his term; he thus left the new president entirely free to act as he saw best, and entirely untrammelled by any previous pledges. As to re-enforcements for southern forts, Maj. Anderson was instructed to report to the government any necessity for assistance, and in the mean time an expedition was fitted out at New York and held in readiness to sail at an hour's notice. Until the close of Mr. Buchanan's administration, Maj. Anderson considered himself sufficiently strong, and agreed with the president that any unnecessary movement of troops would be regarded by the south as a menace and would provoke hostilities. Mr. Buchanan would not initiate a civil war; his policy was entirely defensive; and yet he did all that he could, constitutionally, to avert a war. It has often been asked, Why did Mr. Buchanan suffer state after state to go out of the union? Why did he not call on the north for volunteers, and put down rebellion in its first stage? The president had no power to call for volunteers under any existing law; congress, during the whole winter, refused to pass any law to provide him with men or money. In the application of all the means that he had for protecting the public property, he omitted no step that could have been taken with safety, and, at the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, Maj. Anderson not only held Fort Sumter, but had held it down to that time in perfect confidence that he could maintain his position.

On 9 March, 1861, Mr. Buchanan returned to his home at Wheatland, a view of which appears on page 287, rejoicing to be free from the cares of a long and responsible public life, and welcomed by an immense gathering of his neighbors and the citizens of Lancaster. Here he lived quietly for the remaining seven years of his life, taking, however, a lively interest in public affairs, and always supporting, with his influence as a private citizen, the maintenance of the war for the restoration of the union. His health was generally good throughout his whole life. After his final return to Wheatland he began to be attacked occasionally by rheumatic gout, and this malady at last terminated his life in his seventy-eighth year. His remains were interred in a cemetery near Lancaster. No man was ever treated with greater injustice than he was during the last seven years of his life by a large part of the public. Men said he was a secessionist; he was a traitor; he had given away the authority of the government; he had been weak and vacillating; he had shut his eyes when men about him, the very ministers of his cabinet, were plotting the destruction of the union; he was old and timid; he might have crushed an incipient rebellion, and he had encouraged it. But he bore all this with patience and dignity, forbearing to say anything against the new administration, and confident that posterity would acknowledge that he had done his duty. In 1862 he was attacked by Gen. Scott, who made several statements concerning the president's management of the Fort Sumter affairs during the last winter of his administration, which Mr. Buchanan successfully refuted. Mr. Buchanan's loyalty to the constitution of the United States was unbounded. He was not a man of brilliant genius, nor did he ever do any one thing to make his name illustrious and immortal, as Webster did when he defended the constitution against the heresy of nullification. But in the course of a long, useful, and consistent life, filled with the exercise of talents of a fine order and uniform ability, he had made the constitution of his country the object of his deepest affection, the constant guide of all his public acts. He published a vindication of the policy of his administration during the last months of his term, "Buchanan's Administration" (New York, 1866). See "Life of President Buchanan," by George Ticknor Curtis (2 vols., New York, 1883).

HARRIET LANE JOHNSTON was born in Mercersburg, Pa., in 1833. She is the daughter of Elliott T. Lane and his wife, June Buchanan, who, dying, left her to the care of her uncle, James Buchanan. She was educated at the Roman Catholic convent in Georgetown, D. C., and, on the appointment of Mr. Buchanan to the English mission in 1853, accompanied him to London, where she dispensed the hospitalities of the embassy. During his term as chief magistrate she was mistress of the White House, over which she presided with grace and dignity, receiving, among other distinguished guests, the Prince of Wales and his party. In 1866 she married Henry Elliott Johnston, of Maryland, and since that event has resided in Baltimore, Washington, and at Wheatland, surviving her husband and their two sons.



*H. E. Johnston*

## ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, sixteenth president of the United States, born in Hardin county, Ky., 12 Feb., 1809; died in Washington, D. C., 15 April, 1865. His earliest ancestor in America seems to have been Samuel Lincoln, of Norwich, England, who settled in Hingham, Mass., where he died, leaving a son, Mordecai, whose son of the same name removed to Monmouth, N. J., and thence to Berks county, Pa., dying there in 1735. He was a man of some property, which at his death was divided among his sons and daughters, one of whom, John Lincoln, having disposed of his land in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, established himself in Rockingham county, Va. The records of that county show that he was possessed of a valuable estate, which was divided among five sons, one of whom, named Abraham, emigrated to Kentucky about 1780. At this time Daniel Boone was engaged in those labors and exploits in the new country of Kentucky that have rendered his name illustrious; and there is no doubt that Abraham Lincoln was induced by his friendship for Boone to give up what seems to have been an assured social position in Virginia and take his family to share with him the risks and hardships of life in the new territory. The families of Boone and Lincoln had been closely allied for many years. Several marriages had taken place between them, and their names occur in each other's wills as friends and executors. The pioneer Lincoln, who took with him what for the time and place was a sufficient provision in money, the result of the sale of his property in Virginia, acquired by means of cash and land-warrants a large estate in Kentucky, as is shown by the records of Jefferson and Campbell counties. About 1784 he was killed by Indians while working with his three sons—Mordecai, Josiah, and Thomas—in clearing the forest. His widow removed after his death to



Engr. by A. F. Hall, New York.

*A. Lincoln*



Washington county, and there brought up her family. The two elder sons became reputable citizens, and the two daughters married in a decent condition of life. Thomas, the youngest son, seems to have been below the average of the family in enterprise and other qualities that command success. He learned the trade of a carpenter, and married, 12 June, 1806, Nancy Hanks, a niece of the man with whom he learned his trade. She is represented, by those who knew her at the time of her marriage, as a handsome young woman of twenty-three, of appearance and intellect superior to her lowly fortunes. The young couple began housekeeping with little means. Three children were born to them; the first, a girl, who grew to maturity, married, and died, leaving no children; the third, a boy, who died in infancy; the second was Abraham Lincoln. Thomas Lincoln remained in Kentucky until 1816, when he resolved to remove to the still newer country of Indiana, and settled in a rich and fertile forest country near Little Pigeon creek, not far distant from the Ohio river. The family suffered from diseases incident to pioneer life, and Mrs. Lincoln died in 1818 at the age of thirty-five. Thomas Lincoln, while on a visit to Kentucky, married a worthy, industrious, and intelligent widow named Sarah Bush Johnston. She was a woman of admirable order and system in her habits, and brought to the home of the pioneer in the Indiana timber many of the comforts of civilized life. The neighborhood was one of the roughest. The president once said of it: "It was a wild region, with many bears and other wild animals still in the woods, and there were some schools, so called; but no qualification was ever required of a teacher beyond readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule of three. If a straggler supposed to understand Latin happened to sojourn in the neighborhood, he was looked upon as a wizard. There was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education." But in spite of this the boy Abraham made the best use of the limited opportunities afforded him, and learned all that the half-educated backwoods teachers could impart; and



*Abraham Lincoln.*

besides this he read over and over all the books he could find. He practised constantly the rules of arithmetic, which he had acquired at school, and began, even in his early childhood, to put in writing his recollections of what he had read and his impressions of what he saw about him. By the time he was nineteen years of age he had acquired a remarkably clear and serviceable handwriting, and showed sufficient business capacity to be intrusted with a cargo of farm products, which he took to New Orleans and sold. In 1830 his father emigrated once more, to Macon county, Ill. Lincoln had by this time attained his extraordinary stature of six feet four inches, and with it enormous muscular strength, which was at once put at the disposal of his father in building his cabin, clearing the field, and splitting from the walnut forests, which were plentiful in that county, the rails with which the farm was fenced. Thomas Lincoln, however, soon deserted this new home, his last migration being to Goose Nest Prairie, in Coles county, where he died in 1851, seventy-three years of age. In his last days he was tenderly cared for by his son.


Abraham Lincoln left his father's house as soon as the farm was fenced and cleared, hired himself to a man named Denton Offutt, in Sangamon county, assisted him to build a flat-boat, accompanied him to New Orleans on a trading voyage, and returned with him to New Salem, in Menard county, where Offutt opened a store for the sale of general merchandise. Little was accomplished in this way, and Lincoln employed his too abundant leisure in constant reading and study. He learned during this time the elements of English grammar, and made a beginning in the study of surveying and the principles of law. But the next year an Indian war began, occasioned by the return of Black Hawk with his bands of Sacs and Foxes from Iowa to Illinois. Lincoln volunteered in a company raised in Sangamon county, and was immediately elected captain. His company was organized at Richland on 21 April, 1832; but his service in command of it was brief, for it was mustered out on 27 May. Lincoln immediately re-enlisted as a private, and served for several weeks in that capacity, being finally mustered out on 16 June, 1832, by Lieut. Robert Anderson, who afterward commanded Fort Sumter at the beginning of the civil war. He returned home and began a hasty canvass for election to the legislature. His name had been announced



in the spring before his enlistment; but now only ten days were left before the election, which took place in August. In spite of these disadvantages, he made a good race and was far from the foot of the poll. Although he was defeated, he gained the almost unanimous vote of his own neighborhood, New Salem giving him 277 votes against 3. He now began to look about him for employment, and for a time thought seriously of learning the trade of a blacksmith; but an opportunity presented itself to buy the only store in the settlement, which he did, giving his notes for the whole amount involved. He was associated with an idle and dissolute partner, and the business soon went to wreck, leaving Lincoln burdened with a debt which it required several years of frugality and industry for him to meet; but it was finally paid in full. After this failure he devoted himself with the greatest earnestness and industry to the study of law. He was appointed postmaster of New Salem in 1833, an office which he held for three years. The emoluments of the place were very slight, but it gave him opportunities for reading. At the same time he was appointed deputy to John Calhoun, the county surveyor, and, his modest wants being supplied by these two functions, he gave his remaining leisure unreservedly to the study of law and politics. He was a candidate for the legislature in August, 1834, and was elected this time at the head of the list. He was re-elected in 1836, 1838, and 1840, after which he declined further election. After entering the legislature he did not return to New Salem, but, having by this time attained some proficiency in the law, he removed to Springfield, where he went into partnership with John T. Stuart, whose acquaintance he had begun in the Black Hawk war and continued at Vandalia. He took rank from the first among the leading members of the legislature. He was instrumental in having the state capital removed from Vandalia to Springfield, and during his eight years of service his ability, industry, and weight of character gained him such standing among his associates that in his last two terms he was the candidate of his party for the speakership of the house of representatives. In 1846 he was elected to congress, his opponent being the Rev. Peter Cartwright. The most important congressional measure with which his name was associated during his single term of service was a scheme for the emancipation of the slaves in the District of Columbia, which in the prevail-

ing temper of the time was refused consideration by congress. He was not a candidate for re-election, but for the first and only time in his life he applied for an executive appointment, the commissionership of the general land-office. The place was given to another man, but President Taylor's administration offered Mr. Lincoln the governorship of the territory of Oregon, which he declined.

Mr. Lincoln had by this time become the most influential exponent of the principles of the Whig party in Illinois, and his services were in request in every campaign. After his return from congress he devoted himself with great assiduity and success to the practice of law, and speedily gained a commanding position at the bar. As he says himself, he was losing his interest in politics when the repeal of the Missouri compromise aroused him again. The profound agitation of the question of slavery, which in 1854 followed the repeal of the Missouri compromise, awakened all the energies of Lincoln's nature. He regarded this act, in which Senator Douglas was the most prominent agent of the reactionary party, as a gross breach of faith, and began at once a series of earnest political discussions which immediately placed him at the head of the party that, not only in Illinois but throughout the west, was speedily formed to protest against and oppose the throwing open of the territories to the encroachments of slavery. The legislature



elected in Illinois in the heat of this discussion contained a majority of members opposed to the policy of Douglas. The duty of selecting a senator in place of Gen. Shields, whose term was closing, devolved upon this legislature, and Mr. Lincoln was the unanimous choice of the Whig members. But they did

not command a clear majority of the legislature. There were four members of Democratic antecedents who, while they were ardently opposed to the extension of slavery, were not willing to cast their votes for a Whig candidate, and adhered tenaciously through several ballots to Lyman Trumbull, a Democrat of their own way of thinking. Lincoln, fearing that this dissension among the anti-slavery men might result in the elec-

tion of a supporter of Douglas, urged his friends to go over in a body to the support of Trumbull, and his influence was sufficient to accomplish this result. Trumbull was elected, and for many years served the Republican cause in the senate with ability and zeal.

As soon as the Republican party became fully organized in the nation, embracing in its ranks the anti-slavery members of the old Whig and Democratic parties, Mr. Lincoln, by general consent, took his place at the head of the party in Illinois; and when, in 1858, Senator Douglas sought a re-election to the senate, the Republicans with one voice selected Mr. Lincoln as his antagonist. He had already made several speeches of remarkable eloquence and power against the pro-slavery reaction of which the Nebraska bill was the significant beginning, and when Mr. Douglas returned to Illinois to begin his canvass for the senate, he was challenged by Mr. Lincoln to a series of joint discussions. The challenge was accepted, and the most remarkable oratorical combat the state has ever witnessed took place between them during the summer. Mr. Douglas defended his thesis of non-intervention with slavery in the territories (the doctrine known as "popular sovereignty," and derided as "squatter sovereignty") with remarkable adroitness and energy. The ground that Mr. Lincoln took was higher and bolder than had yet been assumed by any American statesman of his time. In the brief and sententious speech in which he accepted the championship of his party, before the Republican convention of 16 June, 1858, he uttered the following pregnant and prophetic words: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect that it will cease to be divided. It will become all the one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, north as well as south." This bold utterance excited the fears of his timid friends, and laid him open to the hackneyed and conventional attacks of the supporters of slavery; but throughout the contest, while he did not for an instant lower this lofty tone of op-

position to slavery and hope of its extinction, he refused to be crowded by the fears of his friends or the denunciations of his enemies away from the strictly constitutional ground upon which his opposition was made. The debates between him and Senator Douglas aroused extraordinary interest throughout the state and the country. The men were perhaps equally matched in oratorical ability and adroitness in debate, but Lincoln's superiority in moral insight, and especially in far-seeing political sagacity, soon became apparent. The most important and significant of the debates was that which took place at Freeport. Mr. Douglas had previously asked Mr. Lincoln a series of questions intended to embarrass him, which Lincoln without the slightest reserve answered by a categorical yes or no. At Freeport, Lincoln, taking his turn, inquired of Douglas whether the people of a territory could in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a state constitution. By his reply, intimating that slavery might be excluded by unfriendly territorial legislation, Douglas gained a momentary advantage in the anti-slavery region in which he spoke, but dealt a fatal blow to his popularity in the south, the result of which was seen two years afterward at the Charleston convention. The ground assumed by Senator Douglas was, in fact, utterly untenable, and Lincoln showed this in one of his terse sentences. "Judge Douglas holds," he said, "that a thing may lawfully be driven away from a place where it has a lawful right to go."

This debate established the reputation of Mr. Lincoln as one of the leading orators of the Republican party of the Union, and a speech that he delivered at Cooper Institute, in New York, on 27 Feb., 1860, in which he showed that the unbroken record of the founders of the republic was in favor of the restriction of slavery and against its extension, widened and confirmed his reputation; so that when the Republican convention came together in Chicago in May, 1860, he was nominated for the presidency on the third ballot, over William H. Seward, who was his principal competitor. The Democratic convention, which met in Charleston, S. C., broke up after numerous fruitless ballots, and divided into two sections. The southern half, unable to trust Mr. Douglas with the interests of slavery after his Freeport speech, first adjourned to

Richmond, but again joined the other half at Baltimore, where a second disruption took place, after which the southern half nominated John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and the northern portion nominated Mr. Douglas. John Bell, of Tennessee, was nominated by the so-called Constitutional Union party. Lincoln, therefore, supported by the entire anti-slavery sentiment of the north, gained an easy victory over the three other parties. The election took place on 6 Nov., and when the electoral college cast their votes Lincoln was found to have 180, Breckinridge 72, Bell 39, and Douglas 12. The popular vote stood: for Lincoln, 1,866,462; for Douglas, 1,375,157; for Breckinridge, 847,953; for Bell, 590,631.

The extreme partisans of slavery had not even waited for the election of Lincoln, to begin their preparations for an insurrection, and as soon as the result was declared a movement for separation was begun in South Carolina, and it carried along with her the states of Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. A provisional government, styled the "Confederate States of America," of which Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, was made president, was promptly organized, and seized, with few exceptions, all the posts, arsenals, and public property of the United States within their limits. Confronted by this extraordinary crisis, Mr. Lincoln kept his own counsel, and made no public expression of his intentions or his policy until he was inaugurated on 4 March, 1861.

He called about him a cabinet of the most prominent members of the anti-slavery parties of the nation, giving no preference to any special faction. His secretary of state was William H. Seward, of New York, who had been his principal rival for the nomination, and whose eminence and abilities designated him as the leading member of the administration; the secretary of the treasury was Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, whose pre-eminence in the west was as unquestioned as Seward's in the east; of war, Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, the most influential politician of that state; of the navy, Gideon Welles, of Connecticut; of the interior, Caleb B. Smith, of Indiana; the border slave-states were represented in the government by Edward Bates, of Missouri, attorney-general, and Montgomery Blair, of Maryland, postmaster-general—both of them men of great distinction of character and high standing as lawyers. Seward, Smith, and Bates were of Whig antecedents; all the

rest of Democratic. The cabinet underwent, in the course of Mr. Lincoln's term, the following modifications: Sec. Chase, after a brilliant administration of the finances, resigned in 1864 from personal reasons, and was succeeded by William P. Fessenden, of Maine; Sec. Cameron left the war department at the close of the year 1861, and was appointed minister to Russia, and his place was taken by Edwin M. Stanton, a war Democrat of singular energy and vigor, and equal ability and devotion; Sec. Smith, accepting a judgeship, gave way to John P. Usher, of Indiana; Attorney-General Bates resigned in the last year of the administration, and was succeeded by James Speed, of Kentucky; and Postmaster-General Blair about the same time gave way to William Dennison, of Ohio.



In his inaugural address President Lincoln treated the acts of secession as a nullity. He declared the Union perpetual and inviolate, and announced with perfect firmness, though with the greatest moderation of speech and feeling, the intention of the government to maintain its authority and to hold the places under its jurisdiction. He made an elaborate and unanswerable

argument against the legality as well as the justice of secession, and further showed, with convincing clearness, that peaceful secession was impossible. "Can aliens make treaties," he said, "easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war; you cannot fight always, and when, after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you." He pleaded for peace in a strain of equal tenderness and dignity, and in closing he said: "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will

not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have a most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it." This speech profoundly affected the public opinion of the north; but in the excited state of sentiment that then controlled the south it naturally met only contempt and defiance in that section. A few weeks later the inevitable war began, in an attack upon Fort Sumter by the secessionists of South Carolina under Gen. P. G. T. Beauregard, and after a long bombardment the fort surrendered on 13 April, 1861. The president instantly called for a force of 75,000 three-months' militiamen, and three weeks later ordered the enlistment of 64,000 soldiers and 18,000 seamen for three years. He set on foot a blockade of the southern ports, and called congress together in special session, choosing for their day of meeting the 4th of July. The remaining states of the south rapidly arrayed themselves on one side or the other; all except Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri were drawn into the secession movement, and the western part of Virginia, adhering to the Union, under the name of West Virginia, separated itself from that ancient commonwealth.

The first important battle of the war took place at Bull Run, near Manassas station, Va., 21 July, 1861, and resulted in the defeat of the National troops under Gen. Irwin McDowell by a somewhat larger force of the Confederates under Gens. Joseph E. Johnston and Beauregard. Though the loss in killed and wounded was not great, and was about the same on both sides, the victory was still one of the utmost importance for the Confederates, and gave them a great increase of prestige on both sides of the Atlantic. They were not, however, able to pursue their advantage. The summer was passed in enlisting, drilling, and equipping a formidable National army on the banks of the Potomac, which was given in charge of Gen. George B. McClellan, a young officer who had distinguished himself by a successful campaign in western Virginia. In spite of the urgency of the government, which was increased by the earnestness of the people and their representatives in congress, Gen. McClellan made no advance until the spring of 1862, when Gen. Johnston, in command of the Confederate army, evacuated the position which, with about 45,000 men, he had held during the autumn and winter against the Army of the

Potomac, amounting to about 177,000 effectives. Gen. McClellan then transferred his army to the peninsula between the James and York rivers. Although there was but a force of 16,000 opposed to him when he landed, he spent a month before the works at Yorktown, and when he was prepared to open fire upon them they were evacuated, and Gen. Johnston retreated to the neighborhood of Richmond. The battle of Seven Pines, in which the Confederates, successful in their first attack, were afterward repelled, was fought on 31 May, 1862. Johnston was wounded, and the command devolved upon Gen. Robert E. Lee, who in the latter part of June moved out from his position before Richmond and attacked McClellan's right flank, under Gen. Fitz-John Porter, at Gaines's Mills, north of the Chickahominy. Porter, with one corps, resisted the Confederate army all day with great gallantry, unassisted by the main army under McClellan, but withdrew in the evening, and McClellan at once began his retreat to the James river. Several battles were fought on the way, in which the Confederates were checked; but the retreat continued until the National army reached the James. Taking position at Malvern Hill, they inflicted a severe defeat upon Gen. Lee, but were immediately after withdrawn by Gen. McClellan to Harrison's Landing. Here, as at other times during his career, McClellan labored under a strange hallucination as to the numbers of his enemy. He generally estimated them at not less than twice their actual force, and continually reproached the president for not giving him impossible re-enforcements to equal the imaginary numbers he thought opposed to him. In point of fact, his army was always in excess of that of Johnston or Lee. The continual disasters in the east were somewhat compensated by a series of brilliant successes in the west. In February, 1862, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant had captured the Confederate forts Henry and Donelson, thus laying open the great strategic lines of the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers, and, moving southward, had fought (6 and 7 April) the battle of Shiloh, with unfavorable results on the first day, which were turned to a victory on the second with the aid of Gen. D. C. Buell and his army, a battle in which Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston was killed and the Confederate invasion of Kentucky baffled. Farragut, on 24 April, had won a brilliant naval victory, over the twin forts above the mouths of the Mississippi, which resulted in



the capture of New Orleans and the control of the lower Mississippi. After Gen. McClellan's retreat to the James, the president visited the army at Harrison's Landing (8 July), and, after careful consultations with the corps commanders, became convinced that in the actual disposition of the officers and the troops there was no reasonable expectation of a successful movement upon Richmond by McClellan. An order was therefore issued for the withdrawal of the army from the James, and, Gen. Halleck having been appointed general-in-chief, Gen. Pope was sent forward from Washington with a small force to delay the Confederate army under Gen. Lee until the Army of the Potomac could arrive and be concentrated to support him. McClellan's movements, however, were so deliberate, and there was such a want of confidence and co-operation on the part of his officers toward Gen. Pope, that the National army met with a decisive defeat on the same battle-field of Bull Run that saw their first disaster. Gen. Pope, disheartened by the lack of sympathy and support that he discerned among the most eminent officers of the Army of the Potomac, retreated upon Washington, and Gen. McClellan, who seemed to be the only officer under whom the army was at the moment willing to serve, was placed in command of it. Gen. Lee, elated with his success, crossed the Potomac, but was met by the army under McClellan at South Mountain and Antietam, and after two days of great slaughter Lee retreated into Virginia.

President Lincoln availed himself of this occasion to give effect to a resolve that had long been maturing in his mind in an act the most momentous in its significance and results that the century has witnessed. For a year and a half he had been subjected to urgent solicitations from the two great political parties of the country, the one side appealing to him to take decided measures against slavery, and the other imploring him to pursue a conservative course in regard to that institution. His deep-rooted detestation of the system of domestic servitude was no secret to any one; but his reverence for the law, his regard for vested interests, and his anxiety to do nothing that should alienate any considerable body of the supporters of the government, had thus far induced him to pursue a middle course between the two extremes. Meanwhile the power of events had compelled a steady progress in the direction of emancipation. So early as August, 1861, congress had passed

an act to confiscate the rights of slave-owners in slaves employed in a manner hostile to the Union, and Gen. Frémont had seized the occasion of the passage of this act to issue an order to confiscate and emancipate the slaves of rebels in the state of Missouri. President Lincoln, unwilling, in a matter of such transcendent importance, to leave the initiative to any subordinate, revoked this order, and directed Gen. Frémont to modify it so that it should conform to the confiscation act of congress. This excited violent opposition to the president among the radical anti-slavery men in Missouri and elsewhere, while it drew upon him the scarcely less embarrassing importunities of the conservatives, who wished him to take still more decided ground against the radicals.




On 6 March, 1862, he sent a special message to congress inclosing a resolution, the passage of which he recommended, to offer pecuniary aid from the general government to states that should adopt the gradual abolishment of slavery. This resolution was promptly passed by congress; but in none of the slave-states was public

sentiment sufficiently advanced to permit them to avail themselves of it. The next month, however, congress passed a law emancipating slaves in the District of Columbia, with compensation to owners, and President Lincoln had the happiness of affixing his signature to a measure that he had many years before, while a representative from Illinois, fruitlessly urged upon the notice of congress. As the war went on, wherever the National armies penetrated there was a constant stream of fugitive slaves from the adjoining regions, and the commanders of each department treated the complicated questions arising from this body of "contrabands," as they came to be called, in their camps, according to their own judgment of the necessities or the expediencies of each case, a discretion which the president thought

best to tolerate. But on 9 May, 1862, Gen. David Hunter, an intimate and esteemed friend of Mr. Lincoln's, saw proper, without consultation with him, to issue a military order declaring all persons theretofore held as slaves in Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina forever free. The president, as soon as he received this order, issued a proclamation declaring it void, and reserving to himself the decision of the question whether it was competent for him, as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, to declare the slaves of any state or states free, and whether at any time or in any case it should have become a necessity indispensable to the maintenance of the government to exercise such supposed power, and prohibiting to commanders in the field the decision of such questions. But he added in his proclamation a significant warning and appeal to the slave-holding states, urging once more upon them the policy of emancipation by state action. "I do not argue," he said; "I beseech you to make the argument for yourselves. You cannot, if you would, be blind to the signs of the times. I beg of you a calm and enlarged consideration of them, ranging, if it may be, far above personal and partisan politics. This proposal makes common cause for a common object, casting no reproaches upon any. . . . Will you not embrace it? So much good has not been done, by one effort, in all past time, as in the providence of God it is now your high privilege to do. May the vast future not have cause to lament that you have neglected it." He had several times endeavored to bring this proposition before the members of congress from the loyal slave-holding states, and on 12 July he invited them to meet him at the executive mansion, and submitted to them a powerful and urgent appeal to induce their states to adopt the policy of compensated emancipation. He told them, without reproach or complaint, that he believed that if they had all voted for the resolution in the gradual emancipation message of the preceding March, the war would now have been substantially ended, and that the plan therein proposed was still one of the most potent and swift means of ending it. "Let the states," he said, "which are in rebellion see definitely and certainly that in no event will the states you represent ever join their proposed confederacy, and they cannot much longer maintain the contest." While urging this policy upon the conservatives, and while resolved in his own mind upon

emancipation by decree as a last resource, he was the subject of vehement attacks from the more radical anti-slavery supporters of the government, to which he replied with unflinching moderation and good temper. Although in July he had resolved upon his course, and had read to his cabinet a draft of a proclamation of emancipation which he had then laid aside for a more fitting occasion (on the suggestion from Mr. Seward that its issue in the disastrous condition of our military affairs would be interpreted as a sign of desperation), he met the reproaches of the radical Republicans, the entreaties of visiting delegations, and the persuasions of his eager friends with arguments showing both sides of the question of which they persisted in seeing only one. To Horace Greeley, on 22 Aug., Mr. Lincoln said: "My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that." And even so late as 13 Sept. he said to a delegation of a religious society, who were urging immediate action: "I do not want to issue a document that the whole world will see must necessarily be inoperative, like the pope's bull against the comet. . . . I view this matter as a practical war measure, to be decided on according to the advantages or disadvantages it may offer to the suppression of the rebellion." Still, he assured them that he had not decided against a proclamation of liberty to the slaves, but that the matter occupied his deepest thoughts. The retreat of Lee from Maryland after his defeat at Antietam seemed to the president to afford a proper occasion for the execution of his long-matured resolve, and on 22 Sept. he issued his preliminary proclamation, giving notice to the states in rebellion that, on 1 Jan., 1863, all persons held as slaves within any state or designated part of a state, the people whereof should then be in rebellion against the United States, should be then, thenceforward, and forever free. When congress came together on 1 Dec. he urged them to supplement what had already been done by constitutional action, concluding his message with this impassioned appeal: "Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us.

The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or in dishonor to the latest generation. We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honor-



able alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last, best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world

will forever applaud, and God must forever bless." It was hardly to be expected, however, that any action would be taken by congress before the lapse of the hundred days that the president had left between his warning and its execution. On 1 Jan., 1863, the final proclamation of emancipation was issued. It recited the preliminary document, and then designated the states in rebellion against the United States. They were Arkansas, Texas, a part of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, excepting certain counties. The proclamation then continued: "I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated states and parts of states are, and henceforward shall be, free; and that the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons." The criticisms and forebodings of the opponents of emancipation had well-nigh been exhausted during the previous three months, and the definitive proclamation was received with general enthusiasm throughout the loyal states. The dissatisfaction with which this important measure was regarded in the border states gradually died away, as did also the opposition in conservative quarters to the enlistment of negro soldiers. Their good conduct, their quick submission to discipline, and their excellent behavior in several battles, rapidly made an end of the prejudice against them; and when, in the winter session of congress of 1863-'4, Mr. Lincoln again urged upon the attention of that body the passage of a constitutional amendment abolishing slavery, his proposition met with the concurrence of a majority of congress, though it failed of the necessary two-third vote in the house of representatives. During the following year, however, public opinion made rapid progress, and the influence of the president with congress was largely increased after his triumphant re-election. In his annual message of 6 Dec., 1864, he once more pleaded, this time with irresistible force, in favor of constitutional emancipation in all the states. As there had been much controversy during the year in regard to the president's anti-slavery convictions, and the suggestion had been made in many quarters that, for the sake of peace, he might be induced to withdraw the proclamation, he repeated the declaration made the year before: "While I remain in my present position I shall not attempt to retract or modify the

emancipation proclamation; nor shall I return to slavery any person who is free by the terms of that proclamation or by any of the acts of congress. If the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an executive duty to re-enslave such persons, another, and not I, must be their instrument to perform it." This time congress acted with alacrity, and on 31 Jan., 1865, proposed to the states the 13th amendment to the constitution, providing that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. The states rapidly adopted the amendment by the action of their legislatures, and the president was especially pleased that his own state of Illinois led the van, having passed the necessary resolution within twenty-four hours. Before the year ended twenty-seven of the thirty-six states (being the necessary three fourths) had ratified the amendment, and President Johnson, on 18 Dec., 1865, officially proclaimed its adoption.

While the energies of the government and of the people were most strenuously occupied with the war and the questions immediately concerning it, the four years of Mr. Lincoln's administration had their full share of complicated and difficult questions of domestic and foreign concern. The interior and post-office departments made great progress in developing the means of communication throughout the country. Mr. Chase, as secretary of the treasury, performed, with prodigious ability and remarkable success, the enormous duties devolving upon him of providing funds to supply the army at an expense amounting at certain periods to \$3,000,000 a day; and Mr. Seward, in charge of the state department, held at bay the suppressed hostility of European nations. Of all his cabinet, the president sustained with Mr. Seward relations of the closest intimacy, and for that reason, perhaps, shared more directly in the labors of his department. He revised the first draft of most of Seward's important despatches, and changed and amended their language with remarkable wisdom and skill. He was careful to avoid all sources of controversy or ill-feeling with foreign nations, and when they occurred he did his best to settle them in the interests of peace, without a sacrifice of national dignity.

At the end of the year 1861 the friendly relations between

England and the United States were seriously threatened by the capture of the confederate envoys, James Murray Mason and John Slidell, on board a British merchant-ship. Public sentiment approved the capture, and, as far as could be judged by every manifestation in the press and in congress, was in favor of retaining the prisoners and defiantly refusing the demand of England for their return. But when the president, after mature deliberation, decided that the capture was against American precedents, and directed their return to British custody, the second thought of the country was with him. His prudence and moderation were also conspicuously displayed in his treatment of the question of the invasion of Mexico by France, and the establishment by military power of the emperor Maximilian in that country. Accepting as genuine the protestations of the emperor of the French, that he intended no interference with the will of the people of Mexico, he took no measures unfriendly to France or the empire, except those involved in the maintenance of unbroken friendship with the republican government under President Juarez, a proceeding that, although severely criticised by the more ardent spirits in congress, ended, after the president's death, in the triumph of the National party in Mexico and the downfall of the invaders. He left no doubt, however, at any time, in regard to his own conviction that "the safety of the people of the United States and the cheerful destiny to which they aspire are intimately dependent upon the maintenance of free republican institutions throughout Mexico." He dealt in a sterner spirit with the proposition for foreign mediation that the emperor of the French, after seeking in vain the concurrence of other European powers, at last presented singly at the beginning of 1863. This proposition, under the orders of the president, was declined by Mr. Seward on 6 Feb., in a despatch of remarkable ability and dignity, which put an end to all discussion of overtures of intervention from European powers. The diplomatic relations with England were exceedingly strained at several periods during the war. The building and fitting out of Confederate cruisers in English ports, and their escape, after their construction and its purpose had been made known by the American minister, more than once brought the two nations to the verge of war; but the moderation with which the claims of the United States were made by Mr. Lincoln, the energy and



ability displayed by Sec. Seward and by Mr. Charles Francis Adams in presenting these claims, and, it must now be recognized, the candor and honesty with which the matter was treated by Earl Russell, the British minister for foreign affairs, saved the two countries from that irreparable disaster; and the British government at last took such measures as were necessary to put an end to this indirect war from the shores of England upon American commerce. In the course of two years the war attained such proportions that volunteering was no longer a sufficient resource to keep the army, consisting at that time of nearly a million men, at its full fighting strength. Congress therefore authorized, and the departments executed, a scheme of enrolment and draft of the arms-bearing population of the loyal states. Violent opposition arose to this measure in many parts of the country; which was stimulated by the speeches of orators of the opposition, and led, in many instances, to serious breaches of the public peace. A frightful riot, beginning among the foreign population of New York, kept that city in disorder and terror for three days in July, 1863. But the riots were suppressed, the disturbances quieted at last, and the draft was executed throughout the country.

Clement L. Vallandigham, of Ohio, one of the most eloquent and influential orators of the Democratic party, was arrested in Ohio by Gen. Burnside for his violent public utterances in opposition to the war, tried by a military court, and sentenced to imprisonment during the continuance of the war. The president changed his sentence to that of transportation within the lines of the rebellion. These proceedings caused a great ferment among his party in Ohio, who, by way of challenge to the government, nominated him for governor of that state. A committee of its prominent politicians demanded from the president his restoration to his political rights, and a correspondence took place between them and the president, in which the rights and powers of the government in case of rebellion were set forth by him with great



lucidity and force. His letters exercised an important influence in the political discussions of the year, and Mr. Vallandigham was defeated in his candidacy by John Brough by a majority of 100,000 votes.

The war still continued at a rate that appears rapid enough in retrospect, but seemed slow to the eager spirits watching its course. The disasters of the Army of the Potomac did not end with the removal of Gen. McClellan, which took place in November, 1862, as a consequence of his persistent delay in pursuing Lee's retreating army after the battle of Antietam. Gen. Burnside, who succeeded him, suffered a humiliating defeat in his attack upon the intrenched position of the Confederates at Fredericksburg. Gen. Hooker, who next took command, after opening his campaign by crossing the Rapidan in a march of extraordinary brilliancy, was defeated at Chancellorsville, in a battle where both sides lost severely, and then retired again north of the river. Gen. Lee, leaving the National army on his right flank, crossed the Potomac, and Hooker having, at his own request, been relieved and succeeded by Gen. Meade, the two armies met in a three days' battle at Gettysburg, Pa., where Gen. Lee sustained a decisive defeat, and was driven back into Virginia. His flight from Gettysburg began on the evening of the 4th of July, a day that in this year doubled its lustre as a historic anniversary. For on this day Vicksburg, the most important Confederate stronghold in the west, surrendered to Gen. Grant. He had spent the early months of 1863 in successive attempts to take that fortress, all of which had failed; but on the last day of April he crossed the river at Grand Gulf, and within a few days fought the successful battles of Port Gibson, Raymond, Jackson, Champion Hills, and the Big Black river, and shut up the army of Pemberton in close siege in the city of Vicksburg, which he finally captured with about 30,000 men on the 4th of July.

The speech that Mr. Lincoln delivered at the dedication of the National cemetery on the battle-field of Gettysburg, 19 Nov., 1863, was at once recognized as the philosophy in brief of the whole great struggle, and has already become classic. There are slightly differing versions; the one that is here given is a literal transcript of the speech as he afterward wrote it out for a fair in Baltimore:

“Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth

on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

Gen. Grant was transferred to Chattanooga, where, in November, with the troops of Thomas, Hooker, and Sherman, he won the important victory of Missionary Ridge; and then, being appointed lieutenant-general and general-in-chief of the armies of the United States, he went to Washington and entered upon the memorable campaign of 1864. This campaign began with revived hopes on the part of the government, the people, and the army. The president, glad that the army had now at its head a general in whose ability and enterprise he could thoroughly confide, ceased from that moment to exercise any active influence on its movements. He wrote, on 30 April, to Gen. Grant: “The particulars of your plans I neither know nor seek to know. You are vigilant and self-reliant, and, pleased with this, I wish not to obtrude any constraints or restraints upon you. . . . If there is anything wanting which is in my power to give, do not fail to let me know it. And now, with a brave army and a just cause, may God sustain you.” Grant crossed the Rapidan on 4 May, intending to move by

the right flank of Gen. Lee; but the two armies came together in a gloomy forest called the Wilderness, where, from the 5th to the 7th of May, one of the most sanguinary battles known to modern warfare was fought. Neither side having gained any decisive advantage in this deadly struggle, Grant moved to the left, and Lee met him again at Spottsylvania Court-House, where for ten days a series of destructive contests took place, in which both sides were alternately successful. Still moving to the left, Grant again encountered the enemy at the crossing of North Anna river, and still later at Cold Harbor, a few miles northeast of Richmond, where, assaulting Gen. Lee's army in a fortified position, he met with a bloody repulse. He then crossed the James river, intending by a rapid movement to seize Petersburg and the Confederate lines of communication south of Richmond, but was baffled in this purpose, and forced to enter upon a regular siege of Petersburg, which occupied the summer and autumn. While these operations were in progress, Gen. Philip H. Sheridan had made one of the most brilliant cavalry raids in the war, threatening Richmond and defeating the Confederate cavalry under Gen. J. E. B. Stuart, and killing that famous leader. While Grant lay before Richmond, Gen. Lee, hoping to induce him to attack his works, despatched a force under Gen. Early to threaten Washington; but Grant sent two corps of his army northward, and Early—after a sharp skirmish under the fortifications of Washington, where Mr. Lincoln was personally present—was driven back through the Shenandoah valley, and on two occasions, in September and October, was signally defeated by Gen. Sheridan.


Gen. William T. Sherman, who had been left in command of the western district formerly commanded by Grant, moved southward at the same time that Grant crossed the Rapidan. Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, one of the ablest of the Confederate generals, retired gradually before him, defending himself at every halt with the greatest skill and address; but his movements not proving satisfactory to the Richmond government, he was removed, and Gen. John B. Hood appointed in his place. After a summer of hard fighting, Sherman, on 1 Sept., captured Atlanta, one of the chief manufacturing and railroad centres of the south, and later in the autumn organized and executed a magnificent march to the seaboard, which proved that the military power of the Confederacy had been concentrated at a few

points on the frontier, and that the interior was little more than an empty shell. He reached the sea-coast early in December, investing Savannah on the 10th, and capturing the city on the 21st. He then marched northward with the intention of assisting Gen. Grant in the closing scenes of the war. The army under Gen. George H. Thomas, who had been left in Tennessee to hold Hood in check while this movement was going on, after severely handling the Confederates in the preliminary battle of Franklin, 30 Nov., inflicted upon General Hood a crushing and final defeat in the battle of Nashville, 16 Dec., routing and driving him from the state.

During the summer, while Grant was engaged in the desperate and indecisive series of battles that marked his southward progress in Virginia, and Sherman had not yet set out upon his march to the sea, one of the most ardent political canvasses the country had ever seen was in progress at the north. Mr. Lincoln, on 8 June, had been unanimously renominated for the presidency by the Republican convention at Baltimore. The Democratic leaders had postponed their convention to a date unusually late, in the hope that some advantage might be reaped from the events of the summer. The convention came together on 29 Aug. in Chicago. Mr. Vallandigham, who had returned from his banishment, and whom the government had sagaciously declined to rearrest, led the extreme peace party in the convention. Prominent politicians of New York were present in the interest of Gen. McClellan. Both sections of the convention gained their point. Gen. McClellan was nominated for the presidency, and Mr. Vallandigham succeeded in imposing upon his party a platform declaring that the war had been a failure, and demanding a cessation of hostilities. The capture of Atlanta on the day the convention adjourned seemed to the Unionists a providential answer to the opposition. Republicans, who had been somewhat disheartened by the slow progress of military events and by the open and energetic agitation that the peace party had continued through the summer at the north, now took heart again, and the canvass proceeded with the greatest spirit to the close. Sheridan's victory over Early in the Shenandoah valley gave an added impulse to the general enthusiasm, and in the October elections it was shown that the name of Mr. Lincoln was more popular, and his influence more powerful, than any

one had anticipated. In the election that took place on 8 Nov., 1864, he received 2,216,000 votes, and Gen. McClellan 1,800,000. The difference in the electoral vote was still greater, Mr. Lincoln being supported by 212 of the presidential electors, while only 21 voted for McClellan.

President Lincoln's second inaugural address, delivered on 4 March, 1865, will forever remain not only one of the most remarkable of all his public utterances, but will also hold a high rank among the greatest state papers that history has preserved. As he neared the end of his career, and saw plainly outlined before him the dimensions of the vast moral and material success that the nation was about to achieve, his thoughts, always predisposed to an earnest and serious view of life, assumed a fervor and exaltation like that of the ancient seers and prophets. The speech that he delivered to the vast concourse at the eastern front of the capitol is the briefest of all the presidential addresses in our annals; but it has not its



equal in lofty eloquence and austere morality. The usual historical view of the situation, the ordinary presentment of the intentions of the government, seemed matters too trivial to engage the concern of a mind standing, as Lincoln's apparently did at this moment, face to face with the most tremendous problems of fate and moral responsibility. In the briefest words he announced what had been the cause of the war, and how the government had hoped to

bring it to an earlier close. With passionless candor he admitted that neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration it had attained. "Each looked for an easier triumph and a result less fundamental and astounding"; and, passing into a strain of rhapsody, which no lesser mind and character could ever dare to imitate, he said: "Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes his aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces. But let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered;



Nandala, Feb. 14<sup>th</sup> 1839

Dear Short

I have a note on Bank which falls due some time between the 20<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup> of this month— Butler stands as principal, and I as security; but I am in reality the principal— It will take between 50 & 55 dollars to renew it— Butler has more than that much money in his hands which he could either on a debt of mine or on a loan— I wish you to call at the Bank, have a note filled out by some signer below, get Butler to sign it, and also to let you have the money to renew it— Doing wot of any thing— Has not wot a damn— Your friend & friend  
A Lincoln



that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has his own purposes. 'Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh.' If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offences, which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both north and south this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.' With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

The triumphant election of Mr. Lincoln, no less than the steady progress of the National armies, convinced some of the more intelligent of the southern leaders that their cause was hopeless, and that it would be prudent to ascertain what terms of peace could be made before the utter destruction of their military power. There had been already several futile attempts at opening negotiations; but they had all failed of necessity, because neither side was willing even to consider the only terms that the other side would offer. There had never been a moment when Mr. Lincoln would have been willing to receive propositions of peace on any other basis than the recognition of the national integrity, and Mr. Davis steadfastly refused to the end to admit the possibility of the restoration of the national authority. In July, certain unauthorized persons in Canada, having persuaded Horace Greeley that negotiations might be opened through them with the Confederate authorities,

Mr. Lincoln despatched the great editor to Niagara Falls, and sent an open letter addressed, "To whom it may concern." It is in the possession of Mr. William H. Appleton, of New York. This document put an end to the negotiation. The Confederate emissaries in Canada and their principals in Richmond, made no use of this incident except to employ the president's letter as a text for denunciation of the National government. But later in the year, the hopelessness of the struggle having become apparent to some of the Confederate leaders, Mr. Davis was at last induced to send an embassy to Fortress Monroe, to inquire what terms of adjustment were possible. They were met by President Lincoln and the secretary of state in person. The plan proposed was one that had been suggested, on his own responsibility, by Mr. Francis Preston Blair, of Washington, in an interview he had been permitted to hold with Mr. Davis in Richmond, that the two armies should unite in a campaign against the French in Mexico for the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, and that the issues of the war should be postponed for future settlement. The president declined peremptorily to entertain this scheme, and repeated again the only conditions to which he could listen: The restoration of the national authority throughout all the states, the maintenance and execution of all the acts of the general government in regard to slavery, the cessation of hostilities, and the disbanding of the insurgent forces as a necessary prerequisite to the ending of the war. The Confederate agents reported at Richmond the failure of their embassy, and Mr. Davis denounced the conduct of President Lincoln in a public address full of desperate defiance. Nevertheless, it was evident even to the most prejudiced observers that the war could not continue much longer. Sherman's march had demonstrated the essential weakness of the Confederate cause; the soldiers of the Confederacy—who for four years, with the most stubborn gallantry, had maintained a losing fight—began to show signs of dangerous discouragement and insubordination; recruiting had ceased some time before, and desertion was going on rapidly. The army of Gen. Lee, which was the last bulwark of the Confederacy, still held its lines stoutly against the gradually enveloping lines of Grant; but their valiant commander knew it was only a question of how many days he could hold his works, and repeatedly counselled the government at Richmond to evacu-


ate that city, and allow the army to take up a more tenable position in the mountains. Gen. Grant's only anxiety each morning was lest he should find the army of Gen. Lee moving away from him, and late in March he determined to strike the final blow at the rebellion. Moving for the last time by the left flank, his forces under Sheridan fought and gained a brilliant victory over the Confederate left at Five Forks, and at the same time Gens. Humphreys, Wright, and Parke moved against the Confederate works, breaking their lines and capturing many prisoners and guns. Petersburg was evacuated on 2 April. The Confederate government fled from Richmond the same afternoon and evening, and Grant, pursuing the broken and shattered remnant of Lee's army, received their surrender at Appomattox Court-House on 9 April. About 28,000 Confederates signed the parole, and an equal number had been killed, captured, and dispersed in the operations immediately preceding the surrender. Gen. Sherman, a few days afterward, received the surrender of Johnston, and the last Confederate army, under Gen. Edmund Kirby Smith, west of the Mississippi, laid down its arms.

President Lincoln had himself accompanied the army in its last triumphant campaign, and had entered Richmond immediately after its surrender, receiving the cheers and benedictions not only of the negroes whom he had set free, but of a great number of white people, who were weary of the war and welcomed the advent of peace. Returning to Washington with his mind filled with plans for the restoration of peace and orderly government throughout the south, he seized the occasion of a serenade, on 11 April, to deliver to the people who gathered in front of the executive mansion his last speech on public affairs, in which he discussed with unusual dignity and force the problems of reconstruction, then crowding upon public consideration. As his second inaugural was the greatest of all his rhetorical compositions, so this brief political address, which closed his public career, is unsurpassed among his speeches for clearness and wisdom, and for a certain tone of gentle but unmistakable authority, which shows to what a mastery of statecraft he had attained. He congratulated the country upon the decisive victories of the last week; he expressly asserted that, although he had been present in the final operations, "no part of the honor, for plan or execution, was his";

and then, with equal boldness and discretion, announced the principles in accordance with which he should deal with the restoration of the states. He refused to be provoked into controversy, which he held would be purely academic, over the question whether the insurrectionary states were in or out of the Union. "As appears to me," he said, "that question has not been, nor yet is, a practically material one, and any discussion of it, while it thus remains practically immaterial, could have no effect other than the mischievous one of dividing our friends. As yet, whatever it may hereafter become, that question is bad, as the basis of a controversy, and good for nothing at all—a merely pernicious abstraction. We all agree that the seceded states, so-called, are out of their proper practical relation with the Union, and that the sole object of the government, civil and military, in regard to those states, is to again get them into that proper practical relation. I believe it is not only possible, but in fact easier, to do this without deciding, or even considering, whether these states have ever been out of the Union than with it. Finding themselves safely at home, it would be utterly immaterial whether they had ever been abroad. Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restoring the proper practical relations between these states and the Union, and each forever after innocently indulge his own opinion whether in doing the acts he brought the states from without into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it." In this temper he discussed the recent action of the Unionists of Louisiana, where 12,000 voters had sworn allegiance, giving his full approval to their course, but not committing himself to any similar method in other cases; "any exclusive and inflexible plan would surely become a new entanglement. . . . If we reject and spurn them, we do our utmost to disorganize and disperse them. We, in effect, say to the white men, 'You are worthless or worse, we will neither help you, nor be helped by you.' To the blacks we say, 'This cup of liberty which these, your old masters, hold to your lips, we will dash from you and leave you to the chances of gathering the spilled and scattered contents in some vague and undefined when, where, and how. . . . If, on the contrary, we sustain the new government of Louisiana, the converse is made true. Concede that it is only to what it should be as the egg is to the fowl, we shall sooner have the fowl by hatching

the egg than by smashing it." These words were the last he uttered in public; on 14 April, at a cabinet meeting, he developed these views in detail, and found no difference of opinion among his advisers. The same evening he attended a performance of "Our American Cousin" at Ford's theatre, in Tenth street. He was accompanied by Mrs. Lincoln and two friends—Miss Harris, a daughter of Senator Ira Harris, of New York, and Maj. Henry R. Rathbone. In the midst of the play a shot was heard, and a man was seen to leap from the president's box to the stage. Brandishing a dripping knife, with which, after shooting the president, he had stabbed Maj. Rathbone, and shouting, "Sic semper tyrannis!—the south is avenged!" he rushed to the rear of the building, leaped upon a horse, which was held there in readiness for him, and made his escape. The president was carried to a small house on the opposite side of the street, where, surrounded by his family and the principal officers of the government, he breathed his last at 7 o'clock on the morning of 15 April. The assassin was found by a squadron of troops twelve days afterward, and shot in a barn in which he had taken refuge. The illustration on page 319 represents the house where Mr. Lincoln passed away.

The body of the president lay in state at the Capitol on 20 April and was viewed by a great concourse of people; the next day the funeral train set out for Springfield, Ill. The *cortège* halted at all the principal cities on the way, and the remains of the president lay in state in Baltimore, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, New York, Albany, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Chicago, being received everywhere with extraordinary demonstrations of respect and sorrow. The joy over the return of peace was for a fortnight eclipsed by the universal grief for the dead leader. He was buried, amid the mourning of the whole nation, at Oak Ridge, near Springfield, on 4 May, and there on 15 Oct., 1874, an imposing monument—the work of the sculptor Larkin G. Mead—was dedicated to his memory.



The monument is of white marble, with a portrait-statue of Lincoln in bronze, and four bronze groups at the corners, representing the infantry, cavalry, and artillery arms of the service and the navy. (See illustration on previous page.)

The death of President Lincoln, in the moment of the great national victory that he had done more than any other to gain, caused a movement of sympathy throughout the world. The expressions of grief and condolence that were sent to the government at Washington, from national, provincial, and municipal bodies all over the globe, were afterward published by the state department in a quarto volume of nearly a thousand pages, called "The Tribute of the Nations to Abraham Lincoln." After the lapse of thirty years, the high estimate of him that the world appears instinctively to have formed at the moment of his death seems to have been increased rather than diminished, as his participation in the great events of his time has been more thoroughly studied and understood. His goodness of heart, his abounding charity, his quick wit and overflowing humor, which made him the hero of many true stories and a thousand legends, are not less valued in themselves; but they are cast in the shade by the evidences that continually appear of his extraordinary qualities of mind and of character. His powerful grasp of details, his analytic capacity, his unerring logic, his perception of human nature, would have made him unusual in any age of the world, while the quality that, in the opinion of many, made him the specially fitted agent of Providence in the salvation of the country, his absolute freedom from prejudice or passion in weighing the motives of his contemporaries and the deepest problems of state gives him pre-eminence even among the illustrious men that have preceded and followed him in his great office. Simple and modest as he was in his demeanor, he was one of the most self-respecting of rulers. Although his kindness of heart was proverbial, although he was always glad to please and unwilling to offend, few presidents have been more sensible of the dignity of their office, and more prompt to maintain it against encroachments. He was at all times unquestionably the head of the government, and though not inclined to interfere with the routine business of the departments, he tolerated no insubordination in important matters. At one time, being conscious that there was an effort inside of his government to force the resignation of one

of its members, he read in open cabinet a severe reprimand of what was going on, mentioning no names, and ordering peremptorily that no question should be asked, and no allusions be made to the incident then or thereafter. He did not except his most trusted friends or his most powerful generals from this strict subordination. When Mr. Seward went before him to meet the Confederate envoys at Hampton Roads, Mr. Lincoln gave him this written injunction: "You will not assume to definitely consummate anything"; and on 3 March, 1865, when Gen. Grant was about to set out on his campaign of final victory, the secretary of war gave him, by the president's order, this imperative instruction: "The president directs me to say to you that he wishes you to have no conference with Gen. Lee, unless it be for the capitulation of Gen. Lee's army, or on some other minor and purely military matter. He instructs me to say that you are not to decide, discuss, or to confer upon any political question. Such questions the president holds in his own hands, and will submit them to no military conferences or conventions. Meanwhile, you are to press to the utmost your military advantages." When he refused to comply with the desire of the more radical Republicans in congress to take Draconian measures of retaliation against the Confederates for their treatment of black soldiers, he was accused by them of weakness and languor. They never seemed to perceive that to withstand an angry congress in Washington required more vigor of character than to launch a threatening decree against the Confederate government in Richmond. Mr. Lincoln was as unusual in personal appearance as in character. His stature was almost gigantic, six feet and four inches; he was muscular but spare of frame, weighing about 180 pounds. His hair was strong and luxuriant in growth, and stood out straight from his head; it began to be touched with gray in his last years. His eyes, a grayish brown, were deeply set, and were filled, in repose, with an expression of profound melancholy, which easily changed to one of uproarious mirth at the provocation of a humorous anecdote, told by himself or another. His nose was long and slightly curved, his mouth large and singularly mobile. Up to the time of his election he was clean-shaven, but during his presidency the fine outline of his face was marred by a thin and straggling beard. His demeanor was, in general, extremely simple and careless, but he was not without

a native dignity that always protected him from anything like presumption or impertinence.

Mr. Lincoln married, on 4 Nov., 1842, Miss Mary Todd, daughter of Robert S. Todd, of Kentucky. There were born of this marriage four sons. One, Edward Baker, died in infancy; another, William Wallace, died at the age of twelve, during the presidency of Mr. Lincoln; and still another, Thomas, at the age of eighteen, several years after his father's death. The only one that grew to maturity was his eldest son, Robert, who married and has children. The house in which Mr. Lincoln lived when he was elected president, in Springfield, Ill., was conveyed to the state of Illinois in 1887 by his son, and a collection of memorials of him is to be preserved there perpetually. (See illustration on page 304.)

There were few portraits of Mr. Lincoln painted in his lifetime; the vast number of engravings that have made his face one of the most familiar of all time have been mostly copied from photographs. The one on page 301 is from a photograph taken in 1858. There are portraits from life by Frank B. Carpenter, by Matthew Wilson, by Thomas Hicks, and an excellent crayon drawing by Barry. Since his death G. P. A. Healy, William Page, and others have painted portraits of him. There are two authentic life-masks: one made in 1858 by Leonard W. Volk (see illustration on page 324), who also executed a bust of Mr. Lincoln before his election in 1860, and another by Clark Mills shortly before the assassination. There are already a number of statues: one by Henry Kirke Brown in Union square, New York (see page 312); another by the same artist in Brooklyn; one in the group called "Emancipation," by Thomas Ball, in Lincoln Park, Washington, D. C., a work which has especial interest as having been paid for by the contributions of the freed people; one by Mrs. Vinnie Ream Hoxie in the Capitol; one by Augustus St. Gaudens in Chicago, set up in Chicago, 22 Oct., 1887; and one by Randolph Rogers in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia (see illustration on page 315). There is a bust by Thomas D. Jones, modelled from life in 1860.

The Lincoln bibliography is enormous, comprising thousands of volumes. See John Russell Bartlett's "Catalogue of Books and Pamphlets relating to the Civil War in the United States" (Boston, 1866). The most noteworthy of the lives of Lincoln already published are those of Joseph H. Barrett



(Cincinnati, 1865); Linus P. Brockett (Philadelphia, 1865); Henry J. Raymond (New York, 1865); Josiah G. Holland (Springfield, Mass., 1866); Ward H. Lamon (only the first volume, Boston, 1872); William O. Stoddard (New York, 1884); Isaac N. Arnold (Chicago, 1885); William H. Herndon (New York, 1889); and John T. Morse, Jr. (Boston, 1893). Briefer lives have also been written by William D. Howells, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, Charles G. Leland, John Carroll Power, Carl Schurz, and others. The most extensive work upon his life and times yet attempted is by his private secretaries, John G. Nicolay and John Hay, in ten volumes (New York, 1890.) Four years later the same writers prepared a complete edition in two volumes of Lincoln's Works, comprising his Speeches, Letters, State Papers, and Miscellaneous Writings (New York, 1894).

His wife, MARY TODD, born in Lexington, Ky., 12 Dec., 1818; died in Springfield, Ill., 16 July, 1882, was the daughter of Robert S. Todd, whose family were among the most influential of the pioneers of Kentucky and Illinois. Her great-uncle, John Todd, was one of the associates of Gen. George Rogers Clark, in his campaign of 1778, and took part in the capture of Kaskaskia and Vincennes. Being appointed county lieutenant by Patrick Henry, at that time governor of Virginia, he organized the civil government of what became afterward the state of Illinois. He was killed in the battle of Blue Licks, 18 Aug., 1782, of which his brother Levi, Mrs. Lincoln's grandfather, who also accompanied Clark's expedition as a lieutenant, was one of the few survivors. Mary Todd was carefully educated in Lexington. When twenty-one years of age she went to Springfield to visit her sister, who had married Ninian W. Edwards, a son of Ninian Edwards, governor of the state. While there she became engaged to Mr. Lincoln, whom she married, 4 Nov., 1842. Her family was divided by the civil war; several of them were killed in battle; and devoted as Mrs. Lincoln was to her husband and the National cause, this



*Mary Lincoln*

division among her nearest kindred caused her much suffering. The death of her son, William Wallace, in 1862, was an enduring sorrow to her. One of her principal occupations was visiting the hospitals and camps of the soldiers about Washington. She never recovered from the shock of seeing her husband shot down before her eyes; her youngest son, Thomas, died a few years later, and her reason suffered from these repeated blows. She lived in strict retirement during her later years, spending part of her time with her son in Chicago, a portion in Europe, and the rest with her sister, Mrs. Edwards, in Springfield, Illinois, where she died of paralysis.

Their son, ROBERT TODD, lawyer, born in Springfield, Ill., 1 Aug., 1843, was prepared for college at Phillips Exeter



*Robert Todd*


academy, and graduated at Harvard in 1864. He entered Harvard law-school, but after a short stay applied for admission to the military service, and his father suggested his appointment on the staff of Gen. Grant, as a volunteer aide-de-camp without pay or allowances. This exceptional position did not meet with Gen. Grant's approval, and at his suggestion young Lincoln was regularly commissioned as a captain, and entered the service on the same footing with others of his grade. He served with zeal and effi-

ciency throughout the final campaign, which ended at Appomattox. At the close of the war he resumed the study of law, was admitted to the bar in Illinois, and practised his profession with success in Chicago until 1881, with an interval of a visit to Europe in 1872; he steadily refused the offers that were repeatedly made him to enter public life, though taking part, from time to time, in political work and discussion. In 1881, at the invitation of President Garfield, he entered his cabinet as secretary of war. Mr. Lincoln, who, sixteen years before, had returned from the field just in time to stand by the death-bed of his father, assassinated while president, now had his strange experience repeated upon the assassination of President Garfield, a few months after his inauguration. On the

accession of Vice-President Arthur to the Presidency, Mr. Lincoln was the only member of the former cabinet who was requested to retain his portfolio, and he did so to the end of the administration. He performed the duties of the place with such ability and fairness, and with such knowledge of the law and appreciation of the needs of the army, as to gain the warmest approbation of its officers and its friends. Noteworthy incidents of his administration of the civil duties of the department were his report to the house of representatives upon its challenge to him to justify President Arthur's veto of the river and harbor bill of 1882, and the thoroughness and promptness of the relief given, from Wheeling to New Orleans, to those suffering from the great floods of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers in February, 1884. In the latter year Mr. Lincoln was prominently spoken of for the presidency; but as President Arthur was a candidate before the Republican convention, Lincoln refused to allow his name to be presented for either place on the ticket. He returned to Chicago, and in the spring of 1889 he was appointed minister to Great Britain. He was succeeded in June, 1893, by Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware, as ambassador, and resumed his law practice in Chicago.

## ANDREW JOHNSON.

ANDREW JOHNSON, seventeenth president of the United States, born in Raleigh, N. C., 29 Dec., 1808; died near Carter's Station, Tenn., 31 July, 1875. His parents were very poor, and when he was four years old his father died of injuries received in saving another from drowning. At the age of ten Andrew was apprenticed to a tailor. A natural craving to learn was fostered by hearing a gentleman read from "The American Speaker." The boy was taught the alphabet by fellow-workmen, borrowed the book and learned to read. In 1824 he removed to Laurens Court-House, S. C., where he worked as a journeyman tailor. The illustration on page 337 represents the small shop in which he pursued the calling that is announced on the sign over the door. In May, 1826, he returned to Raleigh, and in September, with his mother and step-father, he set out in a two-wheeled cart, drawn by a blind pony, for Greenville, Tenn. Here he married Eliza McCardle, a woman of refinement, who taught him to write, and read to him while he was at work during the day. It was not until he had been in congress that he learned to write with ease. From Greenville he went to the west, but returned after the lapse of a year. In those days Tennessee was controlled by landholders, whose interests were fostered by the state constitution, and Greenville was ruled by what was called an "aristocratic coterie of the quality." Johnson resisted their supremacy, and made himself a leader of the opposition. In 1828 he was elected alderman, in 1829 and 1830 was re-elected, and in 1830 was advanced to the mayoralty, which office he held for three years. In 1831 the county court appointed him a trustee of Rhea academy, and about this time he took part in the debates of a society at Greenville college. In 1834 he advocated the adoption of the new state constitution, by which the influence



Engr. by J. E. Hall, Jr. New York

*Andrew Johnson*



of the large landholders was abridged. In 1835 he represented Greene and Washington counties in the legislature. He resisted the popular mania for internal improvements, which caused his defeat in 1837, but the reaction justified his foresight, strengthened his influence, and restored his popularity. In 1839 he was returned. In 1836 he supported Hugh L. White for the presidency, and was a Bell man in the warm personal and political altercations between John Bell and James K. Polk, which distracted Tennessee at this time. Johnson was the only ardent follower of Bell that failed to go over to the Whig party. In 1840 he was an elector for the state-at-large on Van Buren's ticket, and made a state reputation by the force of his oratory. In 1841 he was elected to the state senate from Greene and Hawkins counties, and while in that body he was one of the "immortal 13" Democrats who, having it in their power to prevent the election of a Whig senator, did so by refusing to meet the house in joint convention. He also proposed that the basis of representation should rest upon the white votes, without regard to the ownership of slaves.

In 1843 he was elected to congress over John A. Asken, a U. S. bank Democrat, who was supported by the Whigs. His first speech was in support of the resolution to restore to Gen. Jackson the fine imposed upon him at New Orleans. He supported the annexation of Texas. In 1845 he was re-elected, and sustained Polk's administration. He opposed all expenditures for internal improvements that were not general, and resisted and defeated the proposed contingent tax of ten per cent. on tea and coffee. He was regularly re-elected until 1853. During this period he made his celebrated defence of the veto power, and urged the adoption of the homestead law, which was obnoxious to the slave-holding power of the south. He supported the compromise measures of 1850 as a matter of expediency, but opposed compromises in general as a sacrifice of principle. In 1853 the district lines were so "gerrymandered" as to throw him into a district in which the



Whigs had an overwhelming majority. Johnson at once announced himself a candidate for the governorship, and was elected by a fair majority. In his message to the legislature he dwelt upon the homestead law and other measures for the benefit of the working-classes, and earned the title of the "mechanic governor." He opposed the Know-nothing movement with characteristic vehemence. In 1855 he was opposed by Meredith P. Gentry, the Whig candidate, and defeated him after a canvass remarkable for the feeling displayed. Mr. Johnson earnestly supported the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

In 1857 he was elected to the U. S. senate, where he urged the passage of the homestead bill, and on 20 May, 1858, made his greatest speech on this subject. Finally, in 1860, he had the momentary gratification of seeing his favorite bill pass both houses of congress, but President Buchanan vetoed it, and the veto was sustained. Johnson revived it at the next session, and also introduced a resolution looking to a retrenchment in the expenditures of the government, and on constitutional grounds opposed the grant of aid for the construction of a Pacific railroad. He was prominent in debate, and frequently clashed with southern supporters of the administration. His pronounced Unionism estranged him from the slave-holders on the one side, while his acceptance of slavery as an institution guaranteed by the constitution caused him to hold aloof from the Republicans on the other. This intermediate position suggested his availability as a popular candidate for the presidency; but in the Democratic convention he received only the vote of Tennessee, and when the convention reassembled in Baltimore he withdrew his name. In the canvass that followed, he supported the extreme pro-slavery candidate, Breckinridge. Johnson had never believed it possible that any organized attempt to dissolve the Union could be made; but the events preceding the session of congress beginning in December, 1860, convinced him of his error. When congress met, he took decided and unequivocal grounds in opposition to secession, and on 13 Dec. introduced a joint resolution, proposing to amend the constitution so as to elect the president and vice-president by district votes, to elect senators by a direct popular vote, and to limit the terms of Federal judges to twenty years, half of them to be from slave-holding and half from non-slave-holding states. In his speech on this



resolution, 18 and 19 Dec., he declared his unyielding opposition to secession and announced his intention to stand by and act in and under the constitution. The southern states were then in the act of seceding, and every word uttered in congress was read and discussed with eagerness by thirty millions of people. Johnson's speech, coming from a southern man, thrilled the popular heart; but his popularity in the north was offset by the virulence with which he was assailed in the south. In a speech delivered 2 March, 1861, he said, referring to the secessionists: "I would have them arrested and tried for treason, and, if convicted, by the eternal God, they should suffer the penalty of the law at the hands of the executioner." Returning to Tennessee from Washington, he was attacked at Liberty, Va., by a mob, but drove them back with his pistol. At Lynchburg he was hooted and hissed, and at various places burned in effigy. He attended the East Tennessee union convention, in Cincinnati, 30 May, and again on 19 June he visited the same place and was received with enthusiasm. Here he declared for a vigorous prosecution of the war.

He retained his seat in the senate until appointed by President Lincoln military governor of Tennessee, 4 March, 1862. On 12 March he reached Nashville, and organized a provisional government for the state. On 18 March he issued a proclamation, in which he appealed to the people to return to their allegiance, to uphold the law, and to accept "a full and competent amnesty for all past acts and declarations." He required the city council to take the oath of allegiance to the United States. They refused, and he removed them and appointed others. He urged the holding of Union meetings throughout the state, and frequently attended them in person. It was chiefly due to his courage that Nashville was held against a Confederate force. He completed the railroad from Nashville to Tennessee river, and raised 25 regiments for service in the state. On 8 Dec., 1862, he issued a proclamation ordering congressional elections, and on the 15th levied an assessment upon the richer southern sympathizers, "in behalf of the many helpless widows, wives, and children in the city of Nashville who have been reduced to poverty and wretchedness in consequence of their husbands, sons, and fathers having been forced into the armies of this unholy and nefarious rebellion." On 20 Feb., 1863, Gov. Johnson issued a proclamation warning the agents of all

“traitors” to retain their collections until some person should be appointed to receive them for the United States. During the term of his service, Gov. Johnson exercised absolute and autocratic powers, but with singular moderation and discretion, and his course strengthened the Union cause in Tennessee. The Republican convention assembled in Baltimore, 6 June, 1864, and renominated Mr. Lincoln for the presidency by acclamation. There was a strong sentiment in favor of recognizing the political sacrifices made for the cause of the Union by the war Democrats, and it was generally conceded that New York should decide who was to be the individual. Daniel S. Dickinson, of that state, was most prominent in this connection; but internal factional divisions made it impossible for him to obtain the solid vote of that state, and Sec. Seward’s friends feared this nomination would force him from the cabinet. Henry J. Raymond urged the name of Andrew Johnson, and he was accordingly selected. Johnson, in his letter of acceptance, virtually disclaimed any departure from his principles as a Democrat, but placed his acceptance upon the ground of “the higher duty of first preserving the government.” He accepted the emancipation proclamation as a war measure, to be subsequently ratified by constitutional amendment. In his inaugural address as vice-president, 4 March, 1865, a lack of dignity in his bearing and an incoherency in his speech were attributed to the influence of strong drink. As a matter of fact, the Vice-President was much worn by disease, and had taken a little stimulant to aid him in the ordeal of inauguration, and in his weakened condition the effect was much more decided than he anticipated. This explanation was very generally accepted by the country.

On 14 April, 1865, President Lincoln was assassinated, and Mr. Johnson was at once sworn in as president, at his rooms in the Kirkwood house, by Chief-Justice Chase. In his remarks to those present Mr. Johnson said: “As to an indication of any policy which may be pursued by me in the administration of the government, I have to say that that must be left for development as the administration progresses. The message or declaration must be made by the acts as they transpire. The only assurance I can now give of the future is reference to the past.” In his addresses to various delegations that called upon him, he emphasized the fact that he advocated a course of for-

bearance toward the mass of the southern people, but demand punishment for those who had been leaders. "Treason is a crime," he said to the Illinois delegation, "and must be punished." At the time it was generally supposed that Johnson, who was known to be personally embittered against the dominant classes in the south, would inaugurate a reign of terror and decimate those who had taken up arms against the national authority. His protest against the terms of surrender granted to Gen. Lee by Gen. Grant, and utterances in private conversation, strengthened the fear that he would be too bloody and vindictive. He was supposed not to have been in accord with the humane policy that Lincoln had foreshadowed, and his silence in reference to Lincoln's policy, which amounted to ignoring it, was accepted as a proof that he did not intend to follow this course. On one occasion he said: "In regard to my future course, I will now make no professions, no pledges." And again: "My past life, especially my course during the present unholy rebellion, is before you. I have no principles to retract. I defy any one to point to any of my public acts at variance with the fixed principles which have guided me through life." It was evident that the difference in views of public policy, which were kept in abeyance during the war, would now come to the surface. The surrender of Gen. Joseph E. Johnston's army, 26 April, 1865, was practically the end of the war (although 20 Aug., 1866, was officially fixed as the close of the civil war by the second section of the act of 2 March, 1867), and on 29 April President Johnson issued a proclamation for the removal of trade restrictions in most of the insurrectionary states, which, being in contravention of an act of congress, was subsequently modified. On 9 May, 1865, he issued a proclamation restoring Virginia to the Union, and on 22 May all ports except four in Texas were opened to foreign commerce. On 29 May a general amnesty was declared to all except fourteen specified classes of citizens. Among the number excepted were "(all participants in the rebellion the estimated value of whose taxable property is over twenty thousand dollars." This exception was undoubtedly the result of personal feeling on the part of the president. It began to be perceived that a change was taking place in his sentiments, and this was attributed to the influence of Sec. Seward, who was popularly supposed to perpetuate the humane spirit of the dead president. Those

who had fears of too great severity now anticipated too great leniency. After the amnesty proclamation, the fundamental and irreconcilable difference between President Johnson and the party that had elevated him to power became more apparent. The constitution made no provision for the readmission of a state that had withdrawn from the Union, and Mr. Johnson, as a state-rights Democrat, held that the southern states had never been out of the Union; that the leaders were solely responsible; that as soon as the seceded states applied for readmission under such a form of government as complied with the requirements of the constitution, the Federal government had no power to refuse them admission, or to make any conditions upon subjects over which the constitution had not expressly given congress jurisdiction. The Republican leaders held that the action of the seceded states had deprived them of their rights as members of the Union; that in any event they were conquered, and as such at the mercy of the conqueror; and that, at best, they stood in the category of territories seeking admission to the Union, in which case congress could admit or reject them at will. The particular question that brought on a clash between these principles was the civil status of the negro. The 13th amendment became a law, 18 Dec., 1865, with Johnson's concurrence. The Republicans held that slavery had been the cause of the war; that only by giving the freedman the right to vote could he be protected, and the results of the war secured; and that no state should be admitted until it had granted the right of suffrage to the negroes within its borders. Johnson held this to be a matter of internal regulation, beyond the control of congress. From 9 May till 13 July he appointed provisional governors for seven states, whose duties were to reorganize the governments. The state governments were organized, but passed such stringent laws in reference to the negroes that the Republicans declared it was a worse form of slavery than the old. When congress met in December, 1865, it was overwhelmingly Republican and firmly determined to protect the negro against outrage and oppression. The first breach between the president and the party in power was the veto of the freedman's bureau bill in February, 1866, which was designed to protect the negroes. One of the grounds of the veto was, that it had been passed by a congress in which the southern states had no representatives. On 27

There is no news worth communicating more.  
Non, what you see in the news papers of the day -  
There are a thousand or so. Speculations here in  
reference to the result of the Charleston Convention  
all which will be solved before this letter reaches  
you - Douglas and friends on my side of the main  
and think they have elected him if he is nominated -

Adopt assurance of my sincere esteem  
Chas. Johnson



March the president vetoed the civil rights bill, which made freedmen citizens without the right of suffrage. The chief ground of objection was the interference with the rights of the states. This bill was passed over the veto.

On 16 June the 14th amendment to the constitution, which contained the principle of the civil rights bill, was proposed, disapproved by the president, but ratified and declared in force, 28 July, 1868. Both houses of congress passed a joint resolution that the delegation from a state lately in rebellion should not be received by either the senate or the house until both united in declaring said state a member of the Union. In July the second freedman's bureau bill was passed, vetoed, and passed over the veto. In June, 1866, the Republicans in congress brought forward their plan of reconstruction, which was called the "congressional plan," in contradistinction to the president's plan, of which he spoke as "my policy." The chief features of the congressional plan were, to give the negroes the right to vote, to protect them in this right, and to prevent the Confederate leaders from voting. Congress met on 3 Dec., 1866. The bill giving negroes the right of suffrage in the District of Columbia was passed over a veto. An attempt was made to impeach the president, but it failed. In January, 1867, a bill was passed to deprive the president of the power to proclaim general amnesty, which he disregarded. Measures were adopted looking to the meeting of the 40th and all subsequent congresses immediately upon the adjournment of the predecessor. The president was deprived of the command of the army by a "rider" to the army appropriation bill, which provided that his orders should only be given through the general, who was not to be removed without the previous consent of the senate. The bill admitting Nebraska provided that no law should ever be passed in that state denying the right of suffrage to any person because of his color or race. This was vetoed, and passed over the veto. On 2 March, 1867, the "bill to provide efficient governments for the insurrectionary states," which embodied the congressional plan of reconstruction, was passed, vetoed, and passed over the veto. This divided the southern states into military districts, each under a brigadier-general, who was to preserve order and exercise all the functions of government until the citizens had formed a state government, ratified the amendments, and been admitted to the

Union. On 2 March, 1867, the tenure-of-office bill was passed over the veto. This provided that civil officers should remain in office until the confirmation of their successors; that the members of the cabinet should be removed only with the consent of the senate; and that when congress was not in session, the president could suspend, but not remove, any official, and in case the senate at the next session should not ratify the suspension, the suspended official should be reinducted into his office. The elections of 1866 were uniformly favorable to the Republicans, and gave them a two-third majority in both house and senate. On 5 Aug., 1867, the president requested Edwin M. Stanton to resign his office as secretary of war. Mr. Stanton refused, was suspended, and Gen. Grant was appointed in his place. When congress met, it refused to ratify the suspension. Gen. Grant then resigned, and Mr. Stanton again entered upon the duties of his office. The president removed him, and appointed Lorenzo Thomas, adjutant-general, U. S. army. The senate declared this act illegal, and Mr. Stanton refused to comply, and notified the speaker of the house. On 24 Feb., 1868, the house passed a resolution for the impeachment of the president. The trial began on 5 March. The main articles of impeachment were for violating the provisions of the tenure-of-office act, which it was claimed he had done in order to test its constitutionality. After the trial began, the president made a tour through the northwest, which was called "swinging round the circle," because in his speeches he declared that he had swung around the entire circle of offices, from alderman to president. He made many violent and intemperate speeches to the crowds that assembled to meet him, and denounced the congress then sitting as "no congress," because of its refusal to admit the representatives and senators from the south, and on these speeches were based additional articles of impeachment. On 16 May the test vote was had. Thirty-five senators were for conviction and nineteen for acquittal. A change of one vote would have carried conviction. The senate adjourned *sine die*, and a verdict of acquittal was entered. After the expiration of his term the president returned to Tennessee. He was a candidate for the U. S. senate, but was defeated. In 1872 he was a candidate for congressman from the state-at-large, and, though defeated, he regained his hold upon the people of the state, and in January, 1875, was elected



to the senate, taking his seat at the extra session of 1875. Two weeks after the session began he made a speech which was a skilful but bitter attack upon Gen. Grant. He returned home at the end of the session, and in July visited his daughter, who lived near Carter's station in east Tennessee. There he was stricken with paralysis, 29 July, and died the next day. He was buried at Greenville. His "Speeches" were published with a biographical introduction by Frank Moore (Boston, 1865), and his "Life and Times" were written by an anonymous author (New York, 1866). See also "The Tailor Boy" (Boston, 1865), and "The Trial of Andrew Johnson on Impeachment" (3 vols., Washington, 1868).

His wife, ELIZA MCCARDLE, b. in Leesburg, Washington co., Tenn., 4 Oct., 1810; d. in Home, Greene co., Tenn., 15 Jan., 1876, was the only daughter of a widow in Greenville, Tenn. On 27 May, 1826, she married Andrew Johnson, and devoted herself to his interest and education, contributing effectually toward his future career. She remained in Greenville while he served in the legislature, and in 1861 spent two months in Washington while Mr. Johnson was in the senate. Owing to impaired health she returned to Greenville, and while there received an order, dated 24 April, 1862, requiring her to pass beyond the Confederate lines through Nashville in thirty-six hours. This was impossible, owing to her illness, and she therefore remained in Greenville all summer, hearing constantly rumors of Mr. Johnson's murder. In September she applied for permission to cross the line, and, accompanied by her children and Mr. Daniel Stover, she began her journey to Nashville. At Murfreesboro they were met by Gen. Forrest, who detained them until Isham G. Harris and Andrew Ewing obtained permission from the authorities at Richmond for them to pass. Mrs. Johnson joined her husband at Nashville. During her residence in Washington Mrs. Johnson appeared in society as little as possible.



*Eliza Johnson*

Their daughter, MARTHA, born in Greenville, Tenn., 25 Oct., 1828, was educated in Georgetown, D. C., and during her school-life was a frequent guest in the White House in President Polk's administration. She returned to east Tennessee in 1851, and on 13 Dec., 1857, married Judge David T. Patterson. She presided at the White House in place of her invalid mother, and, with her sister, assisted in the first reception that was held by President Johnson, 1 Jan., 1866. During the early spring an appropriation of \$30,000 was made by congress to refurnish the executive mansion, and Mrs. Patterson superintended the purchases. Another daughter, MARY, born in Greenville, Tenn., 8 May, 1832; died in Bluff City, Tenn., 19 April, 1883, married Daniel Stover, of Carter county, who died in 1862, and in 1869 she married William R. Bacon, of Greenville. She resided at the White House from August, 1865, until a short time before the expiration of her father's term.





Engraved by H. Hall, Jr. New York


*U. S. Grant*

## ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT.

ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT, eighteenth president of the United States, born at Point Pleasant, Clermont co., Ohio, 27 April, 1822; died on Mount McGregor, near Saratoga, N. Y., 23 July, 1885. (See view of Grant's birthplace on the next page.) He was of Scottish ancestry, but his family had been American in all its branches for eight generations. He was a descendant of Matthew Grant, who arrived at Dorchester, Mass., in May, 1630. His father was Jesse R. Grant, and his mother Hannah Simpson. They were married in June, 1821, in Clermont county, Ohio. Ulysses, the oldest of six children, spent his boyhood in assisting his father on the farm, a work more congenial to his tastes than working in the tannery of which his father was proprietor. He attended the village school, and in the spring of 1839 was appointed to a cadetship in the U. S. military academy by Thomas L. Hamer, M. C. The name given him at birth was Hiram Ulysses, but he was always called by his middle name. Mr. Hamer, thinking this his first name, and that his middle name was probably that of his mother's family, inserted in the official appointment the name of Ulysses S. The officials at West Point were notified by Cadet Grant of the error, but they did not feel authorized to correct it, and it was acquiesced in and became the name by which he was always known. As a student Grant showed the greatest proficiency in mathematics, but he gained a fair standing in most of his studies, and at cavalry-drill he proved himself the best horseman in his class, and afterward was one of the best in the army. He was graduated in 1843, standing twenty-first in a class of thirty-nine. He was commissioned, on graduation, as a brevet 2d lieutenant, and was attached to the 4th infantry and assigned to duty at Jefferson barracks, near St. Louis. (See portrait taken at this period on page 352.) In May, 1844, he accompanied

his regiment to Camp Salubrity, Louisiana. He was commissioned 2d lieutenant in September, 1845. That month he went with his regiment to Corpus Christi (now in Texas) to join the army of occupation, under command of Gen. Zachary Taylor.

He participated in the battle of Palo Alto, 8 May, 1846; and in that of Resaca de la Palma, 9 May, he commanded his company. On 19 Aug. he set out with the army for Monterey, Mexico, which was reached on 19 Sept. He had been appointed regimental quartermaster of the 4th infantry, and was placed in charge of the wagons and pack-train on this march. During the assault of the 21st on Black Fort, one of the works protecting Monterey, instead of remaining in camp in charge of the quartermaster's stores, he charged with his regiment, on horseback, being almost the only officer in the regiment that was mounted. The adjutant was killed in the charge, and



Lieut. Grant was designated to take his place. On the 23d, when the troops had gained a position in the city of Monterey, a volunteer was called for, to make his way to the rear under a heavy fire, to order up ammunition, Lieut.

Grant volunteered, and ran the gantlet in safety, accomplishing his mission. Garland's brigade, to which the 4th infantry belonged, was transferred from Twiggs's to Worth's division, and ordered back to the mouth of the Rio Grande, where it embarked for Vera Cruz, to join the army under Gen. Scott. It landed near that city on 9 March, 1847, and the investment was immediately begun. Lieut. Grant served with his regiment during the siege, until the capture of the place, 29 March, 1847. On 13 April his division began its march toward the city of Mexico; and he participated in the battle of Cerro Gordo, 17 and 18 April. The troops entered Pueblo on 15 May, and Lieut. Grant was there ordered to take charge of a large train of wagons, with an escort of fewer than a thousand men, to obtain forage. He made a two days' march, and procured the necessary supplies. He participated in the capture of San Antonio and the battle of

Churubusco, 20 Aug., and the battle of Molino del Rey, 8 Sept., 1847. In the latter engagement he was with the first troops that entered the mills. Seeing some of the enemy on the top of a building, he took a few men, climbed to the roof, received the surrender of six officers and quite a number of men. For this service he was brevetted a 1st lieutenant. He was engaged in the storming of Chapultepec on 13 Sept., distinguished himself by conspicuous services, was highly commended in the reports of his superior officers, and brevetted captain. While the troops were advancing against the city of Mexico on the 14th, observing a church from the top of which he believed the enemy could be dislodged from a defensive work, he called for volunteers, and with twelve men of the 4th infantry, who were afterward joined by a detachment of artillery, he made a flank movement, gained the church, mounted a howitzer in the belfry, using it with such effect that Gen. Worth sent for him and complimented him in person. He entered the city of Mexico with the army, 14 Sept., and a few days afterward was promoted to be 1st lieutenant. He remained with the army in the city of Mexico till the withdrawal of the troops in the summer of 1848, and then accompanied his regiment to Pascagoula, Miss. He there obtained leave of absence and went to St. Louis, where, on 22 Aug., 1848, he married Miss Julia B. Dent, sister of one of his classmates. He was soon afterward ordered to Sackett's Harbor, N. Y., and in April following to Detroit, Mich. In the spring of 1851 he was again transferred to Sackett's Harbor, and on 5 July, 1852, he sailed from New York with his regiment for California via the Isthmus of Panama. While the troops were crossing the isthmus, cholera carried off one seventh of the command. Lieut. Grant was left behind in charge of the sick, on Chagres river, and displayed great skill and devotion in caring for them and supplying means of transportation. On arriving in California, he spent a few weeks with his regiment at Benicia barracks, and then accompanied it to Fort Vancouver, Oregon. On 5 Aug., 1853, he was promoted to the captaincy of a company stationed at Humboldt bay, Cal., and in September he went to that post.

He resigned his commission, 31 July, 1854, and settled on a small farm near St. Louis. He was engaged in farming and in the real-estate business in St. Louis until May, 1860, when he removed to Galena, Ill., and there became a clerk in the hard-

ware and leather store of his father, who in a letter to Gen Jas. Grant Wilson, dated 20 March, 1868, writes: "After Ulysses's farming and real-estate experiments in St. Louis county, Mo., failed to be self-supporting, he came to me at this place [Covington, Ky.] for advice and assistance. I referred him to Simpson, my next oldest son, who had charge of my Galena business, and who was staying with me on account of ill health. Simpson sent him to the Galena store, to stay until something else might turn up in his favor, and told him he must confine his wants within \$800 a year. That if that would not support him he must draw what it lacked from the rent of his house and the hire of his negroes in St. Louis. He went to Galena in April, 1860, about one year before the capture of Sumter; then he left. That amount would have supported his family then, but he owed debts at St. Louis, and did draw \$1,500 in the year, but he paid back the balance after he went into the army." When news was received of the beginning of the civil war, a public meeting was called in Galena, and Capt. Grant was chosen to preside. He took a pronounced stand in favor of the Union cause and a vigorous prosecution of the war. A company of volunteers was raised, which he drilled and accompanied to Springfield, Ill. Gov. Yates, of that state, employed Capt. Grant in the adjutant-general's department, and appointed him mustering officer. He offered his services to the National government in a letter written on 24 May, 1861, but no answer was ever made to it. On 17 June he was appointed colonel of the 21st Illinois regiment of infantry, which had been mustered in at Mattoon. The regiment was transferred to Springfield, and on 3 July he went with it from that place to Palmyra, Mo., thence to Salt River, where it guarded a portion of the Hannibal and St. Joseph railroad, and thence to the town of Mexico, where Gen. Pope was stationed as commander of the military district. On 31 July, Grant was assigned to the command of a sub-district under Gen. Pope, his troops consisting of three regiments of infantry and a section of artillery. He was appointed a brigadier-general of volunteers on 7 Aug., the commission being dated back to 17 May, and was ordered to Ironton, Mo., to take command of a district in that part of the state, where he arrived 8 Aug. Ten days afterward he was ordered to St. Louis, and thence to Jefferson City. Eight days later he was directed to report in person at St.



Louis, and on reaching there found that he had been assigned to the command of the district of southeastern Missouri, embracing all the territory in Missouri south of St. Louis, and all southern Illinois, with permanent headquarters at Cairo. He established temporary headquarters at Cape Girardeau, on the Mississippi, to superintend the fitting out of an expedition against the Confederate Col. Jeff. Thompson, and arrived at Cairo on 4 Sept. The next day he received information that the enemy was about to seize Paducah, Ky., at the mouth of the Tennessee, having already occupied Columbus and Hickman. He moved that night with two regiments of infantry and one battery of artillery, and occupied Paducah the next morning. He issued a proclamation to the citizens, saying, "I have nothing to do with opinions, and shall deal only with armed rebellion and its aiders and abettors." Kentucky had declared an intention to remain neutral in the war, and this prompt occupation of Paducah prevented the Confederates from getting a foothold there, and did much toward retaining the state within the Union lines. Gen. Sterling Price was advancing into Missouri with a Confederate force, and Grant was ordered, 1 Nov., to make a demonstration on both sides of the Mississippi, to prevent troops from being sent from Columbus and other points to re-enforce Price. On 6 Nov., Grant moved down the river with about 3,000 men on steamboats, accompanied by two gun-boats, debarked a few men on the Kentucky side that night, and learned that troops of the enemy were being ferried across from Columbus to re-enforce those on the west side of the river. A Confederate camp was established opposite, at Belmont, and Grant decided to attack it. On the morning of the 7th he debarked his troops three miles above the place, left a strong guard near the landing, and marched to the attack with about 2,500 men. A spirited engagement took place, in which Grant's horse was shot under him. The enemy was routed and his camp captured, but he soon rallied, and was re-enforced by detachments ferried across from Columbus, and Grant fell back and re-embarked. He got his men safely on the steamboats, and was himself the last one in the command to step aboard. He captured 175 prisoners and two guns, and spiked four other pieces, and lost 485 men. The Confederates lost 642. The opposing troops, including re-enforcements sent from Columbus, numbered about 7,000.

In January, 1862, he made a reconnoissance in force toward Columbus. He was struck with the advantage possessed by the enemy in holding Fort Henry on Tennessee river, and Fort Donelson on the Cumberland, and conceived the idea of capturing them before they could be further strengthened, by means of an expedition composed of the troops under his command, assisted by the gun-boats. He went to St. Louis and submitted his proposition to the department commander, Gen. Halleck, but was listened to with impatience, and his views were not approved. On 28 Jan. he telegraphed Halleck, renewing the suggestion, and saying, "If permitted, I could take and hold Fort Henry on the Tennessee." Com. Foote, commanding the gun-boats, sent a similar despatch.



*U. S. Grant*  
*Bril. 29. 4. 62. 4. 8. 64.*

On the 29th Grant also wrote urging the expedition. Assent was obtained on 1 Feb., and the expedition moved the next day. Gen. Tilghman surrendered Fort Henry on the 6th, after a bombardment by the gun-boats. He with his staff and ninety men were captured, but most of the garrison escaped and joined the troops in Fort Donelson, eleven miles distant, commanded by Gen. Floyd, who, after this re-enforcement, had about 21,000 men. Grant at

once prepared to invest Donelson, and on the 12th began the siege with a command numbering 15,000, which was increased on the 14th to 27,000; but about 5,000 of these were employed in guarding roads and captured places. His artillery consisted of eight light batteries. The weather was extremely cold, the water high, much rain and snow fell, and the sufferings of the men were intense. The enemy's position, naturally strong, had been intrenched and fortified. There was heavy fighting on three successive days. On the 15th the enemy, fearing capture, made a desperate assault with the intention of cutting his way out. Grant detected the object of the movement, repelled the assault, and by a vigorous attack secured so commanding a position that the enemy saw further resistance would be useless. Floyd turned over the command to Pillow, who in

turn resigned it to Buckner, and Floyd and Pillow escaped in the night on a steamboat. Over 3,000 infantry and the greater portion of Forrest's cavalry made their escape at the same time. On the 16th Buckner wrote proposing that commissioners be appointed to arrange for terms of capitulation. General Grant replied: "No terms other than an unconditional and immediate surrender can be accepted. I propose to move immediately upon your works."

The garrison was surrendered the same day, unconditionally. The capture included 14,623 men, 65 cannon, and 17,600 small-arms. The killed and wounded numbered about 2,500. Grant's loss was 2,041 in killed, wounded, and missing. This was the first capture of a prominent strategic point since the war began, and indeed the only substantial victory thus far for the National arms. It opened up two important navigable rivers, and left the enemy no strong foothold in Kentucky or Tennessee. Grant was soon afterward made a major-general of volunteers, his commission dating from 16 Feb., and his popularity throughout the country began from that day. He urged a prompt following up of this victory, and set out for Nashville, 28 Feb., without waiting for instructions, but telegraphing that he should go if he received no orders to the contrary. For this, and under the pretence that he had not forwarded to his superiors in command certain reports showing the strength and positions of his forces, he was deprived of his command, and ordered to remain at Fort Henry. He was not restored to command until 13 March, when his services were again required in view of the enemy's having concentrated a large army near Corinth, Miss., and he transferred his headquarters to Savannah, on Tennessee river, on the 17th. He found the forces under his command, numbering about 38,000 men, encamped on both sides of the river, and at once transferred them all to the west side and concentrated them in the vicinity of Pittsburgh Landing. He there selected a favorable position, and put his army in line, with the right resting at Shiloh Church, nearly three miles from the river. He was directed not to attack the enemy, but to await the arrival of Gen. Buell's army of 40,000 men, which was marching southward through Tennessee to join Grant. On 6 April the Confederate army, numbering nearly 50,000 men, commanded by Gen. Albert S. Johnston, made a vigorous attack at daylight,

drove the National troops back in some confusion, and continued to press the advantage gained during the entire day. Gen. Johnston was killed about one o'clock, and the command of the Confederates devolved upon Gen. Beauregard; 5,000 of Grant's troops did not arrive on the field during the day, so that his command was outnumbered, and it required all his efforts to hold his position on the river until evening. Late in the afternoon the head of Buell's column crossed the river, but not in time to participate actively in the fighting, as the enemy's attacks had ceased. Grant sought shelter that night in a hut; but the surgeons had made an amputating hospital of it, and he found the sight so painful that he went out into the rain-storm and slept under a tree. He had given orders for an advance all along the lines the next morning. Buell's troops had now joined him, and the attack was pushed with such vigor that the enemy were steadily driven back, and retreated nineteen miles to Corinth. On this day Grant's sword-scabbard was broken by a bullet. His loss in the battle was 1,754 killed, 8,408 wounded, 2,885 missing; total, 13,047. The enemy acknowledged a loss of 1,728 killed, 8,012 wounded, and 957 missing; total, 10,699; but there are evidences that it was much greater. The National officers estimated the Confederate dead alone at 4,000. On the 11th Gen. Halleck arrived at headquarters, and took command in person. The forces consisted now of the right and left wings, centre, and reserve, commanded respectively by Gens. Thomas, Pope, Buell, and McClelland, numbering in all nearly 120,000 men. The enemy was behind strong fortifications, and numbered over 50,000. Grant was named second in command of all the troops, but was especially intrusted with the right wing and reserve. On 30 April an advance was begun against Corinth, but the enemy evacuated the place and retreated, without fighting, on 30 May. On 21 June, Grant moved his headquarters to Memphis. Gen. Halleck was appointed general-in-chief of all the armies, 11 July. Grant returned to Corinth on 15 July, and on the 17th Halleck set out for Washington, leaving Grant in command of the Army of the Tennessee; and on 25 Oct. he was assigned to the command of the Department of the Tennessee, including Cairo, Forts Henry and Donelson, northern Mississippi, and portions of Kentucky and Tennessee west of Tennessee river. He ordered a movement against the enemy at Iuka to

capture Price's force at that place, and a battle was fought on 19 and 20 Sept. The plan promised success, but the faults committed by the officer commanding one wing of the troops engaged permitted the enemy to escape. The National loss was 736, that of the Confederates 1,438. Grant strengthened the position around Corinth, and remained there about eight weeks. When the enemy afterward attacked it, 3 and 4 Oct., they met with a severe repulse. Gen. William S. Rosecrans was in immediate command of the National troops. On the 5th they were struck while in retreat, and badly beaten in the battle of the Hatchie. The entire National loss was 2,359. From the best attainable sources of information, the Confederates would seem to have lost nearly twice that number.

After the battle of Corinth, Grant proposed to Halleck, in the latter part of October, a movement looking to the capture of Vicksburg. On 3 Nov. he left Jackson, Tenn., and made a movement with 30,000 men against Grand Junction, and on the 4th he had seized this place and La Grange. The force opposing him was about equal to his own. On the 13th his cavalry occupied Holly Springs; on 1 Dec. he advanced against the enemy's works on the Tallahatchie, which were hastily evacuated, and on the 5th reached Oxford. On the 8th he ordered Sherman to move down the Mississippi from Memphis to attack Vicksburg, Grant's column to co-operate with him by land. On 20 Dec. the enemy captured Holly Springs, which had been made a secondary base of supplies, and seized a large amount of stores. Col. Murphy, who surrendered the post without having taken any proper measures of defence, was dismissed the service. The difficulties of protecting the long line of communication necessary for furnishing supplies, as well as other considerations, induced Grant to abandon the land expedition, and take command in person of the movement down the Mississippi. Sherman had reached Milliken's Bend, on the west side of the river, twenty miles above Vicksburg, on the 24th, with about 32,000 men. He crossed the river, ascended the Yazoo to a point below Haines's Bluff, landed his forces, and made an assault upon the enemy's strongly fortified position at that place on the 29th, but was repelled with a loss of 175 killed, 930 wounded, and 743 missing. The enemy reported 63 killed, 134 wounded, and 10 missing. Grant's headquarters were established at Memphis on 10 Jan., and preparations were

made for a concentrated movement against Vicksburg. On the 29th he arrived at Young's Point, opposite the mouth of the Yazoo, above Vicksburg, and took command in person of the operations against that city, his force numbering 50,000 men. Admiral Porter's co-operating fleet was composed of gun-boats of all classes, carrying 280 guns and 800 men. Three plans suggested themselves for reaching the high ground behind Vicksburg, the only position from which it could be besieged: First, to march the army down the west bank of the river, cross over below Vicksburg, and co-operate with Gen. Banks, who was in command of an expedition ascending the river from New Orleans, with a view to capturing Port Hudson and opening up a line for supplies from below. The high water and the condition of the country made this plan impracticable at that time. Second, to construct a canal across the peninsula opposite Vicksburg, through which the fleet of gun-boats and transports could pass, and which could be held open as a line of communication for supplies. This plan was favored at Washington, and was put into execution at once; but the high water broke the levees, drowned out the camps, and flooded the country, and after two months of laborious effort Grant reported it impracticable. Third, to turn the Mississippi from its course by opening a new channel via Lake Providence and through various bayous to Red river. A force was set to work to develop this plan; but the way was tortuous and choked with timber, and by March it was found impossible to open a practicable channel. In the mean time an expedition was sent to the east side of the river to open a route via Yazoo pass, the Tallahatchie, the Yalabusha, and the Yazoo rivers; but insurmountable difficulties were encountered, and this attempt also had to be abandoned. Grant, having thoroughly tested all the safer plans, now determined to try a bolder and more hazardous one, which he had long had in contemplation, but which the high water had precluded. This was, to run the batteries with the gun-boats and transports loaded with supplies, to march his troops down the west side of the river from Milliken's Bend to the vicinity of New Carthage, and there ferry them across to the east bank. The movement of the troops was begun on 29 March. They were marched to New Carthage and Hard Times. On the night of 16 April the fleet ran the batteries under a severe fire. On 29 April the gun-boats attacked the

works at Grand Gulf, but made little impression, and that night ran the batteries to a point below. On 30 April the advance of the army was ferried across to Bruinsburg, below Grand Gulf and 30 miles south of Vicksburg, and marched out in the direction of Port Gibson. Everything was made subordinate to the celerity of the movement. The men had no supplies except such as they carried on their persons. Grant himself crossed the river with no personal baggage, and without even a horse; but obtained one raggedly equipped horse on the east side. The advance encountered the enemy, under Gen. Bowen, numbering between 7,000 and 8,000, on 1 May, near Port Gibson, routed him, and drove him in full retreat till nightfall. Grant's loss was 131 killed and 719 wounded. The Confederates reported their loss at 448 killed and wounded, and 384 missing; but it was somewhat larger, as Grant captured 650 prisoners. At Port Gibson he learned of the success of Grierson, whom he had despatched from La Grange, 17 April, and who had moved southward with 1,000 cavalry, torn up many miles of railroad, destroyed large amounts of supplies, and arrived, with but slight loss, at Baton Rouge, La., 2 May. On 3 May, Grant entered Grand Gulf, which had been evacuated. He was now opposed by two armies—one commanded by Gen. John C. Pemberton at Vicksburg, numbering about 52,000 men; the other by Gen. Joseph E. Johnston at Jackson, 50 miles east of Vicksburg, who was being rapidly re-enforced. Gen. Sherman had been ordered to make a demonstration against Haines's Bluff, to compel the enemy to detach troops for its defence and withhold them from Grant's front; and this feint was successfully executed, 30 April and 1 May, when Sherman received orders to retire and join the main army. Grant determined to move with celerity, place his force between the two armies of the enemy, and defeat them in detail before they could unite against him. He cut loose from his base, and ordered that the three days' rations issued to the men should be made to last five days. Sherman's command reached Grand Gulf on the 6th. On the 12th, Grant's advance, near Raymond, encountered the enemy approaching from Jackson, and defeated and drove him from the field with a loss of 100 killed, 305 wounded, 415 prisoners, and 2 guns. Grant's loss was 66 killed, 339 wounded, and 37 missing. He pushed on to Jackson, and captured it on the 14th, with a loss of 42 killed, and 251

wounded and missing. The enemy lost 845 in killed, wounded, and missing, and 17 guns. Grant now moved rapidly toward Vicksburg, and attacked Pemberton in a strong position at Champion Hill. After a hotly contested battle, the enemy was completely routed, with a loss of between 3,000 and 4,000 killed and wounded, 3,000 prisoners, and 30 guns; Grant's loss being 410 killed, 1,844 wounded, and 187 missing. The enemy made a stand at Big Black river bridge on the 17th, holding a strongly intrenched position; but by a vigorous assault the place was carried, and the enemy was driven across the river in great confusion, with the loss of many killed, 1,751 prisoners, and 18 guns. Grant's loss was but 39 killed, 237 wounded, and 3 missing. On the 18th the National army closed up against the outworks of Vicksburg, driving the enemy inside his fortifications. Sherman took possession of Haines's Bluff, a base for supplies was established at Chickasaw Landing, and on the 21st the army was once more supplied with full rations. On 19 and 22 May assaults were made upon the enemy's lines, but only a few outworks were carried, and on the 23d the siege was regularly begun. By 30 June there were 220 guns in position, all light field-pieces except six 32-pounders and a battery of heavy guns supplied by the navy. Grant now had 71,000 men to conduct the siege and defend his position against Johnston's army threatening him in the rear. The operations were pressed day and night; there was mining and countermining; and the lines were pushed closer and closer, until the garrison abandoned all hope. On 3 July, Pemberton asked for an armistice, and proposed the appointment of commissioners to arrange terms of capitulation. Grant replied that there would be no terms but unconditional surrender; and this was made on the 4th of July. He permitted the officers and men to be paroled, the officers to retain their private baggage and side-arms, and each mounted officer one horse. Grant showed every consideration to the vanquished, supplied them with full rations, and, when they marched out, issued an order saying, "Instruct the commands to be orderly and quiet as these prisoners pass, and to make no offensive remarks." The surrender included 31,600 prisoners, 172 cannon, 60,000 muskets, and a large amount of ammunition. Grant's total loss in the Vicksburg campaign was 8,873; that of the enemy nearly 60,000. Port Hudson now surrendered to Banks, and



the Mississippi was opened from its source to its mouth. Grant was made a major-general in the regular army; and congress, when it assembled, passed a resolution ordering a gold medal to be presented to him (see illustration on page 379), and returning thanks to him and his army.

He soon recommended a movement against Mobile, but it was not approved. He went to New Orleans, 30 Aug., to confer with Banks, and while there was severely injured by a fall from his horse, during a trial of speed with Col. Wilson, the editor of this work. For nearly three months he was unable to walk unaided, but on 16 Sept. set out for Vicksburg, being carried on board the steamboat. He received orders from Washington on the 27th to send all available forces to the vicinity of Chattanooga, to co-operate with Rosecrans. While personally superintending the carrying out of this order, he received instructions, 10 Oct., to report at Cairo. He arrived there on the 16th, and was directed to proceed to Louisville. At Indianapolis he was met by Mr. Stanton, secretary of war, who accompanied him to Louisville and delivered an order to him placing him in command of the military division of the Mississippi, which was to embrace the departments and armies of the Tennessee, the Cumberland, and the Ohio. He at once went to Chattanooga, arriving on the 23d, and took command there in person. On 29 Oct. the battle of Wauhatchie was fought, and a much-needed line of communication for supplies was opened to the troops in and around Chattanooga, besieged by Bragg's army, which held a strongly fortified position. Thomas commanded the Army of the Cumberland, which held Chattanooga; Sherman, who had succeeded Grant in command of the Army of the Tennessee, was ordered to bring all his available troops to join Thomas; and Burnside, who was in Knoxville, in command of the Army of the Ohio, besieged by Longstreet's corps, was ordered to hold his position at all hazards till Bragg should be crushed and a force could be sent to the relief of Knoxville. Grant, having concentrated his troops near Chattanooga, made an assault upon the enemy's lines on the 23d, which resulted in carrying important positions. The attack was continued on the 24th and 25th, when the enemy's entire line was captured, and his army completely routed and driven out of Tennessee. Grant's forces consisted of 60,000 men; those of the Confederates, 45,000. The enemy's

losses were reported at 361 killed and 2,180 wounded, but were undoubtedly greater. There were captured 6,442 men, 40 pieces of artillery, and 7,000 stands of small-arms. Grant's losses were 757 killed, 4,529 wounded, and 330 missing. On the 28th a force was despatched to Knoxville, the command of the expedition being given to Sherman. On the 29th Longstreet assaulted Knoxville before the arrival of the troops sent for its relief, but was repelled by Burnside, and retreated. Grant visited Knoxville the last week in December, and went from there to Nashville, where he established his headquarters, 13 Jan., 1864. He now ordered Sherman to march a force from Vicksburg into the interior to destroy the enemy's communications and supplies. It moved on 3 Feb., went as far as Meridian, reaching there 14 Feb., and, after destroying railroads and great quantities of supplies, returned to Vicksburg. The grade of lieutenant-general was revived by act of congress in February, and Grant was nominated for that office on 1 March, and confirmed by the senate on the 2d. He left Nashville on the 4th, in obedience to an order calling him to Washington, arrived there on the 8th, and received his commission from the president on the 9th. He was assigned to the command of all the armies on the 12th (Sherman being given the command of the military division of the Mississippi on the 18th), and established his headquarters with the Army of the Potomac at Culpepper, Va., on 26 March, 1864.

Grant now determined to concentrate all the National forces into several distinct armies, which should move simultaneously against the opposing Confederate armies, operate vigorously and continuously, and prevent them from detaching forces to strengthen threatened points, or for the purpose of making raids. He announced that the Confederate armies would be the only objective points in the coming campaigns. Sherman was to move toward Atlanta against Johnston. Banks's army, after it could be withdrawn from the Red river expedition, was to operate against Mobile. Sigel was to move down the valley of Virginia against Breckenridge to destroy communications and supplies, and prevent raids from that quarter. Butler was to ascend the James river and threaten Richmond. The Army of the Potomac, re-enforced by Burnside's troops and commanded by Meade, was to cover Washington, and assume the offensive against the Army of northern Virginia,

commanded by Gen. Robert E. Lee. Orders were issued for a general movement of all the armies in the field on 4 May. During the night of the 4th and 5th Grant crossed the Rapidan and encountered Lee in the Wilderness, where a desperate battle was fought on the 5th, 6th, and 7th. Grant's loss was 2,261 killed, 8,785 wounded, and 2,902 missing. Lee's losses have never been reported; but, as he was generally the attacking party, he probably lost more. He fell back on the 7th, and on that day and the next took up a strong defensive position at Spottsylvania. Grant moved forward on the night of the 7th. As he rode through the troops, the men greeted him as their new commander with an extraordinary demonstration in recognition of the victory, shouting, cheering, and kindling bonfires by the road-side as he passed. The 8th and 9th were spent by both armies in skirmishing and manœuvring for position. Sheridan's cavalry was despatched on the 9th to make a raid in rear of the enemy and threaten Richmond. On the 10th there was heavy fighting, with no decisive results, and on the 11th skirmishing and reconnoitring. On the morning of this day Grant sent a letter to Washington containing the famous sentence, "I propose to fight it out on this line, if it takes all summer." On the 12th a heavy assault was made on Lee's line, near the centre, in which he lost nearly 4,000 prisoners and 30 guns. Violent storms now caused a cessation in the fighting for several days. On the 19th, Ewell's corps, of Lee's army, moved around Grant's right flank and attacked, but was repelled after hard fighting. Grant's losses from the 8th to the 21st of May, around Spottsylvania, were 2,271 killed, 9,360 wounded, and 1,970 missing. The estimate of the enemy's loss in killed and wounded was nearly as great as that of the National army, besides about 4,000 prisoners and 30 cannon captured. In the mean time Butler had occupied Bermuda Hundred, below Richmond. Sherman had reached Dalton, Ga., and was steadily driving Johnston's army toward Atlanta. But Sigel had been forced to retreat before Breckenridge. On the



21st, Grant moved by the left flank to North Anna river, where he again encountered Lee, and after several engagements moved again by the left from that position on the 27th toward Cold Harbor. Grant's losses between the 20th and 26th were 186 killed, 792 wounded, and 165 missing. Lee's losses during this period have never been fully ascertained. After much fighting by detached portions of the two armies, Grant made a general assault upon Lee's heavily intrenched position at Cold Harbor on 3 June, but did not succeed in carrying it, being repelled with a loss of about 7,000 in killed, wounded, and missing, while Lee's loss was probably not more than 2,500. The campaign had now lasted thirty days. Grant had received during this time about 40,000 re-enforcements, and had lost 39,259 men—6,586 killed, 26,047 wounded, and 6,626 missing. Lee had received about 30,000 re-enforcements. There are no official figures as to his exact losses, but they have been estimated at about equal to his re-enforcements. Sherman had now reached Kenesaw, within thirty miles of Atlanta; and on the 7th news arrived that Hunter, who had succeeded Sigel, had gained a victory and had seized Staunton, on the Virginia Central railroad. Grant made preparations for transferring the Army of the Potomac to the south side of James river, to operate against Petersburg and Richmond from a more advantageous position. The army was withdrawn from the enemy's front on the night of 12 June, and the crossing of the river began on the 13th, and occupied three days. A force had also been sent around by water, by York and James rivers to City Point, to move against Petersburg. On the 15th the advanced troops attacked the works in front of that place; but, night coming on, the successes gained were not followed up by the commanders, and the next morning the position had been re-enforced and strengthened. An assault was made on the afternoon of the 16th, which was followed up on the 17th and 18th, and the result was the capture of important outworks, and the possession of a line closer to Petersburg. Lee's army had arrived, and again confronted the Army of the Potomac. Grant's headquarters had been established at City Point. On 22 and 23 June he made a movement from the left toward the Weldon railroad, and heavy fighting took place, with but little result, except to render Lee's use of that line of communication more precarious. Sheridan had set out on a raid from Pamun-

key river, 7 June, and, after defeating the enemy's cavalry, in the battle of Trevilian Station, destroying portions of the Virginia railroad, and inflicting other damage, he returned to White House, on York river, on the 20th. From there he crossed the James and rejoined the Army of the Potomac. A cavalry force under Gen. James H. Wilson had also been sent to the south and west of Petersburg, which destroyed railroad property, and for a time seriously interrupted the enemy's communications via the Danville and South-side railroads. Hunter, in the valley of Virginia, had destroyed the stores captured at Staunton and Lexington, and moved to Lynchburg. This place was re-enforced, and, after sharp fighting, Hunter fell back, pursued by a heavy force, to Kanawha river. Early's army drove the National troops out of Martinsburg, crossed the upper Potomac, and moved upon Hagerstown and Frederick. There was great consternation in Washington, and Grant was harassed by many anxieties. On 11 July, Early advanced against the fortifications on the north side of Washington; but Grant had sent the 6th corps there, which arrived opportunely, and the enemy did not attack. Sherman had outflanked Johnston at Kenesaw, crossed the Chattahoochee on 17 July, driven the enemy into his works around Atlanta, and destroyed a portion of the railroad in his rear. In Burnside's front, before Petersburg, a large mine had been constructed beneath the enemy's works. Many of Lee's troops had been decoyed to the north side of the James by feints made upon the lines there. The mine was fired at daylight on the morning of 30 July. A defective fuse caused a delay in the explosion, and when it occurred the assault ordered was badly executed by the officers in charge of it. Confusion arose, the place was re-enforced, and the National troops had to be withdrawn, after sustaining a heavy loss. Grant, in his anxiety to correct the errors of his subordinates, dismounted and made his way to the extreme front, giving directions in person, and exposing himself to a most destructive fire. He went to Monocacy 5 Aug., had Sheridan meet him there on the 6th, and placed him in command of all the forces concentrated in Maryland, with directions to operate against Early's command. On 14 Aug., Hancock's corps was sent to the north side of the James, and made a demonstration against the enemy at Deep Bottom, to develop his strength and prevent him from detaching troops to

send against Sheridan. This resulted in the capture of six pieces of artillery and a few prisoners. On 18 Aug., Warren's corps moved out and, after heavy fighting, seized and held a position on the Weldon railroad. Fighting continued on the 19th, with Warren's troops re-enforced by part of the 9th corps. Lee attempted to recover the Weldon road by an assault on the 21st, but was repelled. On the 23d, Ream's Station was occupied by the National troops, and the enemy attacked them in this place in force. Two assaults were successfully met, but the place was finally captured, and the National troops were compelled to fall back. Sherman's series of brilliant battles and manœuvres around Atlanta had forced Gen. Hood to evacuate that place, and his troops entered the city on 2 Sept. Sheridan attacked Early's army on 19 Sept., and in the battle of Winchester completely routed him. He pursued the enemy to Fisher's Hill, and on the 22d gained another signal victory. Grant now made several movements against Richmond and Petersburg, intended to keep Lee from detaching troops, to extend the National lines, and to take advantage of any weak spot in the enemy's front, with a view to penetrate it. On 29 Sept., Butler's forces were ordered to make an advance upon the works at Deep Bottom. Fort Harrison, the strongest work north of the James, was captured, with 15 guns and several hundred prisoners. On the 30th the enemy made three attempts to retake it by assault, but was each time repelled with heavy loss. On the same day Meade moved out and carried two redoubts and a line of rifle-pits at Peebles's farm, two miles west of the Weldon railroad. On 1 Oct., Meade's left was attacked; but it successfully repelled the assault, and he advanced his line on the 2d. Butler lost, in the engagements of the 29th and 30th, 394 killed, 1,554 wounded, and 324 missing. Meade lost, from 30th Sept. to 2 Oct., 151 killed, 510 wounded, and 1,348 missing. On 19 Oct., Sheridan's army was attacked by Early at Cedar Creek. Sheridan, who was on his return from Washington, rode twenty miles from Winchester, turned a defeat into a decisive victory, captured 24 guns, 1,600 prisoners, and 300 wagons, and left the enemy a complete wreck. On 27 Oct., Butler was ordered to make a demonstration against the enemy's line in his front, and had some fighting. At the same time, Meade moved out to Hatcher's run; but Gen. Lee was found strongly intrenched, the

ground very difficult, and no assault was attempted. In the afternoon a heavy attack was made by the enemy, but was successfully resisted. That night the National forces were withdrawn to their former positions. Meade's loss was 143 killed, 653 wounded, and 488 missing; the enemy's was greater, as he lost in prisoners alone about 1,300 men. Butler's loss on this day was 700 in killed and wounded, and 400 missing.

Sherman destroyed the railroad in his rear, cut loose from his base, and set out from Atlanta, 16 Nov., on his march to Savannah. Gen. John D. Hood, who had superseded Johnston, instead of following Sherman, turned northward and moved his army against Thomas, who had been placed in command of the troops left for the defence of Tennessee. Thomas concentrated his forces in the vicinity of Nashville. Schofield was at Franklin, twenty-five miles from Nashville, with about 26,000 men. Hood attacked him on 30 Nov., but after a hotly contested battle was repelled with heavy loss. Thomas, with his entire army, attacked Hood, and in the battle of Nashville, 15 and 16 Dec., completely defeated the enemy, capturing 53 guns and 4,462 prisoners, and drove him south of Tennessee river. Sherman reached the sea-coast near Savannah on 14 Dec., after destroying about 200 miles of railroad and \$100,000,000 worth of property. He invested Savannah, and forced the enemy to evacuate it on the night of 20 Dec. Grant had sent Butler in charge of an expedition against Fort Fisher, at the mouth of Cape Fear river, to act in conjunction with the naval fleet under Admiral Porter. He sailed from Fort Monroe, 14 Dec., landed his troops 25 Dec., and advanced against the fort, which had been vigorously shelled by the navy; but, while the assaulting party had every prospect of entering the work, they received an order to fall back and re-embark. The expedition reached Fort Monroe, on its return, 27 Dec. Butler was relieved, and Gen. E. O. C. Ord was assigned to the command of the Army of the James. Grant fitted out another expedition against Fort Fisher, under Gen. Alfred H. Terry, which sailed from Fort Monroe on 6 Jan., 1865. On the 13th the navy directed a heavy fire against the fort. Terry landed his troops, intrenched against a force of the enemy threatening him from the direction of Wilmington, and on the 15th made a vigorous assault, capturing the fort with its garrison and 169 heavy guns, and a large quantity of ammunition. It was

at first thought best to transfer Sherman's army by sea to Virginia, but this plan was abandoned, and on 27 Dec. he was ordered to move north by land. His army numbered 60,000 men, and was accompanied by 68 guns and 2,500 wagons. On 7 Jan., Schofield was directed to bring his army, then at Clifton, Tenn., to the sea-coast. It reached Washington and Alexandria, 31 Jan., and on 9 Feb. arrived at the mouth of Cape Fear river, with instructions to operate against Wilmington and penetrate the interior. He entered Wilmington on 22 Feb., it having been evacuated by the enemy, and took 51 heavy guns, 15 light guns, and 800 prisoners. His own loss in these operations was about 200 in killed and wounded. He moved thence to Goldsboro, where it was intended he should form a junction with Sherman. On 2 March, Lee addressed a letter to Grant, suggesting a personal meeting with a view to arranging subjects of controversy between the belligerents to a convention; but Grant replied that he had no authority to accede to the proposition; that he had a right to act only on subjects of a purely military character.

Sheridan moved down the valley of Virginia, from Winchester, 27 Feb., and defeated Early at Waynesboro, 2 March, capturing and scattering nearly his entire command. He then turned eastward, destroyed many miles of the James river canal, passed around the north side of Richmond, and tore up the railroads, arrived at White House on the 19th, and from there joined the Army of the Potomac. Grant had been anxious for some time lest Lee should suddenly abandon his works and fall back to unite with Johnston's forces in an attempt to crush Sherman and force Grant to pursue Lee to a point that would compel the Army of the Potomac to maintain a long line of communications with its base, as there would be nothing left in Virginia to subsist on after Lee had traversed it. Sleepless vigilance was enjoined on all commanders, with orders to report promptly any movement looking to a retreat. Sherman captured Columbia on 17 Feb., and destroyed large arsenals, railroad establishments, and forty-three cannon. The enemy was compelled to evacuate Charleston. On 3 March, Sherman struck Cheraw, and seized a large quantity of material of war, including 25 guns and 3,600 barrels of powder. At Fayetteville, on the 11th, he captured the finely equipped arsenal and twenty guns. On the 16th he struck the enemy at




Averysboro, and after a stubborn fight drove him from his position, losing 554 men. The Confederates reported their loss at 500. On the 19th Johnston's army attacked a portion of Sherman's forces at Bentonville, and made six heavy assaults, which were all successfully met, and on the night of the 21st the enemy fell back. The National loss was 191 killed and 1,455 wounded and missing; that of the Confederates was reported at 223 killed, 1,467 wounded, 653 missing, but Sherman reports his captures of prisoners at 1,621. On the 23d Sherman reached Goldsboro, where Schofield had arrived two days before, and was again in communication with the sea-coast, and able to draw supplies. On 20 March, Gen George Stoneman set out to march eastward from east Tennessee, toward Lynchburg, and on the same day Gen. E. R. S. Canby moved against Mobile. Gen. Pope, who had succeeded Rosecrans in Missouri, was ordered to drive Price beyond Red river. Hancock had been assigned to command the middle division when Sheridan joined the Army of the Potomac, and the troops under him near Washington were held in readiness to move.

All was now in readiness for the spring campaign, which Grant intended should be the last. President Lincoln, between whom and Grant had sprung up a strong personal attachment, visited him at City Point on 22 March, and Sherman came there on the 27th. They, with Grant and Admiral Porter, held an informal conference, and on the 28th Sherman set out again to join his army. At daylight, on 25 March, Lee had made a determined assault on Grant's right, capturing Fort Steadman, breaking through the National lines, and gaining possession of several batteries. In a few hours he was driven back, and all the captured positions were regained. Lee took this step to endeavor to force the withdrawal of troops in front of his left, and enable him to leave his intrenchments and retreat toward Danville. Its failure prevented the attempt. The country roads being considered sufficiently dry, Grant had issued orders for a general advance on the 29th, and these were carried out at the appointed time. Sheridan, with his cavalry, was sent in advance to Dinwiddie Court-House. The 5th corps had some fighting on the 29th, and in moving forward on the 31st was attacked and driven back a mile. Supported by a part of the 2d corps, it made a counter-attack, drove the enemy back into his breastworks, and secured an

advanced position. Sheridan had pushed on to Five Forks, but his command encountered a strong force of infantry and cavalry, and after heavy fighting all day he fell back to Dinwiddie Court-House, where he repelled the repeated assaults made upon him, and held the place. The 5th corps was that night ordered to report to Sheridan. The enemy, on the morning of 1 April, fell back toward Five Forks, closely followed by the cavalry, which pressed him closely. In the afternoon he had taken up a strongly intrenched position at Five Forks, on Lee's extreme right. The 5th corps having joined Sheridan, he made a combined attack, with infantry and cavalry, and by nightfall had gained a brilliant victory, capturing the Confederate works, 6 guns, and nearly 6,000 prisoners. His cavalry pursued the broken and flying enemy for six miles beyond the field of battle. That night, after getting the full details of Sheridan's success, Grant determined to make a vigorous assault the next day, with all his troops, upon the lines around Petersburg. It began at daylight, 2 April; the works were carried, and in a few hours Grant was closing in upon the inner defences of the city. Two of the forts, Gregg and Whitworth, were secured in the afternoon. The former was captured by assault, the latter was evacuated; 12,000 prisoners and over fifty guns were already in Grant's hands. Richmond and Petersburg were evacuated that night, and the National forces entered and took possession on the morning of the 3d. Grant, anticipating this, had begun a movement westward during the night, to head off Lee from Danville, and a vigorous pursuit by the whole army was ordered. It became evident that Lee was moving toward Amelia Court-House, and a force was urged forward to Jetersville, on the Danville railroad, to get between him and Danville. Part of Sheridan's cavalry and the head of the 5th corps reached there on the afternoon of the 4th and intrenched. The Army of the Potomac arrived by forced marches on the 5th, while the Army of the James, under Ord, pushed on toward Burkesville. An attack was ordered upon Lee on the morning of the 6th, but he had left Amelia Court-House during the night, and was pushing on toward Farmville by the Deatonville road. He was closely pursued, and on the afternoon of the 6th, Sheridan, with his cavalry and the 6th corps, attacked him at Sailor's Creek, capturing 7 general officers, about 7,000 men, and 14 guns. The

2d corps had kept up a running fight with the enemy all day, and had captured 4 guns, 17,000 prisoners, 13 flags, and 300 wagons. Lee was continuing his retreat through Farmville, and Grant urged troops to that place by forced marches on the 7th. The 2d corps and a portion of the cavalry had been repelled in their attacks on Lee, north of the Appomattox, and the 6th corps crossed from Farmville on the evening of the 7th to re-enforce them. That night Grant sent a note from Farmville to Lee, calling his attention to the hopelessness of further resistance, and asking the surrender of his army. He received a reply from Lee on the morning of the 8th, saying he was not entirely of Grant's opinion as to the hopelessness of further resistance, but asking what terms would be offered. Grant, who was still at Farmville, immediately replied, saying that, as peace was his great desire, he would insist on but one condition—that the men and officers surrendered should be disqualified from taking up arms again until properly exchanged. On the 8th Lee's troops were in full retreat on the north side of the Appomattox. The 2d and 6th corps followed in hot pursuit on that side, while Sheridan, Ord, and the 5th corps were pushed forward with all speed on the south side to head off Lee from Lynchburg. Near midnight on the night of the 8th Grant received another note from Lee, saying he had not intended to propose the surrender of his army, but desired to know whether Grant's proposals would lead to peace, and suggested a meeting at 10 A. M. the next morning. Grant replied that such a meeting could lead to no good, as he had no authority to treat on the subject of peace, but suggested that the south's laying down their arms would hasten the event and save thousands of lives and hundreds of millions of property. Early on the morning of 9 April, Lee's advance arrived at Appomattox Court-House; but by extraordinary forced marches, Sheridan, Ord, and Griffin reached that place at the same time. Lee attacked the cavalry; but, when he found infantry in his front, he sent in a flag of truce, and forwarded a note to Grant, asking an interview in accordance with the offer contained in Grant's letter of the day before. Grant received it on the road while riding toward Appomattox Court-House, and sent a reply saying he would move forward and meet Lee at any place he might select. They met in the McLean house, in Appomattox (see accompanying illustration) on the afternoon

of the 9th, and the terms of surrender were drawn up by Grant and accepted by Lee. The conference lasted about three hours. The men and officers were paroled and allowed to return to their homes; all public property was to be turned over, but the officers were allowed to keep their side-arms, and both officers and men to retain their private horses and baggage. These terms were so magnanimous, and the treatment of Lee and his officers so considerate, that the effect was to



induce other Confederates to seek the same terms and bring the rebellion to a speedy close. In riding to his camp after the surrender, Grant heard the firing of salutes. He sent at once to suppress them, and said: "The war is over; the rebels are again our

countrymen, and the best sign of rejoicing after the victory will be to abstain from all demonstrations in the field." The number paroled was 28,356. In addition to these, 19,132 had been captured during the campaign since 29 March. The killed were estimated at 5,000. After 9 April, over 20,000 stragglers and deserters besides came in and surrendered. The National losses during this period were 2,000 killed, 6,500 wounded, and 2,500 missing. Grant's losses, including those of Butler's army, during the year beginning with the battle of the Wilderness, were 12,663 killed, 49,559 wounded, and 20,498 missing; total, 82,720. No accurate reports of the Confederate losses can be obtained; but Grant's captures in battle during this year were 66,512.

On 10 April, Grant went to Washington to hasten the disbanding of the armies, stop purchases of supplies, and save expense to the government. He did not stop to visit Richmond. President Lincoln was assassinated on the 14th, and Grant would probably have shared the same fate but for his having left Washington that day. On 18 April, Sherman received the surrender of Johnston's army, but on terms that the

government did not approve, and Grant was sent to North Carolina to conduct further negotiations. On the 26th Johnston surrendered to Sherman on terms similar to those given to Lee, and 31,243 men were paroled. Grant remained at Raleigh and avoided being present at the interview, leaving to Sherman the full credit of the capture. Canby's force appeared before Mobile on 27 March, the principal defensive works were captured on 9 April, and Mobile was evacuated on the 11th, when 200 guns and 4,000 prisoners were captured, but about 9,000 of the garrison escaped. Wilson's cavalry command captured Selma, Ala., on 2 April, and Tuscaloosa on the 4th, occupied Montgomery on the 14th, and took West Point and Columbus, Ga., on the 16th. Macon surrendered on the 21st. Kirby Smith surrendered his command, west of the Mississippi, on the 26th. There was then not an armed enemy left in the country, and the rebellion was ended. Grant established his headquarters in Washington. He was greeted with ovations wherever he went, honors were heaped upon him in every part of the land, and he was universally hailed as the country's deliverer. In June, July, and August, 1865, he made a tour through the northern States and Canada. In November he was welcomed in New York by a demonstration that exceeded all previous efforts. It consisted of a banquet and reception, and the manifestations of the people in their greetings knew no bounds. Immediately after the war, Grant sent Gen. Sheridan with an army corps to the Rio Grande river to observe the movements of the French, who were then in Mexico supporting the Imperial government there in violation of the Monroe doctrine. This demonstration was the chief cause of the withdrawal of the French. Maximilian, being left without assistance from a European power, was soon driven from his throne, and the republic of Mexico was re-established.

The U. S. court in Virginia had found indictments against Gen. Lee and other officers prominent in the rebellion, and much anxiety was manifested by them on this account. Two months after the war, Lee applied by letter to be permitted to enjoy privileges extended to those included in a proclamation of amnesty, which had been issued by the president. Grant put an indorsement on the letter, which began as follows: "Respectfully forwarded through the secretary of war to the president, with the earnest recommendation that the application of

Gen. Robert E. Lee for amnesty and pardon be granted him." But President Johnson was at that time embittered against all participants in the rebellion, and seemed determined to have Lee and others punished for the crime of treason. Lee afterward made a strong appeal by letter to Grant for protection. Grant put a long and emphatic endorsement upon this letter, in which he used the following language: "In my opinion, the officers and men paroled at Appomattox Court-House, and since upon the same terms given to Lee, can not be tried for treason so long as they preserve the terms of their parole. . . . The action of Judge Underwood in Norfolk has already had an injurious effect, and I would ask that he be ordered to quash all indictments found against paroled prisoners of war, and to desist from further prosecution of them." Grant insisted that he had the power to accord the terms he granted at Appomattox, and that the president was bound to respect the agreements there entered into unless they should be abrogated by the prisoners violating their paroles. He went so far as to declare that he would resign his commission if so gross a breach of good faith should be perpetrated by the executive. The result was the abandonment of the prosecutions. This was the first of a series of contests between Grant and President Johnson, which finally resulted in their entire estrangement. In December, Grant made a tour of inspection through the south. His report upon affairs in that section of the country was submitted to congress by the president, and became the basis of important reconstruction laws. In May, 1866, he wrote a letter to the secretary of war, which was submitted to congress, and became the basis for the reorganization of the army, and also for the distribution of troops through the south during the process of reconstruction. The Fenians were now giving the government much trouble, and, in consequence of their acts, the relations between the United States and Great Britain were becoming strained. They had organized a raid into Canada to take place during the summer; but Grant visited Buffalo in June, took effective measures to stop them, and prevented all further unlawful acts on their part. Congress had passed an act creating the grade of general, a higher rank than had before existed in the army, to be conferred on Grant as a reward for his illustrious services in the field, and on 25 July, 1866, he received his commission.

In the autumn of 1866, President Johnson having changed his policy toward the south, finding that Grant refused to support him in his intentions to assume powers that Grant believed were vested only in congress, ordered him out of the country, with directions to proceed on a special mission to Mexico. Grant refused, saying that this was not a military service but a diplomatic mission, and that he claimed the right possessed by every citizen to decline a civil appointment. An effort was afterward made to send him west, to prevent his presence in Washington, but it was soon abandoned. The 39th congress, fearing the result of this action on the part of the president, attached a clause to the army appropriation bill, passed on 4 March, 1867, providing that "all orders and instructions relating to military operations shall be issued through the general of the army," and added that he should "not be removed, suspended, or relieved from command, or assigned to duty elsewhere than at the headquarters in Washington, except at his own request, without the previous approval of the senate." The president signed the bill, with a protest against this clause, and soon obtained an opinion from his attorney-general that it was unconstitutional. The president then undertook to send this opinion to the district commanders, but, finding the secretary of war in opposition, he issued it through the adjutant-general's office. Gen. Sheridan, then at New Orleans, in command of the fifth military district, inquired what to do, and Grant replied that a "legal opinion was not entitled to the force of an order," and "to enforce his own construction of the law until otherwise ordered." This brought on a crisis. The president claimed that under the constitution he could direct the district commanders to issue such orders as he dictated, and was met by an act of congress, passed in July, making the orders of the district commanders "subject to the disapproval of the general of the army." Thus Grant was given chief control of affairs relating to the reconstruction of the southern states. The president still retained the power of removal, and on the adjournment of congress he removed Sheridan and placed Gen. Hancock in command of the fifth military district. Some of Hancock's orders were revoked by Grant, which caused not a little bitterness of feeling between these officers, and provoked opposition from the Democratic party. Subsequently, when a bill was before congress to mus-

ter Gen. Hancock out of the service for his acts in Louisiana, Grant opposed it, and it was defeated. Soon afterward he recommended Hancock for a major-generalship in the regular army, to which he was appointed.

The "tenure-of-office" act forbade the president from removing a cabinet officer without the consent of the senate; but President Johnson suspended Sec. Stanton, and appointed Grant secretary of war *ad interim* on 12 Aug., 1867. Grant protested against this action, but retained the office until 14 Jan., 1868, when the senate refused to confirm the suspension of Stanton. Grant immediately notified the president, who, finding that the general of the army would not retain the place in opposition to the will of congress, and that Sec. Stanton had re-entered upon his office, ordered Grant verbally to disregard Stanton's orders. Grant declined to do so unless he received instructions in writing. This led to an acrimonious correspondence. The president claimed that Grant had promised to sustain him. This Grant emphatically denied, and in a long letter reviewing his action said: "The course you would have it understood I agreed to pursue, was in violation of law, and was without orders from you, while the course I did pursue, and which I never doubted you understood, was in accordance with law. . . . And now, Mr. President, when my honor as a soldier and integrity as a man have been so violently assailed, pardon me for saying that I regard this whole matter, from the beginning to the end, as an attempt to involve me in the resistance of law for which you hesitate to assume the responsibility in orders." On 21 Feb. the president appointed Lorenzo Thomas adjutant-general of the army, secretary of war, and ordered him to take possession of the office. On 24 Feb. articles of impeachment were passed by the house of representatives. Throughout these years of contest between the executive and congress, Grant's position became very delicate and embarrassing. He was compelled to execute the laws of congress at the risk of appearing insubordinate to his official chief, but his course was commended by the people, his popularity increased, and when the Republican convention met in Chicago, 20 May, 1868, he was unanimously nominated for the presidency on the first ballot. In his letter of acceptance, dated nine days after, he made use of the famous phrase, "Let us have peace." The Democratic party nominated Horatio



Seymour, of New York. When the election occurred, Grant carried twenty-six states with a popular vote of 3,015,071, while Seymour carried eight states with a popular vote of 2,709,613. It was claimed that the state of New York was really carried by Grant, but fraudulently counted for Seymour. Out of the 294 electoral votes cast for president, Grant received 214 and Seymour 80, three States—Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—not voting.

Grant possessed in a striking degree the essential characteristics of a successful soldier. His self-reliance was one of his most pronounced traits, and enabled him at critical moments to decide promptly the most important questions without useless delay in seeking advice from others, and to assume the gravest responsibilities without asking any one to share them. He had a fertility of resource and a faculty of adapting the means at hand to the accomplishment of his purposes, which contributed no small share to his success. His moral and physical courage were equal to every emergency in which he was placed. His unassuming manner, purity of character, and absolute loyalty to his superiors and to the work in which he was engaged, inspired loyalty in others and gained him the devotion of the humblest of his subordinates. He was singularly calm and patient under all circumstances, was never unduly elated by victory or depressed by defeat, never became excited, and never uttered an oath or imprecation. His habits of life were simple, and he was possessed of a physical constitution that enabled him to endure every form of fatigue and privation incident to military service in the field. He had an intuitive knowledge of topography, and never became confused as to locality in directing the movements of large bodies of men. He exhibited a rapidity of thought and action on the field that enabled him to move troops in the presence of an enemy with a promptness that has rarely been equalled. He had no hobby as to the use of any particular arm of the service. He naturally placed his main reliance on his infantry, but made a more vigorous use of cavalry than any of the generals of his day, and was judicious in apportioning the amount of his artillery to the character of the country in which he was operating. While his achievements in actual battle eclipse by their brilliance the strategy and grand tactics employed in his campaigns, yet the extraordinary combinations effected and the

skill and boldness exhibited in moving large armies into position entitle him, perhaps, to as much credit as the qualities he displayed in the face of the enemy. On 4 March, 1869, Grant was inaugurated the eighteenth president of the United States.

Gen. Grant had never taken an active part in politics, and had voted for a presidential candidate but once. In 1856, although his early associations had been with the Whigs, he cast his vote for James Buchanan, the Democratic candidate; but this was on personal rather than political grounds, as he believed that the Republican candidate did not possess the requisite qualifications for the office. So much doubt existed as to his political proclivities that prominent Democrats had made overtures to him to accept a nomination from their party only a few months before the nominating conventions were held. But he was at heart in thorough accord with the principles of the Republican party. He believed in a national banking system, a tariff that would fairly protect American industries, in the fostering of such internal improvements as would unite our two seaboard and give the eastern and western sections of the country mutual support and protection, in the dignifying of labor, and in laws that would secure equal justice to all citizens, regardless of race, color, or previous condition.

As early as August, 1863, he had written a letter to Elihu B. Washburne, member of congress, in which he said: "It became patent to my mind early in the rebellion that the north and south could never live at peace with each other except as one nation, and that without slavery. As anxious as I am to see peace established, I would not, therefore, be willing to see any settlement until this question is forever settled." In his inaugural address he declared that the government bonds should be paid in gold, advocated a speedy return to specie payments, and made many important recommendations in reference to public affairs. Regarding the good faith of the nation he said: "To protect the national honor, every dollar of government indebtedness should be paid in gold, unless otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract. . . . Let it be understood that no repudiator of one farthing of our public debt will be trusted in public place, and it will go far toward strengthening a credit which ought to be the best in the world, and will ultimately enable us to replace the debt with bonds bearing less interest than we now pay." Congress acted



Long Branch, N.J.  
August 3<sup>d</sup> 1862

My dear General Wilcox:

I have your letter of yesterday. On account of my continued lameness I will not be able to attend the reunion of the Society of the Army of the Potomac this year.

I have completed two of the four articles on the war that I promised the Century Magazine, Shiloh and Vicksburg, The Wilderness Campaign and that is to be followed by one in the closing scenes of the war — is commenced.

Very Truly Yours  
W. A. Grant

promptly upon his recommendation, and on 18 March, 1869, an act was passed entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit." Its language gave a pledge to the world that the debts of the country would be paid in coin unless there were in the obligations express stipulations to the contrary. Both in his inaugural address and in his first annual message to congress he took strong ground in favor of an effort to "civilize and Christianize" the Indians, and fit them ultimately for citizenship. His early experience among these people, while serving on the frontier, had eminently fitted him for inaugurating practical methods for improving their condition. He appointed as commissioner of Indian affairs the chief of the Six Nations, Gen. Ely S. Parker, a highly educated Indian, who had served on his staff, and selected as members of the board of Indian commissioners gentlemen named by the various religious denominations throughout the country. Although such men were not always practical in their views, and many obstacles had to be overcome in working out this difficult problem, great good resulted in the end; public attention was attracted to the amelioration of the condition of our savage tribes; they came to be treated more like wards of the nation, were gathered upon government reservations, where they could be more economically provided for, the number of Indian wars was reduced, and large amounts were saved to the government.

The 15th amendment to the constitution, adopted 26 Feb., 1869, guaranteed the right of suffrage without regard to race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It was ratified by the requisite three fourths of the states, and declared in force, 30 March, 1870. The adoption of this amendment had been recommended by President Grant, and had had his active support throughout, and it is largely due to his efforts that it is now a part of the constitution. He proclaimed its adoption by the somewhat unusual course of sending a special message to congress, in which he said: "I regard it as a measure of grander importance than any other one act of the kind from the foundation of the government to the present day." He also urged in this message that congress should encourage popular education, in order that the negro might become better fitted for the exercise of the privileges conferred upon him by this important amendment.


In the summer of 1869 a representative from Santo Do-

mingo informed the president that the government and people of that republic favored annexation to the United States. The president sent several officers of the government to investigate the condition of affairs there, and became so clearly impressed with the advantages that would result from the acquisition of that country that he negotiated a treaty of annexation, and submitted it to the senate at the next meeting of congress. In May, 1870, he urged favorable action on the part of that body in a message in which he set forth the reasons that had governed him, and again called attention to it in his second annual message. He claimed, among other things, that its admission into the Union as a territory would open up a large trade between the two lands, furnish desirable harbors for naval stations, and a place of refuge for negroes in the south who found themselves persecuted in their old homes; would favor the abolition of slavery in the West Indies, would be in harmony with the Monroe doctrine, and would redound to the great benefit of both countries and to civilization, and that there was danger, if we failed to receive it, that it would be taken by some European power, and add another to the list of islands off our coast controlled by European powers, and likely to give us trouble in case we became engaged in war. The measure was debated for a long time, but the senate did not act favorably upon it. In 1871 a commission of distinguished citizens was sent to investigate and report upon all matters relating to Santo Domingo and the proposed treaty. They visited that country, and made an exhaustive report, which was highly favorable to the plan of annexation; but the treaty was constitutionally rejected, having failed to receive the necessary two-third vote, and was never brought up again. The president declared that he had no policy to enforce against the will of the people. He referred to the subject in his last annual message to congress, and reviewed the grounds of his action, not in order to renew the project, but, as he expressed it, "to vindicate my previous action in regard to it." Many outrages had been committed in the south against the freedmen, and congress spent much time in considering measures for the suppression of these crimes. On 31 May, 1870, a bill was passed, called the Enforcement act, which empowered the president to protect the freedmen in their newly acquired rights, and punish the perpetrators of the outrages. Several

supplements to this were subsequently enacted, and a most onerous and exacting duty was imposed upon the executive in enforcing their provisions.

The reconstruction of the states recently in rebellion now progressed rapidly under the 14th amendment, which guaranteed equal civil rights to all citizens, and in July, 1870, all the states had ratified this amendment and been readmitted to the Union. The votes of Arkansas and Louisiana were not received by congress in the presidential election of 1872; but this was on account of fraud and illegal practices at the polls. In the president's annual message to congress, December, 1869, he recommended the passage of an act authorizing the funding of the public debt at a lower rate of interest. This was followed by the passing of an act, approved 14 July, 1870, which authorized the secretary of the treasury to issue bonds to the amount of \$200,000,000, bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent., \$300,000,000 at the rate of 4½ per cent., and \$ 1,000,000,000 at the rate of 4 per cent. Under this act, and subsequent amendments thereto, the national debt has been refunded from time to time, until the average rate of actual interest does not exceed 3½ per cent.

In 1870 President Grant sent special messages to congress urging upon that body the necessity of building up our merchant marine, and the adopting of methods for increasing our foreign commerce, and regarding our relations with Spain, which had become strained in consequence of the action of Spanish officials in Cuba. In August of this year, soon after the beginning of the war between France and Ger-



many, he issued a proclamation of neutrality as to both of those nations, and defined the duties of Americans toward the belligerents. He directed the U. S. minister to France, Elihu B. Washburne, to remain at his post in Paris, and extend the protection of the American flag to peoples of all nationalities who were without the protection of their own flag—an act that saved much suffering and loss to individuals.

In his annual message in 1870, the president took strong ground in favor of civil service reform, saying: "I would have it govern, not the tenure, but the manner of making all appointments," and "The present system does not secure the best men, and not even fit men, for public place." This subject gave rise to a spirited controversy in congress, many declaring the principle to be wholly un-American, and calculated to build up a favored class, who would be in great measure independent of their executive chiefs, etc. But on 3 March, 1871, an act was passed authorizing the president to appoint a civil service commission, and to prescribe rules and regulations governing the appointments of civil officers. He appointed seven gentlemen on this commission, selecting those who had been most prominent in advocating the measure, and transmitted their report to congress, with a special message urging favorable action. The plan recommended, which provided for competitive examinations, was approved, and was put into operation 1 Jan., 1872. An appropriation was procured for the expenses of the commission and the carrying out of the plan, but congress gave little countenance to the measure. Up to 1874 the president continued to urge that body to give legislative sanction to the rules and methods proposed, and declared that it was impossible to maintain the system without the "positive support of congress." He finally notified congress that if it adjourned without action he would regard it as a disapproval of the system, and would abandon it; but he continued it until its expenses were no longer provided for. The agitation of the question had been productive of much good. The seeds thus sown had taken deep root in the minds of the people, and bore good fruit in after years. In March, 1871, the disorders in the southern states, growing out of conflicts between the whites and the blacks, had assumed such proportions that the president sent a special message to congress requesting "such legislation as shall effectually secure life, liberty, and property, and the enforcement of law in all parts of the United States." On 20 April congress passed an act that authorized the president to suspend, under certain defined circumstances, the writ of habeas corpus in any district, and to use the army and navy in suppressing insurrections. He issued a proclamation, 4 May, ordering all unlawful armed bands to disperse, and, after expressing his




reluctance to use the extraordinary power conferred upon him, said he would "not hesitate to exhaust the power thus vested in the executive, whenever and wherever it shall become necessary to do so for the purpose of securing to all citizens of the United States the peaceful enjoyment of the rights guaranteed to them by the constitution and the laws." As this did not produce the desired effect, he issued a proclamation of warning, 12 Oct., and on the 17th suspended the writ of habeas corpus in parts of North and South Carolina. He followed this by vigorous prosecutions, which resulted in sending a number of prominent offenders to prison, and the outrages soon ceased. The most important measure of foreign policy during President Grant's administration was the treaty with Great Britain of 8 May, 1871, known as the treaty of Washington. Early in his administration the president had begun negotiations looking to the settlement of the claims made by the United States against Great Britain, arising from the depredations upon American vessels and commerce by Confederate cruisers that had been fitted out or obtained supplies in British ports, and the questions growing out of the Canadian fishery disputes and the location of our northern boundary-line at its junction with the Pacific ocean, which left the jurisdiction of the island of San Juan in controversy. Neither of the two last-mentioned questions had been settled by the treaty of peace of 1783, or any subsequent treaties. The fishery question was referred to arbitration by three commissioners, one to be chosen by the United States, one by Great Britain, and the third by the other two, provided they should make a choice within a stated time, otherwise the selection to be made by the Emperor of Austria. The two commissioners having failed to agree, the third was named by the Austrian emperor. The award was unsatisfactory to the United States, the decision of the commission was severely criticised, and the dispute has from time to time been reopened to the detriment of both countries. The San Juan question was referred to the emperor of Germany as arbitrator, with sole power. His award fully sustained the claim of the United States. A high joint commission had assembled at Washington, composed of American and English statesmen, which formulated the treaty of Washington, and by its terms the claims against Great Britain growing out of the operations of the Confederate cruisers,

commonly known as the "Alabama claims," were referred to a court of arbitration, which held its session at Geneva, Switzerland. In September, 1872, it awarded the United States the sum of \$15,500,000, which was subsequently paid by the British government. War had at one time seemed imminent, on account of the bitterness felt against Great Britain in consequence of her unfriendly acts during our civil war; but the president was a man who had seen so much of the evils of war that he became a confirmed believer in pacific measures as long as there was hope through such means. In his inaugural address he said: "In regard to foreign policy, I would deal with nations as equitable law requires individuals to deal with each other. . . . I would respect the rights of all nations, demanding equal respect for our own. If others depart from this rule in their dealings with us, we may be compelled to follow their precedent." The adoption of the treaty was a signal triumph for those who advocated the settlement of international disputes by peaceful methods. The adoption of the rules contained in the treaty for the government of neutral nations was of far more importance than the money award. These rules were to govern the action of the two contracting parties, and they agreed to bring them to the notice of other nations, and invite them to follow the precedent thus established. The rules stipulated that a neutral shall not permit a belligerent to fit out, arm, or equip in its ports any vessel that it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or carry on war against a nation with which it is at peace and that neither of the contracting parties shall permit a belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as a base of operations against the other. The two nations also agreed to use due diligence to prevent any infraction of these rules.

On 22 May, 1872, the amnesty bill was passed by congress, restoring their civil rights to all but about 350 persons in the south who had held conspicuous positions under the Confederate government. President Grant's first administration had been vigorous and progressive. Important reforms had been inaugurated, and measures of vital moment to the nation, both at home and abroad, had been carried to a successful conclusion in the face of opposition from some of the most prominent men of his own political party. Not a few Republicans became estranged, feeling that they were being ignored

by the executive, and formed themselves into an organization under the name of "Liberal Republicans." This opposition resulted in the holding of a convention in Cincinnati, and the nomination of Horace Greeley as its candidate for the presidency, which nomination was afterward adopted by the Democratic party. The Republican convention met in Philadelphia, 5 June, 1872, renominated President Grant, and adopted a platform approving the principles advocated by him in his previous administration. When the election took place, he carried 31 states, with a popular vote of 3,597,070, the largest that had ever been given for any president, while Greeley carried 6 states with a popular vote of 2,834,079. Grant received 286 electoral votes against 66 that would have been cast for Mr. Greeley if he had lived. The 14 votes of Arkansas and Louisiana were not counted, because of fraud and illegality in the election. The canvass had been one of the most aggressive and exciting in the history of the country, and abounded in personal attacks upon the candidates. Gen. Grant, in his inaugural address on 4 March, 1873, said, in alluding to the personal abuse that had been aimed at him: "To-day I feel that I can disregard it, in view of your verdict, which I gratefully accept as my vindication." His second term was a continuation of the policy that had characterized his first. His foreign policy was steadfast, dignified, and just, always exhibiting a conscientious regard for the rights of foreign nations, and at the same time maintaining the rights of our own. He instructed the ministers to China and Japan to deal with those powers as "we would wish a strong nation to deal with us if we were weak." During the insurrection in the island of Cuba, which had lasted for several years, a number of American citizens had been arrested by the Spanish authorities, under the pretence that they had been furnishing aid to the insurgents, and American vessels plying in Cuban waters had at times been subjected to much inconvenience. Then matters culminated in the seizure by Spain, without justification, of an American vessel named the "Virginius." The excitement created in the United States by this outrage was intense, and many statesmen were clamorous for war. But the president believed that pacific measures would accomplish a better result, and, by acting with promptness and firmness, he soon wrung from Spain ample apology and full reparation.

Political troubles were still rife in certain states of the south. The result of the election in Louisiana in 1872 was in dispute, and armed violence was threatened in that state. Early in 1873 the president called the attention of congress to the inadequacy of the laws applying to such cases, saying that he had recognized the officers installed by the decision of the returning-board as representing the *de facto* government, and added: "I am extremely anxious to avoid any appearance of undue interference in state affairs, and if congress differs from me as to what ought to be done, I respectfully urge its



immediate decision to that effect." Congress, however, took no action, and left with the executive the sole responsibility of dealing with this delicate question. The next year the trouble was renewed, and the fierce contest that was

waged between the Republicans under Kellogg, and the Democrats under McEnery, their respective candidates for the governorship, resulted in armed hostilities. Kellogg, the *de facto* governor, called upon the Federal authority for protection, and Gen. Emory was sent to New Orleans with U. S. troops, and the outbreak was for a time suppressed. But difficulties arose again, and the president sent Gen. Sheridan to Louisiana to report upon the situation of affairs, and, if necessary, to take command of the troops and adopt vigorous measures to preserve the peace. Gen. Sheridan became convinced that his duty was to sustain the government organized by Kellogg, and, on the demand of the governor, he ejected some of McEnery's adherents from the state capitol. The president submitted the whole history of the case to congress, asking for legislation defining his duties in the emergency. Getting no legislation on the subject, he continued his recognition of the government of which Kellogg was the head, until the election of a new governor; but there was afterward no serious trouble in Louisiana. Difficulties of the same nature arose in Arkansas and Texas, which were almost as perplexing to the executive;

but these attracted less attention before the public. Difficulties of a somewhat similar kind were encountered also in Mississippi, but the president in this case avoided interference on the part of the general government.

In April, 1874, congress passed what was known as the "Inflation bill," which increased the paper currency of the country, and was contrary to the financial principles that the president had always entertained and advocated in his state papers. Many of his warmest political supporters had approved the measure, and unusual efforts were made to convince him that it was wise financially and expedient politically. The president gave much thought and study to the question, and at one time wrote out the draft of a message in which he set forth all the arguments that could be made in its favor, in order that he might fully weigh them; but, on reading it over, he became convinced that the reasons advanced were not satisfactory, and that the measure would in the end be injurious to the true business interests of the country, and delay the resumption of specie payment. He therefore returned the bill to congress, with his veto, 22 April. The arguments contained in his message were unanswerable, the bill was not passed over his veto, and his course was sustained by the whole country. Perhaps no act of his administration was more highly approved by the people at large, and the result amply proved the wisdom of the firmness he exhibited at this crisis. About two months after this, in a conversation at the executive mansion with Senator Roscoe Conkling, of New York, and Senator John P. Jones, of Nevada, the president entered at length upon his views concerning the duty of the government to take steps looking to the return to specie payment. His earnestness on this subject, and the advantages of the methods proposed, so impressed the senators that they asked him to commit his views to writing. He complied with this request by writing a letter addressed to Senator Jones, dated 4 June, 1874, in which he began by saying: "I believe it a high and plain duty to return to a specie basis at the earliest practical day, not only in compliance with legislative and party pledges, but as a step indispensable to national lasting prosperity." Then followed his views at length. This letter was made public, and attracted much attention, and in January, 1875, the "Resumption act" was passed, which, to a

large extent, embodied the views that had been suggested by the president. There were doubts in the minds of many as to the ability of the government to carry it into effect; but it proved entirely successful, and the country was finally relieved from the stigma of circulating an irredeemable paper currency.

During 1875 the president had reason to suspect that frauds were being practised by government officials in certain states in collecting the revenue derived from the manufacture of whiskey. He at once took active measures for their detection, and the vigorous pursuit and punishment of the offenders. He issued a stringent order for their prosecution, closing with the famous words, "Let no guilty man escape." Many indictments soon followed, the ringleaders were sent to the penitentiary, and an honest collection of the revenue was secured. Some of the revenue officials were men of much political influence, and had powerful friends. The year for nominating a president was at hand, and the excitement ran high. Friends of the convicted, political enemies and rivals for the succession in his own party, resorted to the most desperate means to break the president's power and diminish his popularity. The grossest misrepresentations were practised, first in trying to bring into question the honesty of his purpose in the prosecution of offenders, and afterward in endeavoring to rob him of the credit of his labors after they had purified the revenue-service. But these efforts signally failed.

In September, 1875, Gen. Grant, while attending an army reunion in Iowa, offered three resolutions on the subject of education, and made a speech in which he used this language: "Let us labor for the security of free thought, free speech, free press, pure morals, unfettered religious sentiments, and equal rights and privileges for all men, irrespective of nationality, color, or religion; encourage free schools; resolve that not one dollar appropriated to them shall go to the support of any sectarian school; resolve that neither state nor nation shall support any institution save those where every child may get a common-school education, unmixed with any atheistic, pagan, or sectarian teaching; leave the matter of religious teaching to the family altar, and keep church and state forever separate." This was published broadcast, and was received with marked favor by the press and people.

In 1876 Samuel J. Tilden, of New York, was nominated for

the presidency by the Democrats, and Gen. Rutherford B. Hayes, of Ohio, by the Republicans. When the election was held in November, the result was in dispute, and a bitter contest was likely to follow in determining which was the legally elected candidate. After an exciting debate in congress, a bill was passed providing for an electoral commission, to whose decision the question was to be referred. It decided in favor of Gen. Hayes, and he was inaugurated on 4 March, 1877. During all this time the political passions of the people were raised to fever-heat, serious threats of violence were made, and the business interests of the country were greatly disturbed. President Grant took no active part in the determination of the question, but devoted himself to measures to preserve the peace. There were many changes in the cabinet during Grant's two administrations. The following is a list of its members, giving the order in which they served: Secretaries of state, Elihu B. Washburne, of Illinois; Hamilton Fish, of New York. Secretaries of the treasury, Alexander T. Stewart, of New York (appointed, but not confirmed, on account of the discovery of an old law rendering him ineligible because of his being engaged in the business of an importing merchant); George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts; William M. Richardson, of Massachusetts; Benjamin H. Bristow, of Kentucky; Lot M. Morrill, of Maine. Secretaries of war, Gen. John M. Schofield, U. S. army; John A. Rawlins, of Illinois; William W. Belknap, of Iowa; Alonzo Taft, of Ohio; J. Donald Cameron, of Pennsylvania. Secretaries of the navy, Adolph E. Borie, of Pennsylvania; George M. Robeson, of New Jersey. Postmasters-General, John A. J. Creswell, of Maryland; Marshall Jewell, of Connecticut; James A. Tyner, of Indiana. Attorneys-General, Ebenezer R. Hoar, of Massachusetts; Amos T. Akerman, of Georgia; George H. Williams, of Oregon; Edwards Pierrepont, of New York; Alonzo Taft, of Ohio. Secretaries of the interior, Gen. Jacob D. Cox, of Ohio; Columbus Delano, of Ohio; Zachariah Chandler, of Michigan.

During President Grant's administrations the taxes had been reduced over \$300,000,000, the national debt over \$450,000,000, the interest on the debt from \$160,000,000 to \$100,000,000; the balance of trade had changed from \$130,000,000 against this country to \$130,000,000 in its favor; the reconstruction of the southern states had been completed; the first trans-

continental railroad had been finished; all threatening foreign complications had been satisfactorily settled; and all exciting national questions seemed to have been determined and removed from the arena of political contests. Gen. Grant, while president, exhibited the same executive ability as in the army, insisting upon a proper division of labor among the different branches of the government, leaving the head of each department great freedom of action, and holding him to a strict accountability for the conduct of the affairs of his office. He decided with great promptness all questions referred to him,



and suggested many measures for improving the government service, but left the carrying out of details to the proper chiefs. While positive in his views, and tenacious of his opinions when they had once been formed after due reflection, he listened patiently to suggestions and arguments, and had no pride of opinion as to changing his mind, if convincing reasons were presented to him. He was generally a patient listener while others presented their views, and seldom gave his opinions until they were thoroughly matured; then he talked freely and with great force and effect. He was one of the most accessible of all the presidents. He reserved no hours that he could call




his own, but was ready to see all classes of people at all times, whether they were high in position or from the ranks of the plain people. His patience was one of the most characteristic traits of his character, and his treatment of those who came in contact with him was frank and cordial to the highest degree. His devotion to his friends was proverbial, and his loyalty to others commanded loyalty from them, and accounted, in great measure, for the warmth and devotion of his followers. Wherever he placed trust he reposed rare confidence, until it was shaken by actual proofs of betrayal. This characteristic of his nature led him at times to be imposed upon by those who were not worthy of the faith he placed in them; but persons that once lost his confidence never regained it.

After retiring from the presidency, 4 March, 1877, Gen. Grant decided to visit the countries of the Old World, and on 17 May he sailed from Philadelphia for Liverpool on the steamer "Indiana," accompanied by his wife and one son. His departure was the occasion for a memorable demonstration on the Delaware. Distinguished men from all parts of the country had assembled to bid him good-by, and accompanied him down the river. A fleet of naval and commercial vessels and river boats, decorated with brilliant banners, convoyed his steamer, crowds lined the shores greeting him with cheers, bells rang, whistles sounded from mills and factories, and innumerable flags saluted as he passed. On his arrival in Liverpool, 28 May, he received the first of a series of ovations in foreign lands scarcely less cordial and enthusiastic than those which had been accorded him in his own country. The river Mersey was covered with vessels displaying the flags of all nations, and all vied with each other in their demonstrations of welcome. He visited the places of greatest interest in Great Britain, and was accorded the freedom of her chief cities, which means the granting of citizenship. He received a greater number of such honors than had ever been bestowed even upon the most illustrious Englishman. In London he was received by the queen and the Prince of Wales, and afterward visited her majesty at Windsor Castle. While he was entertained in a princely manner by royalty, the most enthusiastic greetings came from the masses of the people, who everywhere turned out to welcome him. His replies to the numerous addresses of welcome were marked by exceeding good taste, and were

read with much favor by his own countrymen. Upon leaving England he visited the continent, and the greetings there from crowned heads and common people were repetitions of the receptions he had met ever since he landed in Europe. The United States man-of-war "Vandalia" had been put at his disposal, and on board that vessel he made a cruise in the Mediterranean, visiting Italy, Egypt, and the Holy Land. He sailed from Marseilles for India, 23 Jan., 1879, arrived at Bombay, 12 Feb., and from there visited Calcutta and many other places of interest. His journey through the country called forth a series of demonstrations which resembled the greetings to an emperor passing through his own realms. He sailed in the latter part of March for Burmah, and afterward visited the Malacca peninsula, Siam, Cochin China, and Hong-Kong, arriving at the latter place on 30 April. He made a tour into the interior of China, and was everywhere received with honors greater than had ever been bestowed upon a foreigner. At Peking, Prince Kung requested him to act as sole arbitrator in the settlement of the dispute between that country and Japan concerning the Loo Choo islands. His plans prevented him from entering upon the duties of arbitrator, but he studied the questions involved and gave his advice on the subject, and the matters in dispute were afterward settled without war. On 21 June he reached Nagasaki, where he was received by the imperial officials and became the guest of the mikado. The attention shown him while in Japan exceeded in some of its features that which he had received in any of the other countries included in his tour. The entertainments prepared in his honor were memorable in the history of that empire. He sailed from Yokohama, 3 Sept., and reached San Francisco on the 20th. He had not visited the Pacific coast since he had served there as a lieutenant of infantry. Preparations had been made for a reception that should surpass any ever accorded to a public man in that part of the country, and the demonstration in the harbor of San Francisco on his arrival formed a pageant equal to anything of the kind seen in modern times. On his journey east he was tendered banquets and public receptions, and greeted with every manifestation of welcome in the different cities at which he stopped. Early in 1880 he travelled through some of the southern states and visited Cuba and Mexico. In the latter country he was hailed as its staunchest

and most pronounced friend in the days of its struggle against foreign usurpation, and the people testified their gratitude by extending to him every possible act of personal and official courtesy. On his return he took his family to his old home in



Galena, Ill. A popular movement had begun looking to his renomination that year for the presidency, and overtures were made to him to draw him into an active canvass for the purpose of accomplishing this result; but he declined to take any part in the movement, and preferred that the nomination should

either come to him unsolicited or not at all. When the Republican convention met in Chicago in June, 1880, his name was presented, and for thirty-six ballots he received a vote that only varied between 302 and 313. Many of his warmest admirers were influenced against his nomination by a traditional sentiment against a third presidential term, and after a long and exciting session the delegates to the convention compromised by nominating Gen. James A. Garfield. Gen. Grant devoted himself loyally during this political canvass to the success of the party that had so often honored him, and contributed largely by his efforts to the election of the candidate.

In August, 1881, Gen. Grant bought a house in New York, where he afterward spent his winters, while his summers were passed at his cottage at Long Branch. On Christmas eve, 1883, he slipped and fell upon the icy sidewalk in front of his house, and received an injury to his hip, which proved so severe that he never afterward walked without the aid of a crutch. Finding himself unable with his income to support his family properly, he had become a partner in a banking-house in which one of his sons and others were interested, bearing the name of Grant and Ward, and invested all his available capital in the business. He took no part in the management, and the affairs of the firm were left almost entirely in the hands of the junior partner. In May, 1884, the firm without warning suspended. It was found that two of the partners had been practising a series of unblushing frauds, and had robbed the general and his family of all they possessed, and left them hopelessly bankrupt. Until this time he had refused all solicitations to write the history of his military career for publication, intending to leave it to the official records and the historians of the war. Almost his only contribution to literature was an article entitled "An Undeserved Stigma," in the "North American Review" for December, 1882, which he wrote as an act of justice to Gen. Fitz-John Porter, whose case he had personally investigated. But now he was approached by the conductors of the "Century" magazine with an invitation to write a series of articles on his principal campaigns, which he accepted, for the purpose of earning money, of which he was then greatly in need, and he accordingly produced four articles for that periodical. Finding this a congenial occupation, and receiving handsome offers from several publishers, he set himself to the task of preparing

two volumes of personal memoirs, in which he told the story of his life down to the close of the war, and proved himself a natural and charming writer, and a valuable contributor to history. The contract for the publication of the book was made on 27 Feb., 1885, and the work appeared about a year afterward. The sales were enormous, having reached up to this time 312,000 sets. The amount that Mrs. Grant has already (July, 1894) received as her share of the profits is upwards of \$440,000, paid in two checks, of \$200,000 and \$150,000, and several smaller amounts, the largest sum ever received by an author or his representatives from the sale of any single work. It is expected by the publishers that the amount of half a million of dollars will be ultimately paid to the general's family. In the summer of 1884 Gen. Grant complained of a soreness in the throat and roof of the mouth. In August he consulted a physician, and a short time afterward the disease was pronounced to be cancer at the root of the tongue. The sympathies of the entire nation were now aroused, messages of hope and compassion poured in from every quarter, and on 4 March, 1885, congress passed a bill creating him a general on the retired list, thus restoring him to his former rank in the army. He knew that his disease would soon prove fatal. He now bent all his energies to the completing of his "Memoirs," in order that the money realized from the sale might provide for his family. He summoned all his will power to this task, and nothing in his career was more heroic than the literary labor he now performed. Hovering between life and death, suffering almost constant agony, and speechless from disease, he struggled through his daily task, and laid down his pen only four days before his death. At this time the last portrait was made of the great soldier, which appears on page 361.

On 16 June, 1885, he was removed to the Joseph W. Drexel cottage on Mount McGregor, near Saratoga, N. Y., where he passed the remaining five weeks of his life. (See illustration on page 384.) The cottage was offered by its owner as a gift to the U. S. government. As it was not accepted, Mr. Drexel kept the cottage and its contents in the condition they were in at the time of the general's death, and continued to do so until it was accepted by the State of New York. On Thursday, 23 July, at eight o'clock in the morning, Grant passed away, surrounded by his family. The remains were taken to

New York, escorted by a detachment of U. S. troops and a body of the Grand Army of the republic composed of veterans of the war. A public funeral was held in that city on Saturday, 8 Aug., which was the most magnificent spectacle of the kind ever witnessed in this country. The body was deposited in a temporary tomb in Riverside park, overlooking the Hudson river, where an imposing monument, to cost about \$500,000, is now in course of erection. In Chicago a bronze equestrian statue of the general, executed by Rebisso, has been erected near the centre of Lincoln park, overlooking Lake Michigan. The illustration on page 388 is a representation of the statue, and following on page 391 is a view of the eastern façade of the structure, designed by Whitehouse, which is surmounted by the statue. The large collection of swords, gold-headed canes, medals, rare coins, and other articles that had been presented to Gen. Grant passed into the possession of William H. Vanderbilt as security in a financial transaction shortly before the general's death. After that event Mr. Vanderbilt returned the articles to Mrs. Grant, by whom they were given to the United States government, and the entire collection is now in the National museum at Washington. Among the many portraits of the great soldier, perhaps the best are those painted by Healy for the Union league club about 1865, and another executed in Paris in 1877, now in the possession of the family, those painted in 1882 by Le Clear for the White House at Washington and the Calumet club of Chicago, and one executed by Ulke for the U. S. war department, where is also to be seen a fine marble bust, executed in 1872-'3, by Hiram Powers. See "Military History of Ulysses S. Grant, from April, 1861, to April, 1865," by Adam Badeau (3 vols., New York, 1867-'81); "Life and Public Services of Gen. U. S. Grant," by James Grant Wilson (1868); revised and enlarged edition (1886); "The Ancestry of General Grant and their Contemporaries," by Edward C. Marshall (1869); "Around the World with General Grant," by John Russell Young (1880); and "Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant," written by himself (2 vols., 1885-'6); also various biographies and numerous addresses, among them one by Henry Ward Beecher, delivered in Boston, 22 Oct., 1885. General Grant's birthday is now celebrated by public dinners in many of the principal cities of the North, like those of Washington and Lincoln.

His wife, JULIA DENT, born in St. Louis, Mo., 26 Jan., 1826, is the daughter of Frederick and Ellen Wrenshall Dent. Her father was the son of Capt. George Dent, who led the forlorn hope at Fort Montgomery, when it was stormed by Mad Anthony Wayne. On her mother's side she was descended from John Wrenshall, who came from England to this country to escape religious intolerance, and settled in Philadelphia, Pa. At the age of ten years she was sent to Miss Moreau's boarding-school, where she remained for eight years. Soon after her return home she met Lieut. Grant, then of the 4th infantry, stationed at Jefferson barracks at St. Louis, and in the spring of 1844 became engaged to him. Their marriage, deferred by the war with Mexico, took place on 22 Aug., 1848. The first four years of her married life were spent at Detroit, Mich., and at Sackett's Harbor, N. Y., where Capt. Grant was stationed. In 1852 Mrs. Grant returned to her father's home in St. Louis, her health not being sufficiently strong to accompany her husband to California, whither his command had been ordered. Two years later he resigned from the army and joined his family in St. Louis. During the civil war Mrs. Grant passed much of the time with Gen. Grant, or near the scene of action, he sending for her whenever opportunity permitted. She was with him at City Point in the winter of 1864-'5, and accompanied him to Washington when he returned with his victorious army. She saw her husband twice inaugurated president of the United States, and was his companion in his journey around the world. She herself has said: "Having learned a lesson from her predecessor, Penelope, she accompanied her Ulysses in his wanderings around the world." After Gen. Grant's death a bill was passed by congress giving his widow a pension of \$5,000 a year. She is the fourth to whom such a pension has been granted, the others being Mrs. Tyler, Mrs. Polk, and Mrs. Garfield. Four children were born to her—three sons, Frederick Dent, Ulysses, Jr., and Jesse, and one daughter, Nellie, who, in 1874, married Algernon Sartoris, and went with him to his




*Julia D. Grant*

English home near Southampton. She is now a widow with three children, and has lived in London for several years. Mrs. Grant expects to reside hereafter in Washington, D. C. She has written her Memoirs, but it is not thought likely that they will be published during her life.

Their eldest son, FREDERICK DENT, born in St. Louis, Mo., 30 May, 1850, accompanied his father during the civil war, and was in five battles before he was thirteen years of age. In 1867 he entered the U. S. military academy, where he was graduated in 1871 and assigned to the 4th cavalry. During the summer of 1871 he was employed on the Union Pacific and Colorado Central railroads as an engineer. Late in 1871 he visited Europe with Gen. Sherman, and in 1872 was detailed to command the escort to the party that was making the preliminary survey for the Southern Pacific railroad. In 1873 he was assigned to the staff of Gen. Sherman as lieutenant-colonel, in which capacity he served eight years, accompanying nearly every expedition against the Indians. He was with his father in 1879 in the oriental part of the journey round the world, and in 1881 resigned his commission. During his father's illness, Col. Grant remained constantly with him and assisted somewhat in the preparation of the "Personal Memoirs." After Gen. Grant's death his son had the care of his mother and her estate, residing with her, until his appointment by President Harrison, in 1889, as minister to Austria, from which he was relieved in June, 1893, and returned to New York. He is married, and has two children, a daughter and a son, Ulysses, who expects soon to enter the U. S. Military Academy, his grandfather having just before his death written a letter, addressed to whoever should be President of the United States at the time his namesake attained to the necessary age, requesting the appointment for him.







1847 - H. B. Hall of New York

*R. B. Hayes*

## RUTHERFORD BIRCHARD HAYES.

RUTHERFORD BIRCHARD HAYES, nineteenth president of the United States, was born in Delaware, Ohio, 4 Oct., 1822. His father had died in July, 1822, leaving his mother in modest but easy circumstances. The boy received his first education in the common schools, and began early the study of Latin and Greek with Judge Sherman Finch, of Delaware. Then he was sent to an academy at Norwalk, Ohio, and in 1837 to Isaac Webb's school, at Middletown, Conn., to prepare for college. In the autumn of 1838 he entered Kenyon college, at Gambier, Ohio. He excelled in logic, mental and moral philosophy, and mathematics, and also made his mark as a debater in the literary societies. On his graduation in August, 1842, he was awarded the valedictory oration, with which he won much praise. Soon afterward he began to study law in the office of Thomas Sparrow, at Columbus, Ohio, and then attended a course of law lectures at Harvard university, entering the law-school on 22 Aug., 1843, and finishing his studies there in January, 1845. As a law student he had the advantage of friendly intercourse with Judge Story and Prof. Greenleaf, and he also attended the lectures of Longfellow on literature and of Agassiz on natural science, prosecuting at the same time the study of French and German. On 10 May, 1845, after due examination, he was admitted to practice in the courts of Ohio as an attorney and counsellor at law. He established himself first at Lower Sandusky (now Fremont), where, in April, 1846, he formed a law partnership with Ralph P. Buckland, then a member of congress. In November, 1848, having suffered from bleeding in the throat, Mr. Hayes went to spend the winter in the milder climate of Texas, where his health was completely restored. Encouraged by the good opinion and advice of professional friends to seek a larger field of activity, he established himself, in the winter of 1849-'50,

in Cincinnati. His practice at first being light, he earnestly and systematically continued his studies in law and literature, also enlarging the circle of his acquaintance by becoming a member of various societies, among others the literary club of Cincinnati, in the social and literary entertainments of which at that time such men as Salmon P. Chase, Thomas Ewing, Thomas Corwin, Stanley Matthews, Moncure D. Conway, Manning F. Force, and others of note, were active participants. He won the respect of the profession, and attracted the attention of the public as attorney in several criminal cases which gained some celebrity, and gradually increased his practice.

On 30 Dec., 1852, he married Miss Lucy W. Webb, daughter of Dr. James Webb, a physician of high standing in Chillicothe, Ohio. In January, 1854, he formed a law partnership with H. W. Corwine and William K. Rogers. In 1856 he was nominated for the office of common pleas judge, but declined. In 1858 the city council of Cincinnati appointed him city solicitor, to fill a vacancy caused by death, and in the following year he was elected to the same office at a popular election by a majority of over 2,500 votes. Although he performed his duties to the general satisfaction of the public, he was, in April, 1861, defeated for re-election as solicitor, together with the whole ticket. Mr. Hayes, ever since he was a voter, had acted with the Whig party, voting for Henry Clay in 1844, for Gen. Taylor in 1848, and for Gen. Scott in 1852. Having from his youth always cherished anti-slavery feelings, he joined the Republican party as soon as it was organized, and earnestly advocated the election of Fremont in 1856, and of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. At a great mass-meeting, held in Cincinnati immediately after the arrival of the news that the flag of the United States had been fired upon at Fort Sumter, he was made chairman of a committee on resolutions to give voice to the feelings of the loyal people. His literary club formed a military company, of which he was elected captain, and this club subsequently furnished to the National army more than forty officers, of whom several became generals. On 7 June, 1861, the governor of Ohio appointed Mr. Hayes a major of the 23d regiment of Ohio volunteer infantry, and in July the regiment was ordered into West Virginia. On 19 Sept., 1861, Maj. Hayes was appointed by Gen. Rosecrans judge advocate of the Department of Ohio, the duties of which office he performed for about two months.

On 24 Oct., 1861, he was promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel. On 14 Sept., 1862, in the battle of South Mountain, he distinguished himself by gallant conduct in leading a charge and in holding his position at the head of his men, after being severely wounded in his left arm, until he was carried from the field. His regiment lost nearly half its effective force in the action. On 24 Oct., 1862, he was appointed colonel of the same regiment. He spent some time at his home while under medical treatment, and returned to the field as soon as his wound was healed. In July, 1863, while taking part in the operations of the National army in southwestern Virginia, Col. Hayes caused an expedition of two regiments and a section of artillery, under his own command, to be despatched to Ohio for the purpose of checking the raid of the Confederate Gen. John Morgan, and he aided materially in preventing the raiders from recrossing the Ohio river and in compelling Morgan to surrender. In the spring of 1864 Col. Hayes commanded a brigade in Gen. Crook's expedition to cut the principal lines of communication between Richmond and the southwest. He again distinguished himself by conspicuous bravery at the head of his brigade in storming a fortified position on the crest of Cloyd mountain. In the first battle of Winchester, 24 July, 1864, commanding a brigade in Gen. Crook's division, Col. Hayes was ordered, together with Col. James Mulligan, to charge what proved to be a greatly superior force. Col. Mulligan fell, and Col. Hayes, flanked and pressed in front by overwhelming numbers, conducted the retreat of his brigade with great intrepidity and skill, checking the pursuit as soon as he had gained a tenable position. He took a creditable part in the engagement at Berryville and in the second battle of Winchester, 19 Sept., 1864, where he performed a feat of extraordinary bravery. Leading an assault upon a battery on an eminence, he found in his way a morass over fifty yards wide. Advancing at the head of his brigade, he plunged in first, and, his horse becoming mired at once, he dismounted and waded across alone under the enemy's fire. Waving his cap, he signalled to his men to come over, and, when about forty had joined him, he rushed upon the battery and took it after a hand-to-hand fight with the gunners, the enemy having deemed the battery so secure that no infantry supports had been placed near it. At Fisher's Hill, in pursuing Gen. Early,

on 22 Sept., 1864, Col. Hayes, then in command of a division, executed a brilliant flank movement over mountains and through woods difficult of access, took many pieces of artillery, and routed the enemy's forces in his front.

At the battle of Cedar Creek, 19 Oct., 1864, the conduct of Col. Hayes attracted so much attention that his commander, Gen. Crook, on the battle-field took him by the hand, saying: "Colonel, from this day you will be a brigadier-general." The commission arrived a few days afterward, and on 13 March, 1865, he received the rank of brevet major-general "for gallant and distinguished services during the campaign of 1864 in West Virginia, and particularly at the battles of Fisher's Hill and Cedar Creek, Va." Of his military services Gen. Grant, in the second volume of his memoirs, says: "On more than one occasion in these engagements Gen. R. B. Hayes, who succeeded me as president of the United States, bore a very honorable part. His conduct on the field was marked by conspicuous gallantry, as well as the display of qualities of a higher order than mere personal daring. Having entered the army as a major of volunteers at the beginning of the war, Gen. Hayes attained, by his meritorious service, the rank of brevet major-general before its close." While Gen. Hayes was in the field, in August, 1864, he was nominated by a Republican district convention at Cincinnati, in the second district of Ohio, as a candidate for congress. When a friend suggested to him that he should take leave of absence from the army in the field for the purpose of canvassing the district, he answered: "Your suggestion about getting a furlough to take the stump was certainly made without reflection. An officer fit for duty, who at this crisis would abandon his post to electioneer for a seat in congress, ought to be scalped." He was elected by a majority of 2,400. The Ohio soldiers in the field nominated him also for the governorship of his state.

After the war Gen. Hayes returned to civil life, and took his seat in congress on 4 Dec., 1865. He was appointed chairman of the committee on the library. On questions connected with the reconstruction of the states lately in rebellion he voted with his party. He earnestly supported a resolution declaring the sacredness of the public debt and denouncing repudiation in any form; also a resolution commending President Johnson for declining to accept presents, and condemn-

ing the practice as demoralizing in its tendencies. He opposed a resolution favoring an increase of the pay of members. He also introduced in the Republican caucus a set of resolutions declaring that the only mode of obtaining from the states lately in rebellion irreversible guarantees was by constitutional amendment, and that an amendment basing representation upon the number of voters, instead of population, ought to be acted upon without delay. These resolutions marked the line of action of the Republicans. In August, 1866, Gen. Hayes was renominated for congress by acclamation, and, after an active canvass, was re-elected by the same majority as before. He supported the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. In the house of representatives he won the reputation, not of an orator, but of a working legislator and a man of calm, sound judgment. In June, 1867, the Republican convention of Ohio nominated him for the governorship. The Democrats had nominated Judge Allen G. Thurman. The question of negro suffrage was boldly pushed to the foreground by Gen. Hayes in an animated canvass, which ended in his election, and that of his associates on the Republican ticket. But the negro-suffrage amendment to the state constitution was defeated at the same time by 50,000 majority, and the Democrats carried the legislature, which elected Judge Thurman to the United States senate. In his inaugural address Gov. Hayes laid especial stress upon the desirability of taxation in proportion to the actual value of property, the evils of too much legislation, the obligation to establish equal rights without regard to color, and the necessity of ratifying the 14th amendment to the federal constitution. In his message to the legislature, delivered in November, 1868, he recommended amendments to the election laws, providing for the representation of minorities in the boards of the judges and clerks of election, and for the registration of all the lawful voters prior to an election. He also recommended a comprehensive geological survey of the state, which was promptly begun. In his second annual message he warmly urged such changes in the penal laws, as well as in prison discipline, as would tend to promote the moral reformation of the culprit together with the punishment due to his crime.

In June, 1869, Gov. Hayes was again nominated by the Republican state convention for the governorship, there being no competitor for the nomination. The Democratic candidate


was George H. Pendleton. The platform adopted by the Democratic state convention advocated the repudiation of the interest on the U. S. bonds unless they be subjected to taxation, and the payment of the national debt in greenbacks. In the discussions preceding the election, Gov. Hayes pronounced himself unequivocally in favor of honestly paying the national debt and of an honest money system. He was elected by a majority of 7,500. In his second inaugural address, delivered on 10 Jan., 1870, he expressed himself earnestly against the use of public offices as party spoils, and suggested that the constitution of the state be so amended as to secure the introduction of a system making qualification, and not political services and influence, the chief test in determining appointments, and giving subordinates in the civil service the same permanence of place that is enjoyed by officers of the army and navy. He also advocated the appointment of judges, by the executive, for long terms, with adequate salaries, as best calculated to "afford to the citizen the amplest possible security that impartial justice will be administered by an independent judiciary." In his correspondence with members of congress, he urged a monthly reduction of the national debt as more important than a reduction of taxation, the abolition of the franking privilege, and the passage of a civil-service-reform law. In his message addressed to the legislature on 3 Jan., 1871, he recommended that the policy embodied in that provision of the state constitution which prohibited the state from creating any debt, save in a few exceptional cases, be extended to the creation of public debts by county, city, and other local authorities, and further that for the remuneration of public officers a system of fixed salaries, without fees and perquisites be adopted. Complaint having been made by the state commissioner of railroads and telegraphs that many "clear and palpable violations of law" had been committed by railroad companies, Gov. Hayes asked, in his message of 1872, that a commission of five citizens be organized, with ample power to investigate the management of railroad companies, and to report the information acquired with a recommendation of such measures as they might deem expedient. He also, believing that "publicity is a great corrector of official abuses," recommended that it be made the duty of the governor, on satisfactory information that the public good required an in-



vestigation of the affairs of any public office or the conduct of any public officer, whether state or local, to appoint one or more citizens, who should have ample powers to make such investigation. Gov. Hayes's administration of the executive office of his state won general approval, without distinction of party. At the expiration of his term, when a senator of the United States was to be elected, and several Republican members of the legislature were disinclined to vote for John Sherman, who controlled a majority of the Republican votes, Gov. Hayes was approached with the assurance that he could be elected senator by the anti-Sherman Republicans with the aid of the Democrats in the legislature; but he positively declined.

In July, 1872, Gov. Hayes was strongly urged by many Republicans in Cincinnati to accept a nomination for congress. Wishing to retire permanently from political life, he declined; but when he was nominated in spite of his protests, he finally yielded his consent. In his speeches during the canvass he put forward as the principal issues an honest financial policy and civil-service reform. Several sentences on civil-service reform

that he pronounced in a speech at Glendale, on 4 Sept., 1872, were to appear again in his letter accepting the nomination for the presidency four years later. In 1872 the current of public sentiment in Cincinnati ran



against the Republican party, and Gov. Hayes was defeated in the election by a majority of 1,500. President Grant offered him the office of assistant treasurer of the United States at Cincinnati, which he declined. In 1873 he established his home at Fremont, in the northern part of Ohio, with the firm intention of final retirement from public life. (The accompanying illustration is a view of his home in Fremont.) In 1874 he came into possession of a considerable estate as the heir of his uncle, Sardis Birchard. In 1875 the Republican state convention again nominated him for the governorship. He not only had not desired that nomination, but whenever spoken or written to about it,

uniformly replied that his retirement was absolute, and that neither his interests nor his tastes permitted him to accept. But the circumstances were such as to overcome his reluctance. In 1873 the Democratic candidate, William Allen, was elected governor of Ohio. His administration was honest and economical, he was personally popular, and his renomination by the Democratic party in 1875 seemed to be a foregone conclusion. It was equally certain that the Democratic convention would declare itself in favor of a circulation of irredeemable paper money, and against the resumption of specie payments. Under such circumstances the Republicans felt themselves compelled to put into the field against him the strongest available candidate they had, and a large majority of them turned at once to Gov. Hayes. But he had expressed himself in favor of Judge Taft, of Cincinnati, and urged the delegates from his county to vote for that gentleman, which they did. Notwithstanding this, the convention nominated Hayes on the first ballot by an overwhelming majority. When he, at Fremont, received the telegraphic announcement of his nomination, he at once wrote a letter declining the honor; but upon the further information that Judge Taft's son, withdrawing the name of his father, had moved in the convention to make the nomination unanimous, he accepted. Thus he became the leader of the advocates of a sound and stable currency in that memorable state canvass, the public discussions in which did so much to mould the sentiments of the people, especially in the western states, with regard to that important subject. The Democratic convention adopted a platform declaring that the volume of the currency (meaning the irredeemable paper currency of the United States) should be made and kept equal to the wants of trade; that the national bank currency should be retired, and greenbacks issued in its stead; and that at least half of the customs duties should be made payable in the government paper money. The Republicans were by no means as united in favor of honest money as might have been desired, and Gov. Hayes was appealed to by many of his party friends not to oppose an increase of the paper currency; but he resolutely declared his opinions in favor of honest money in a series of speeches, appealing to the honor and sober judgment of the people with that warmth of patriotic feeling and that good sense in the statement of political issues which, uttered in

language always temperate and kindly, gave him the ear of opponents as well as friends. The canvass, on account of the national questions involved in it, attracted attention in all parts of the country, and Gov. Hayes was well supported by speakers from other states. Another subject had been thrust upon the people of Ohio by a legislative attempt to divide the school fund between Catholics and Protestants, and Hayes vigorously advocated the cause of secular education. After a spirited struggle he carried the election by a majority of 5,500. He had thus not only won the distinction of being elected three times governor of his state, but, as the successful leader in a campaign for an honest money system, he was advanced to a very prominent position among the public men of the country, and his name appeared at once among those of possible candidates for the presidency.

While thus spoken of and written to, he earnestly insisted upon the maintenance by his party of an uncompromising position concerning the money question. To James A. Garfield he wrote in March, 1876: "The principal question will again be irredeemable paper as a permanent policy, or a policy which seeks a return to coin. My opinion is decidedly against yielding a hair's-breadth." On 29 March, 1876, the Republican state convention of Ohio passed a resolution to present Rutherford B. Hayes to the National Republican convention for the nomination for president, and instructing the state delegation to support him. The National Republican convention met at Cincinnati on 14 June, 1876. The principal candidates before it were James G. Blaine, Oliver P. Morton, Benjamin H. Bristow, Roscoe Conkling, Gov. Hayes, and John F. Hartranft. The name of Hayes was presented to the convention by Gen. Noyes in an exceedingly judicious and well-tempered speech, dwelling not only upon his high personal character, but upon the fact that he had no enemies and possessed peculiarly the qualities "calculated best to compromise all difficulties and to soften all antagonisms." Hayes had sixty-one votes on the first ballot, 378 being necessary to a choice, and his support slowly but steadily grew until on the seventh ballot the opposition to Mr. Blaine, who had been the leading candidate, concentrated upon Hayes, and gave him the nomination, which, on motion of William P. Frye, of Maine, was made unanimous.

In his letter of acceptance, dated 8 July, 1876, Mr. Hayes laid especial stress upon three points, civil-service reform, the currency, and the pacification of the south. As to the civil service, he denounced the use of public offices for the purpose of rewarding party services, and especially for services rendered to party leaders, as destroying the independence of the separate departments of the government, as leading directly to extravagance and official incapacity, and as a temptation to dishonesty. He declared that a reform, "thorough, radical, and complete," should lead us back to the principles and practices of the founders of the government, who "neither expected nor desired from the public officer any partisan service," who meant "that public officers should owe their whole service to the government and to the people," and that "the officer should be secure in his tenure so long as his personal character remained untarnished, and the performance of his duties satisfactory." As to the currency, he regarded "all the laws of the United States relating to the payment of the public indebtedness, the legal-tender notes included, as constituting a pledge and moral obligation of the government, which must in good faith be kept." He therefore insisted upon as early as possible a resumption of specie payments, pledging himself to "approve every appropriate measure to accomplish the desired end," and to "oppose any step backward." As to the pacification of the south, he pointed out, as the first necessity, "an intelligent and honest administration of the government, which will protect all classes of citizens in all their political and private rights." He deprecated "a division of political parties resting merely upon distinctions of race, or upon sectional lines," as always unfortunate and apt to become disastrous. He expressed the hope that with "a hearty and generous recognition of the rights of all by all," it would be "practicable to promote, by the influence of all legitimate agencies of the general government, the efforts of the people of those states to obtain for themselves the blessings of honest and capable local government." He also declared his "inflexible purpose," if elected, not to be a candidate for election to a second term—a pledge which he never thought of breaking.

The Democrats nominated for the presidency Samuel J. Tilden, who, having, as governor of New York, won the reputation of a reformer, attracted the support of many Republi-

cans who were dissatisfied with their party. The result of the election became the subject of acrimonious dispute. Both parties claimed to have carried the states of Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida. Each charged fraud upon the other, the Republicans affirming that Republican voters, especially colored men, all over the south had been deprived of their rights by intimidation or actual force, and that ballot-boxes had been foully dealt with, and the Democrats insisting that their candidates in Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina had received a majority of the votes actually cast, and that the Republican canvassing boards were preparing to falsify the result in making up the returns. The friends of both the candidates for the presidency sent prominent men into the states in dispute, for the purpose of watching the proceedings of the canvassing boards. The attitude maintained by Mr. Hayes personally was illustrated by a letter addressed by John Sherman at New Orleans, which was brought to light by a subsequent congressional investigation. It was dated at Columbus, Ohio, 27 Nov., 1876, and said: "I am greatly obliged for your letter of the 23d. You feel, I am sure, as I do about this whole business. A fair election would have given us about forty electoral votes at the south—at least that many. But we are not to allow our friends to defeat one outrage and fraud by another. There must be nothing crooked on our part. Let Mr. Tilden have the place by violence, intimidation, and fraud, rather than undertake to prevent it by means that will not bear the severest scrutiny." The canvassing boards of the states in question declared the Republican electors chosen, which gave Mr. Hayes a majority of one vote in the electoral college, and certifications of these results were sent to Washington by the governors of the states. But the Democrats persisted in charging fraud; and other sets of certificates, certifying the Democratic electors to have been elected, arrived at Washington. To avoid a deadlock, which might have happened if the canvass of the electoral votes had been left to the two houses of congress (the senate having a Republican and the house of representatives a Democratic majority), an act, advocated by members of both parties, was passed to refer all contested cases to a commission composed of five senators, five representatives, and five judges of the supreme court; the decision of this commission to be final, unless set aside by a

concurrent vote of the two houses of congress. The commission, refusing to go behind the certified returns, decided in each contested case by a vote of eight to seven in favor of the Republican electors, beginning with Florida on 7 Feb., and Rutherford B. Hayes was at last, on 2 March, declared duly elected president of the United States. Thus ended the long and painful suspense. The decision was generally acquiesced in, and the popular excitement subsided quickly.

President Hayes was inaugurated on 5 March, 1877. In his inaugural address he substantially restated the principles and views of policy set forth in his letter of acceptance, adding that, while the president of necessity owes his election to the suffrage and zealous labors of a party, he should be always mindful that "he serves his party best who serves his country best," and declaring also, referring to the contested election, that the general acceptance of the settlement by the two great parties of a dispute, "in regard to which good men differ as to the facts and the law, no less than as to the proper course to be pursued in solving the question in controversy," was an "occasion for general rejoicing." The cabinet that he appointed consisted of William M. Evarts, secretary of state; John Sherman, secretary of the treasury; George W. McCrary, secretary of war; Richard W. Thompson, secretary of the navy; David M. Key, postmaster-general; Charles Devens, attorney-general; and Carl Schurz, secretary of the interior. The administration began under very unfavorable circumstances, as general business stagnation and severe distress had prevailed throughout the country since the crisis of 1873. As soon as the cabinet was organized, the new president addressed himself to the composition of difficulties in several southern states. He had given evidence of his conciliatory disposition by taking into his cabinet a prominent citizen of the south who had been an officer in the Confederate army and had actively opposed his election. In both South Carolina and Louisiana there were two sets of state officers and two legislatures, one Republican and the other Democratic, each claiming to have been elected by a majority of the popular vote. The presence of Federal troops at or near the respective state-houses had so far told in favor of the Republican claimants, while the Democratic claimants had the preponderance of support from the citizens of substance and influence. President

Hayes was resolved that the upholding of local governments in the southern states by the armed forces of the United States must come to an end, and that, therefore, the Federal troops should be withdrawn from the positions they then occupied; but he was at the same time anxious to have the change effected without any disturbance of the peace, and without imperilling the security or rights of any class of citizens. His plan was to put an end by conciliatory measures to the lawless commotions and distracting excitements which, ever since the close of the war, had kept a large part of the south in constant turmoil, and thus to open to that section a new career of peace and prosperity. He obtained from the southern leaders in congress assurances that they would use their whole influence for the maintenance of good order and the protection of the rights and security of all, and for a union of the people in a mutual understanding that, as to their former antagonisms, by-gones should be treated as by-gones. To the same end he invited the rival governors of South Carolina, Daniel H. Chamberlain and Wade Hampton, to meet him in conference at Washington; and he appointed a commission composed of eminent gentlemen, Democrats as well as Republicans—Gen. Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut; Charles B. Lawrence, of Illinois; John M. Harlan, of Kentucky; Ex-Gov. John C. Brown, of Tennessee; and Wayne McVeagh, of Pennsylvania—to go to Louisiana and there to ascertain what were “the real impediments to regular, loyal, and peaceful procedures under the laws and constitution of Louisiana,” and further, by conciliatory influences to endeavor to remove “the obstacles to an acknowledgment of one government within the state,” or, if that were found impracticable, at least “to accomplish the recognition of a single legislature as the depository of the representative will of the people of Louisiana.” The two rival governors—S. B. Packard, Republican, and Francis T. Nichols, Democrat—stoutly maintained their respective claims; but the two legislatures united into one, a majority of the members of both houses, whose election was conceded on both sides meeting and organizing under the auspices of the Nichols government. President Hayes, having received the necessary assurances of peace and good will, issued instructions to withdraw the troops of the United States from the state-house of South Carolina on 10 April, 1877, and from the state-house of Louisi-

ana on 20 April, 1877, whereupon in South Carolina the state government passed peaceably into the hands of Wade Hampton, and in Louisiana into those of Francis T. Nichols. The course thus pursued by President Hayes was, in the north as well as in the south, heartily approved by a large majority of the people, to whom the many scandals springing from the interference of the general government in the internal affairs of the southern states had become very obnoxious, and who desired the southern states to be permitted to work out their own salvation. But this policy was also calculated to loosen the hold that the Republican party had upon the southern states, and was therefore disliked by many Republican politicians.

President Hayes began his administration with earnest efforts for the reform of the civil service. In some of the departments competitive examinations were resumed for the appointment of clerks. In filling other offices, political influence found much less regard than had been the custom before. The pretension of senators and representatives that the "patronage" in their respective states and districts belonged to them was not recognized, although in many cases their advice was taken. The president's appointments were generally approved by public opinion, but he was blamed for appointing persons connected with the Louisiana returning-board. On 26 May, 1877, he addressed a letter to the secretary of the treasury, expressing the wish "that the collection of the revenues should be free from partisan control, and organized on a strictly business basis, with the same guarantees for efficiency and fidelity in the selection of the chief and subordinate officers that would be required by a prudent merchant," and that "party leaders should have no more influence in appointments than other equally respectable citizens." On 22 June, 1877, he issued the following executive order: "No officer should be required or permitted to take part in the management of political organizations, caucuses, conventions, or election campaigns. Their right to vote or to express their views on public questions, either orally or through the press, is not denied, provided it does not interfere with the discharge of their official duties. No assessment for political purposes, on officers or subordinates, should be allowed. This rule is applicable to every department of the civil service. It should be understood by every officer of the general government that



he is expected to conform his conduct to its requirements." The policy thus indicated found much favor with the people generally, and not a few men in public life heartily approved of it. But the bulk of the professional politicians, who saw themselves threatened in their livelihood, and many members of congress, who looked upon government patronage as a part of their perquisites, and the distribution of offices among their adherents as the means by which to hold the party together and to maintain themselves in public place, became seriously alarmed and began a systematic warfare upon the president and his cabinet.

The administration was from the beginning surrounded with a variety of perplexities. Congress had adjourned on 3 March, 1877, without making the necessary appropriations for the support of the army, so that from 30 June the army would remain without pay until new provision could be made. The president, therefore, on 5 May, 1877, called an extra session of congress to meet on 15 Oct. But in the mean time a part of the army was needed for active service of a peculiarly trying kind. In July strikes broke out among the men employed upon railroads, beginning on the line of the Baltimore and Ohio railroad and then rapidly spreading over a large part of the northern states. It is estimated that at one time more than 100,000 men were out. Grave disorders occurred, and the president found himself appealed to by the governors of West Virginia, of Maryland, and of Pennsylvania to aid them with the Federal power in suppressing domestic violence, which the authorities of their respective states were not able to master. He issued his proclamations on 18, 21, and 23 July, and sent into the above-mentioned states such detachments of the Federal army as were available. Other detachments were ordered to Chicago. Wherever the troops of the United States appeared, however small the force, they succeeded in restoring order without bloodshed—in fact, without meeting with any resistance, while the state militia in many instances had bloody encounters with the rioters, sometimes with doubtful result.

In his first annual message, 3 Dec., 1877, President Hayes congratulated the country upon the results of the policy he had followed with regard to the south. He said: "All apprehension of danger from remitting those states to local self-government is dispelled, and a most salutary change in the minds of

the people has begun and is in progress in every part of that section of the country once the theatre of unhappy civil strife; substituting for suspicion, distrust, and aversion, concord, friendship, and patriotic attachment to the Union. No unprejudiced mind will deny that the terrible and often fatal collisions which for several years have been of frequent occurrence, and have agitated and alarmed the public mind, have almost entirely ceased, and that a spirit of mutual forbearance and hearty national interest has succeeded. There has been a general re-establishment of order, and of the orderly administration of justice; instances of remaining lawlessness have become of rare occurrence; political turmoil and turbulence have disappeared; useful industries have been resumed; public credit in the southern states has been greatly strengthened and the encouraging benefit of a revival of commerce between the sections of country lately embroiled in civil war are fully enjoyed." He also strongly urged the resumption of specie payments. As to the difficulties to be met in this respect he said: "I must adhere to my most earnest conviction that any wavering in purpose or unsteadiness in methods, so far from avoiding or reducing the inconvenience inseparable from the transition from an irredeemable to a redeemable paper currency, would only tend to increased and prolonged disturbance in values, and, unless retrieved, must end in serious disorder, dishonor, and disaster in the financial affairs of the government and of the people." As to the restoration of silver as a legal tender, which was at the time being agitated, he insisted that "all the bonds issued since 12 Feb., 1873, when gold became the only unlimited legal-tender metallic currency of the country, are justly payable in gold coin, or in coin of equal value"; and that "the bonds issued prior to 1873 were issued at a time when the gold dollar was the only coin in circulation or contemplated by either the government or the holders of the bonds as the coin in which they were to be paid." He added: "It is far better to pay these bonds in that coin than to seem to take advantage of the unforeseen fall in silver bullion to pay in a new issue of silver coin thus made so much less valuable. The power of the United States to coin money and to regulate the value thereof ought never to be exercised for the purpose of enabling the government to pay its obligations in a coin of less value than that contemplated by the parties when the bonds

were issued." He favored the coinage of silver, but only in a limited quantity, as a legal tender to a limited amount. He expressed the fear "that only mischief and misfortune would flow from a coinage of silver dollars with the quality of unlimited legal tender, even in private transactions. Any expectation of temporary ease from an issue of silver coinage to pass as a legal tender, at a rate materially above its commercial value, is, I am persuaded, a delusion." As to the reform of the civil service he reiterated what he had said in his letter of acceptance and inaugural address, and insisted that the constitution imposed upon the executive the sole duty and responsibility of the selection of Federal officers who, by law, are appointed, not elected; he deprecated the practical confusion, in this respect, of the duties assigned to the several departments of the government, and earnestly recommended that congress make a suitable appropriation to be immediately available for the civil service commission, which was still in legal existence, but had become inactive because no money had been provided for its expenses. He also recommended efficient legislation for the work of civilization among the Indian tribes, and for the prevention of the destruction of the forests on lands of the United States.

The recommendations thus made by President Hayes were not heeded by congress. No appropriation was made for the civil-service commission; on the contrary, the dissatisfaction of Republican senators and representatives with the endeavors of the administration in the direction of civil-service reform found vent in various attacks upon the president and the heads of departments. The nomination of one of the foremost citizens of New York for the office of collector of customs at that port was rejected by the senate. The efforts of the administration to check depredations on the timber-lands of the United States, and to prevent the destruction of the forests, were denounced as an outlandish policy. Instead of facilitating the resumption of specie payments, the house of representatives passed a bill substantially repealing the resumption act. A resolution was offered by a Republican senator, and adopted by the senate, declaring that to restore the coinage of 412½-grain silver dollars and to pay the government bonds, principal and interest, in such silver coin, was "not in violation of the public faith, nor in derogation of the rights of the public cred-

itor." A "silver bill" passed both houses providing that a silver dollar should be coined at the several mints of the United States, of the weight of  $412\frac{1}{2}$  grains, which, together with all silver dollars of like weight and fineness coined theretofore by the United States, should be a full legal tender for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract, and directing the secretary of the treasury to buy not less than two million dollars' worth of silver bullion a month, and cause it to be coined into dollars as fast as purchased. President Hayes returned this bill with his veto, mainly on the ground that the commercial value of the silver dollar was then worth eight to ten per cent. less than its nominal value, and that its use as a legal tender for the payment of pre-existing debts would be an act of bad faith. He said: "As to all debts heretofore contracted, the silver dollar should be made a legal tender only at its market value. The standard of value should not be changed without the consent of both parties to the contract. National promises should be kept with unflinching fidelity. There is no power to compel a nation to pay its just debts. Its credit depends on its honor. A nation owes what it has led or allowed its creditors to expect. I cannot approve a bill which in my judgment authorizes the violation of sacred obligations." But the bill was passed over the veto in both houses by majorities exceeding two thirds. During the same session the house of representatives, which had a Democratic majority, on motion of Clarkson N. Potter, of New York, resolved to make an inquiry into the allegations of fraud said to have been committed in Louisiana and Florida in making the returns of the votes cast for presidential electors at the election of 1876. The Republicans charged that the investigation was set on foot for the purpose of ousting Mr. Hayes from the presidency and putting in Mr. Tilden. The Democrats disclaimed any such intention. The result of the investigation was an elaborate report from the Democratic majority of the committee, impugning the action of the returning boards in Louisiana and Florida as fraudulent, and a report from the Republican minority dissenting from the conclusions of the majority as unwarranted by the evidence, and alleging that the famous "cipher despatches" sent to the south by friends of Mr. Tilden showed "that the charges of corruption were but the slanders of foiled suborners of corruption." The

investigation led to no further action, the people acquiescing in the decision of the electoral commission, and the counting of the electoral vote by congress based thereon, as irreversible.

President Hayes was again obliged to resort to the employment of force by the outbreak of serious disturbances caused by bands of desperadoes in the territory of New Mexico, which amounted to organized resistance to the enforcement of the laws. He issued, on 7 Oct., 1878, a proclamation substantially putting the disturbed portion of New Mexico under martial law, and directing the U. S. forces stationed there to restore and maintain peace and order, which was speedily accomplished.

In his message of 2 Dec., 1878, President Hayes found himself obliged to say that in Louisiana and South Carolina, and in some districts outside of those states, "the records of the recent [congressional] elections compelled the conclusion that the rights of the colored voters had been overridden, and their participation in the elections not been permitted to be either general or free." He added that, while it would be for congress to examine into the validity of the claims of members to their seats, it became the duty of the executive and judicial departments of the government to inquire into and punish violations of the laws, and that every means in his power would be exerted to that end. At the same time he expressed his "absolute assurance that, while the country had not yet reached complete unity of feeling and confidence between the communities so lately and so seriously estranged, the tendencies were in that direction, and with increasing force." He deprecated all interference by congress with existing financial legislation, with the confident expectation that the resumption of specie payments would be "successfully and easily maintained," and would be "followed by a healthful and enduring revival of business prosperity." On 1 Jan., 1879, the resumption act went into operation without any difficulty. No preparation had been made for that event until the beginning of the Hayes administration. The secretary of the treasury, in 1877, began to accumulate coin; and, notwithstanding the opposition it found, even among Republicans, this policy was firmly pursued by the administration until the coin reserve held against the legal-tender notes was sufficient to meet all probable demands. Thus the country was lifted out of the bog of an irredeemable paper currency. The operation was facilitated by increased

exports and a general revival of business. Although his first nominee for the office of collector of customs in New York had been rejected by the senate, President Hayes made a second nomination for the same place, as well as for that of naval officer of the same port, and in a special message addressed to the senate on 31 Jan., 1879, he gave the following reasons for the suspension of the incumbents, Chester A. Arthur and Alonzo B. Cornell, who had failed to conform their conduct to the executive order of 22 June, 1877: "For a long period of time it [the New York custom-house] has been used to manage and control political affairs. The officers suspended by me are, and for several years have been, engaged in the active personal management of the party politics of the city and state of New York. The duties of the offices held by them have been regarded as of subordinate importance to their partisan work. Their offices have been conducted as part of the political machinery under their control. They have made the custom-house a centre of partisan political management." For like reasons, President Hayes removed an influential party manager in the west, the postmaster of St. Louis. With the aid of Democratic votes in the senate, the new nominations were confirmed. President Hayes then addressed a letter to the new collector of customs at New York, Gen. Edwin A. Merritt, instructing him to conduct his office "on strictly business principles, and according to the rules which were adopted, on the recommendation of the civil-service commission, by the administration of Gen. Grant." He added: "Neither my recommendation, nor that of the secretary of the treasury, nor the recommendation of any member of congress, or other influential person, should be specially regarded. Let appointments and removals be made on business principles, and by fixed rules." Thus the system of competitive examinations, which under the preceding administration had been abandoned upon the failure of congress to make appropriations for the civil-service commission, was, by direction of President Hayes, restored in the custom-house of New York. A like system was introduced in the New York post-office under the postmaster, Thomas L. James.

Congress passed a bill "to restrict the immigration of Chinese to the United States," requiring the president immediately to give notice to the government of China of the abrogation of certain articles of the treaty of 1858 between the

United States and China, which recognized "the inherent and inalienable right of a man to change his home and allegiance," and provided that "the citizens of the United States visiting or residing in China shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, or exemptions, in respect to travel or residence, as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation," and reciprocally that Chinese subjects should enjoy the same advantages in the United States. The bill further limited the number of Chinese passengers that might be brought to this country by any one vessel to fifteen. President Hayes, on 1 March, 1879, returned the bill to congress with his veto. While recognizing some of the difficulties created by the immigration of the Chinese as worthy of consideration, he objected to the bill mainly on the ground that it was inconsistent with existing treaty relations between the United States and China; that a treaty could be abrogated or modified by the treaty-making power, and not, under the constitution, by act of congress; and that "the abrogation of a treaty by one of the contracting parties is justifiable only upon reasons both of the highest justice and of the highest necessity"; and "to do this without notice, without fixing a day in advance when the act shall take effect, without affording an opportunity to China to be heard, and without the happening of any grave unforeseen emergency, would be regarded by the enlightened judgment of mankind as the denial of the obligation of the national faith."

The 45th congress adjourned on 4 March, 1879, without making the usual and necessary appropriations for the expenses of the government. The house, controlled by a Democratic majority, attached to the army appropriation bill a legislative provision substantially repealing a law passed in 1865, under President Lincoln, which permitted the use of troops "to keep the peace at the polls" on election-days. The house also attached to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill a repeal of existing laws providing for the appointment of supervisors of election and special deputy marshals to act at elections of members of congress. The Republican majority of the senate struck out these legislative provisions, and, the two houses disagreeing, the appropriation bills failed. President Hayes, on 4 March, 1879, called an extra session of congress to meet on 18 March. The Democrats then had a major-

ity in the senate as well as in the house, and attached to the army appropriation bill the same legislative provision on which in the preceding congress the two houses had disagreed. President Hayes returned the bill with his veto on 29 April, 1879. He took the ground that there was ample legislation to prevent military interference at elections; that there never had been any such interference since the passage of the act of 1865, and there was no danger of any; that if the proposed legislation should become law, there would be no power vested in any officer of the government to protect from violence the officers of the United States engaged in the discharge of their duties; that the states may employ both military and civil power to keep the peace, and to enforce the laws at state elections, but that it was now proposed to deny to the United States even the necessary civil authority to protect the national elections. He pointed out also that the tacking of legislative provisions to appropriation bills was a practice calculated to be used as a means of coercion as to the other branches of the government, and to make the house of representatives a despotic power. Congress then passed the army appropriation bill without the obnoxious clause, but containing the provision that no money appropriated should be paid for the subsistence, equipment, transportation, or compensation of any portion of the army of the United States "to be used as a police force to keep the peace at the polls at any election held within any state." This President Hayes approved. The two houses then passed a separate bill, substantially embodying the provision objected to by the president in the vetoed army-appropriation bill. This "act to prohibit military interference at elections" President Hayes returned with his veto. He said: "The true rule as to the employment of military force at the elections is not doubtful. No intimidation or coercion should be allowed to influence citizens in the exercise of their right to vote, whether it appears in the shape of combinations, of evil-disposed persons, or of armed bodies of the militia of a state, or of the military force of the United States. The elections should be free from all forcible interference, and, as far as practicable, from all apprehension of such interference. No soldiery, either of the United States or of the state militia, should be present at the polls to perform the duties of the ordinary civil police force. There has been and will be no



violation of this rule under orders from me during this administration. But there should be no denial of the right of the national government to employ its military force on any day and at any place in case such employment is necessary to enforce the constitution and laws of the United States." The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill passed by congress contained a legislative provision not, indeed, abolishing the supervisors of election, but divesting the government of the power to protect them, or to prevent interference with their duties, or to punish any violation of the law from which their power was derived. President Hayes returned this bill also with his veto, referring to his preceding veto message as to the impropriety of tacking general legislation to appropriation bills. He further pointed out that, in the various legal proceedings under the law sought to be repealed, its constitutionality had never been questioned; and that the necessity of such a law had been amply demonstrated by the great election frauds in New York city in 1868. He added: "The great body of the people of all parties want free and fair elections. They do not think that a free election means freedom from the wholesome restraints of law, or that the place of an election should be a sanctuary for lawlessness and crime." If any oppression, any partisan partiality, had been shown in the execution of the existing law, he added, efficient correctives of the mischief should be applied; but as no congressional election was immediately impending, the matter might properly be referred to the regular session of congress.

In a bill "making appropriations for certain judicial expenses," passed by congress, it was attempted, not indeed to repeal the election laws, but to make their enforcement impossible by prohibiting the payment of any salaries, fees, or expenses under or in virtue of them, and providing also that no contract should be made, and no liability incurred, under any of their provisions. President Hayes vetoed this bill, 23 June, 1879, on the ground that as no bill repealing the election laws had been passed over his veto, those laws were still in existence, and the present bill, if it became a law, would make it impossible for the executive to perform his constitutional duty to see to it that the laws be faithfully executed. On the same ground the president returned with his veto a bill making appropriations to pay fees of United States marshals and their

general deputies, in which the same attempt was made to defeat the execution of the election laws by withholding the necessary funds as well as the power to incur liabilities under them. All the appropriation bills were passed without the obnoxious provisions except the last. President Hayes appealed to congress in a special message on 30 June, 1879, the end of the fiscal year, not to permit the marshals and their general deputies, officers so necessary to the administration of justice, to go unprovided for, but in vain. The attorney-general then admonished the marshals to continue in the performance of their duties, and to rely upon future legislation by congress, which would be just to them.

In his annual message of 1 Dec., 1879, President Hayes found occasion to congratulate the country upon the successful resumption of specie payments and upon "a very great revival of business." He announced a most gratifying reduction of the interest on the public debt by refunding at lower rates. He strongly urged congress to authorize the secretary of the treasury to suspend the silver coinage, as the cheaper coin, if forced into circulation, would eventually become the sole standard of value. He also recommended the retirement of United States notes with the capacity of legal tender in private contracts, it being his "firm conviction that the issue of legal-tender paper money based wholly upon the authority and credit of the government, except in extreme emergency, is without warrant in the constitution, and a violation of sound financial principles." He recommended a vigorous enforcement of the laws against polygamy in the territory of Utah. He presented a strong argument in favor of civil-service reform, pointed out the successful trial of the competitive system in the interior department, the post-office department, and the post-office and the custom-house in New York, and once more earnestly urged that an appropriation be made for the civil-service commission, and that all persons in the public service be protected by law against assessments for party ends. But these recommendations remained without effect.

On 12 Feb., 1880, President Hayes issued a second proclamation—the first having been put forth in April, 1879—against the attempts made by lawless persons to possess themselves for settlement of lands within the Indian territory, and effective measures were taken to expel the invaders. On 8 March,

1880, he sent to the house of representatives a special message communicating correspondence in relation to the interoceanic canal, which had passed between the American and foreign governments, and expressing his own opinion on the subject as follows: "The policy of this country is a canal under American control. The United States cannot consent to the surrender of this control to any European power, or to any combination of European powers. If existing treaties between the United States and other nations, or if the rights of sovereignty or property of other nations, stand in the way of this policy—a contingency which is not apprehended—suitable steps should be taken by just and liberal negotiations to promote and establish the American policy on this subject, consistently with the rights of the nations to be affected by it. An interoceanic canal across the American isthmus will be the great ocean thoroughfare between our Atlantic and our Pacific shores, and virtually a part of the coast-line of the United States. No other great power would, under similar circumstances, fail to assert a rightful control over a work so closely and vitally affecting its interest and welfare." Congress passed a deficiency appropriation bill, which contained provisions materially changing, and, by implication, repealing certain important parts of the election laws. President Hayes, on 4 May, 1880, returned the bill with his veto, whereupon congress made the appropriation without re-enacting the obnoxious clauses.

In November, 1880, was held the election that put James A. Garfield into the presidential chair and proved conclusively that the Republican party had gained largely in the confidence of the public during the Hayes administration. In his last annual message, 6 Dec., 1880, President Hayes again mentioned the occurrence of election disorders in a part of the Union, and the necessity of their repression and correction, but declared himself satisfied, at the same time, that the evil was diminishing. Again he argued in favor of civil-service reform, especially competitive examinations, which had been conducted with great success in some of the executive departments and adopted by his direction in the larger custom-houses and post-offices. He reiterated his recommendation of an appropriation for the civil-service commission, and of a law against political assessments. He also, to stop the interference of members of congress with the civil service, suggested that an act be passed

“defining the relations of members of congress with regard to appointments to office by the president,” and that the tenure-of-office act be repealed. He recommended “that congress provide for the government of Utah by a governor and judges, or commissioners, appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate—a government analogous to the provisional government established for the territory northwest of the Ohio, by the ordinance of 1787,” dispensing with an elected territorial legislature. He announced that on 17 Nov. two treaties had been signed at Peking by the commissioners of the United States and the plenipotentiaries of the emperor of China—one purely commercial, and the other authorizing the government of the United States, whenever the immigration of Chinese laborers threatened to affect the interests of the country, to regulate, limit, or suspend such immigration, but not altogether to prohibit it, said government at the same time promising to secure to Chinese permanently or temporarily residing in the United States the same protection and rights as to citizens or subjects of the most favored nation. President Hayes further suggested the importance of making provision for regular steam postal communication with the Central and South American states; he recommended that congress, by suitable legislation and with proper safeguards, supplement the local educational funds in the several states where the grave duties and responsibilities of citizenship had been devolved upon uneducated people, by devoting to the purpose grants of lands, and, if necessary, by appropriations from the treasury of the United States; he repeated his recommendations as to the suspension of the silver coinage, and as to the retirement from circulation of the United States notes, and added one that provision be made by law to put Gen. Grant upon the retired list of the army, with rank and pay befitting the great services he had rendered to the country.

On 1 Feb., 1880, he addressed a special message to congress in relation to the Ponca Indians, in which he pointed out the principles that should guide our Indian policy: preparation for citizenship by industrial and general education; allotment of land in severalty, inalienable for a certain period; fair compensation for Indian lands not required for allotment; and, finally, investment of the Indians, so educated and provided for, with the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. His

1 Dec 1877

My Dear General:

Thanks for the  
beautiful Hall's manual  
volumes. We shall look  
them, and be our indebted  
by them of one the most  
agreeable incidents of your  
kind. We shall be  
happy to see you at the  
M in Washington

With kindest regards from Mrs  
R and myself to Mrs Wilson  
Sincerely  
R B Hayes



last communication to congress, 3 March, 1881, was a message returning with his veto a bill "to facilitate the refunding of the national debt," which contained a provision seriously impairing the value and tending to the destruction of the national banking system. On the following day he assisted at the inauguration of his successor.

The administration of President Hayes, although much attacked by the politicians of both parties, was on the whole very satisfactory to the people at large. By withdrawing the Federal troops from the southern state-houses, and restoring to the people of those states practical self-government, it prepared the way for that revival of patriotism among those lately estranged from the Union, that fraternal feeling between the two sections of the country, and the wonderful material advancement of the south which we now witness. It conducted with wisdom and firmness the preparations for the resumption of specie payments, as well as the funding of the public debt at lower rates of interest, and thus facilitated the development of the remarkable business prosperity that continued to its close. While in its endeavors to effect a thorough and permanent reform of the civil service there were conspicuous lapses and inconsistencies, it accomplished important and lasting results. Not only without any appropriations of money and without encouragement of any kind from congress, but in the face of the decided hostility of a large majority of its members, the system of competitive examinations was successfully applied in some of the executive departments at Washington, and in the great government offices at New York, thus proving its practicability and usefulness. The removal by President Hayes of some of the most powerful party managers from their offices, avowedly on the ground that the offices had been used as a part of the political machinery, was an act of high courage, and during his administration there was far less meddling with party politics on the part of officers of the government than at any period since Andrew Jackson's time. The success of the Republican party in the election of 1880 was largely due to the general satisfaction among the people with the Hayes administration.

On the expiration of his term, ex-President Hayes retired to his home at Fremont, Ohio. He was the recipient of various distinctions. The degree of LL. D. was conferred upon

him by Kenyon college, Harvard University, Yale college, and Johns Hopkins university. He was made commander of the military order of the Loyal legion, the first president of the Society of the Army of West Virginia, and president of the 23d regiment Ohio volunteers association. Much of his time was devoted to benevolent and useful enterprises. He was president of the trustees of the John F. Slater education-fund, one of the trustees of the Peabody education fund, president of the National prison-reform association, an active member of the National conference of corrections and charities, a trustee of the Western Reserve university at Cleveland, Ohio, of the Wesleyan university of Delaware, Ohio, of Mount Union college, at Alliance, Ohio, and of several other charitable and educational institutions. On the occasion of a meeting of the National prison-reform association, held at Atlanta, Ga., in November, 1886, he was received with much popular enthusiasm, and greeted by an ex-governor of Georgia as one to whom, more than to any other, the people were indebted for the era of peace and union which they now enjoyed, and by the governor, Gen. John B. Gordon, as the man who had "made a true and noble effort to complete the restoration of the Union by restoring fraternal feeling between the estranged sections." Thus he devoted the last years of his life to dignified occupations and endeavors, mostly of a philanthropic character, which were congenial to his nature and kept him in active contact with public-spirited men, by whom he was highly esteemed. He died after a short illness at his home in Fremont, Ohio, 17 Jan., 1893. While he lived, the prejudice against him among some of his fellow-citizens, owing to the cloud which hung over his title to the presidency, had never entirely disappeared; but after his death even his former opponents admitted that there had never been the slightest reason for holding him responsible for the conduct of the returning boards in the southern states, or for the decision of the electoral commission which awarded the presidency to him, and that, when he had been declared elected by the competent authority, it was not only his right but his duty as a good citizen to accept the presidential office, and thus to put an end to one of the most perilous crises in the history of the republic. It was also universally recognized that the conduct of his administration had been conspicuously clean and blameless, as well as fruitful of



good results, and that he rendered the country especially valuable service by the statesmanlike wisdom of his conciliatory course toward the south, by the unflinching and defiant firmness with which he upheld sound principles of national finance, and by his efforts in the line of civil-service reform, after his predecessor, yielding to the impetuous pressure of his party friends, had abandoned the whole system. He was not a man of genius, but of a strong and clear intellect, quick perceptions, and far more than ordinary acquirements, animated with the most conscientious conceptions of duty and the highest patriotic motives. The uprightness of his character and the exquisite purity of his life, public as well as domestic, exercised a conspicuously wholesome influence not only upon the *personnel* of the governmental machinery, but also upon the social atmosphere of the national capital while he occupied the White House. See "Life, Public Services, and Select Speeches of Rutherford B. Hayes," by James Quay Howard (Cincinnati, 1876). Campaign lives were also written by William D. Howells (New York, 1876) and Russell H. Conwell (Boston, 1876).

His wife, LUCY WARE WEBB, born in Chillicothe, Ohio, 28 Aug., 1831; died in Fremont, Ohio, 25 June, 1889. She was the daughter of a physician, and married in 1852. Of eight children, four sons and one daughter are living. Mrs. Hayes was noted for her devotion to the wounded soldiers during the war. She refused to permit wine to be served on the White House table, and for this

innovation incurred much censure in some political circles, but received high praise from the advocates of total abstinence, who, on the expiration of her husband's term of office, presented her with various testimonials, including an album filled with autographic expressions of approval from many prominent persons, and an association of prominent ladies presented her portrait, to be added to the collection at the White House. Her high character, her frankness and sincerity, as well as the rare charm of her being, won her in an uncommon degree the affection and esteem of all who came into contact with her.



*Lucy W. Hayes*

## JAMES ABRAM GARFIELD.

JAMES ABRAM GARFIELD, twentieth president of the United States, born in Orange, Cuyahoga co., Ohio, 19 Nov., 1831; died in Elberon, N. J., 19 Sept., 1881. His father, Abram Garfield, was a native of New York, but of Massachusetts ancestry, descended from Edward Garfield, an English Puritan, who in 1630 was one of the founders of Watertown. His mother, Eliza Ballou, was born in New Hampshire, of a Huguenot family that fled from France to New England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in 1685. Garfield, therefore, was from lineage well represented in the struggles for civil and religious liberty, both in the Old and in the New World. Abram Garfield, his father, moved to Ohio in 1830, and settled in what was then known as "The Wilderness," now as the "Western Reserve," which was occupied by Connecticut people. Abram Garfield made a prosperous beginning in his new home, but died, after a sudden illness, at the age of thirty-three, leaving a widow with four small children, of whom James was the youngest. In bringing up her family, unaided in a lonely cabin (see accompanying illustration), and impressing on them a high standard of moral and intellectual worth, Mrs. Garfield displayed an almost heroic courage. It was a life of struggle and privation; but the poverty of her home differed from that of cities or settled communities—it was the poverty of the frontier, all shared it, and all were bound closely together in a common struggle, where there were no humiliating contrasts in neighboring wealth. At three years of age James A. Garfield went to school in a log hut, learned to read, and began that habit of omnivorous reading which ended only with his life. At ten years of age he was accustomed to manual labor, helping out his mother's meagre income by work at home or on the farms of the neighbors. Labor was play to the




Engr. by H. H. Hall of New York

*J. A. Garfield.*



healthy boy ; he did it cheerfully, almost with enthusiasm, for his mother was a staunch Campbellite, whose hymns and songs sent her children to their tasks with a feeling that the work was consecrated ; but work in winter always yielded its claims to those of the district school, where he made good progress, and was conspicuous for his assiduity. By the time he was fourteen, young Garfield had a fair knowledge of arithmetic and gram-



mar, and was particularly apt in the facts of American history, which he had eagerly gathered from the meagre treatises that circulated in that remote section. Indeed, he read and re-read every book the scanty libraries of that part of the wilderness supplied, and many he learned by heart. Mr. Blaine attributes the dignity and earnestness of his style to his familiarity with the Bible and its literature, of which he was a constant student. His imagination was especially kindled by the tales of the sea ; a love for adventure took strong possession of him. He so far yielded to it that in 1848 he went to Cleveland and proposed to ship as a sailor on board a lake schooner. But a glance showed him that the life was not the romance he had conceived. He turned promptly from the shore, but, loath to return home without adventure and without money, drove some months for a boat on the Ohio canal. Little is known of this experience, except that he secured promotion from the tow-path to the boat, and a story that he was strong enough and brave enough to hold his own against his companions, who were naturally a rough set. During the winter of 1849-'50 he attended the Geauga seminary at Chester, Ohio, about ten miles from his home. In the vacations he learned and practised the trade of a carpenter, helped at harvest, taught, did anything and everything to get money to pay for his schooling. After the first term, he asked and needed no aid from home ; he had reached the point where he could support himself. At Chester he met Miss Lucretia Rudolph,

his future wife. Attracted at first by her interest in the same intellectual pursuits, he quickly discovered sympathy in other tastes, and a congeniality of disposition, which paved the way for the one great love of his life. He was himself attractive at this time, exhibited many signs of intellectual superiority, and was physically a splendid specimen of vigorous young manhood. He studied hard, worked hard, cheerfully ready for any emergency, even that of the prize-ring; for, finding it a necessity, he one day thrashed the bully of the school in a stand-up fight. His nature, always religious, was at this period profoundly stirred in that direction. He was converted under the instructions of a Campbellite preacher, was baptized and received into that denomination. They called themselves "The Disciples," contemned all doctrines and forms, and sought to direct their lives by the Scriptures, simply interpreted as any plain man would read them. This sanction to independent thinking, given by religion itself, must have had great influence in creating that broad and catholic spirit in this young disciple which kept his earnest nature out of the ruts of moral and intellectual bigotry. From this moment his zeal to get the best education grew warmer; he began to take wider views, to look beyond the present into the future. As soon as he finished his studies in Chester he entered (1851) the Hiram eclectic institute (now Hiram college), at Hiram, Portage co., Ohio, the principal educational institution of his sect. He was not very quick of acquisition, but his perseverance was indomitable, and he soon had an excellent knowledge of Latin and a fair acquaintance with algebra, natural philosophy, and botany. He read Xenophon, Cæsar, and Virgil with appreciation; but his superiority was more easily recognized in the prayer-meetings and debating societies of the college, where he was assiduous and conspicuous. Living here was inexpensive, and he readily made his expenses by teaching in the English departments, and also gave instruction in the ancient languages. After three years he was well prepared to enter the junior class of any eastern college, and had saved \$350 out of his salary toward the expenses of such an undertaking. He hesitated between Yale, Brown, and Williams colleges, finally choosing Williams on the kindly promise of encouragement sent him by its president, Mark Hopkins. It was natural to expect he would choose Bethany college, in West Virginia, an

institution largely controlled and patronized by the "Disciples of Christ." Garfield himself seems to have thought some explanation necessary for his neglect to do so, and with particularity assigns as reasons that the course of instruction at Bethany was not so extended as in the old New England colleges; that Bethany was too friendly in opinion to slavery; and—most significant of all the reasons he gave—that, as he had inherited by birth and association a strong bias toward the religious views there inculcated, he ought especially to examine other faiths. Entering Williams in the autumn of 1854, he was duly graduated with the highest honors in the class of 1856. His classmates unite with President Hopkins in testifying that in college he was warm-hearted, large-minded, and possessed of great earnestness of purpose and a singular poise of judgment. All speak, too, of his modest and unassuming manners. But, outside of these and other like qualities, such as industry, perseverance, courage, and conscientiousness, Garfield had exhibited up to this time no signs of the superiority that was to make him a conspicuous figure. But the effects of twenty-five years of most varied discipline, cheerfully accepted and faithfully used, begin now to show themselves, and to give to history one of its most striking examples of what education—the education of books and of circumstances—can accomplish. Garfield was not born, but made; and he made himself by persistent, strenuous, conscientious study and work. In the next six years he was a college president, a state senator, a major-general in the National army, and a representative-elect to the National congress. American annals reveal no other promotion so rapid and so varied.

On his return to Ohio, in 1856, he resumed his place as a teacher of Latin and Greek at Hiram institute, and the next year (1857), being then only twenty-six years of age, he was made its president. He was a successful officer, and ambitious, as usual, beyond his allotted task. He discussed before his interested classes almost every subject of current interest in scholarship, science, religion, and art. The story spread, and his influence with it; he became an intellectual and moral force in the Western Reserve. It was greatest, however, over the young. They keenly felt the contagion of his manliness, his sympathy, his thirst for knowledge, and his veneration for the truth when it was found. As an educator, he was, and

always would have been, eminently successful; he had the knowledge, the art to impart it, and the personal magnetism that impressed his love for it upon his pupils. His intellectual activity at this time was intense. The canons of his church permitted him to preach, and he used the permission. He also pursued the study of law, entering his name, in 1858, as a student in a law-office in Cleveland, but studying in Hiram. To one ignorant of the slow development that was characteristic of Garfield in all directions, it would seem incredible that he now for the first time began to show any noticeable interest in politics. He seems never to have even voted before the autumn of 1856. No one who knew the man could doubt that he would then cast it, as he did, for John C. Frémont, the first Republican candidate for the presidency. As moral questions entered more and more into politics, Garfield's interest grew apace, and he sought frequent occasions to discuss these questions in debate. In advocating the cause of freedom against slavery, he showed for the first time a skill in discussion, which afterward bore good fruit in the house of representatives. Without solicitation or thought on his part, in 1859 he was sent to represent the counties of Summit and Portage in the senate of Ohio. Again in this new field his versatility and industry are conspicuous. He made exhaustive investigations and reports on such widely different topics as geology, education, finance, and parliamentary law. Always looking to the future, and apprehensive that the impending contest might leave the halls of legislation and seek the arbitrament of war, he gave especial study to the militia system of the state, and the best methods of equipping and disciplining it.

The war came, and Garfield, who had been farmer, carpenter, student, teacher, lawyer, preacher, and legislator, was to show himself an excellent soldier. In August, 1861, Gov. William Dennison commissioned him lieutenant-colonel in the 42d regiment of Ohio volunteers. The men were his old pupils at Hiram college, whom he had persuaded to enlist. Promoted to the command of this regiment, he drilled it into military efficiency while waiting orders to the front, and in December, 1861, reported to Gen. Buell, in Louisville, Ky. Gen. Buell was so impressed by the soldierly condition of the regiment that he gave Col. Garfield a brigade, and assigned him the difficult task of driving the Confederate general Humphrey Mar-



shall from eastern Kentucky. His confidence was such that he allowed the young soldier to lay his own plans, though on their success hung the fate of Kentucky. The undertaking itself was difficult. Gen. Marshall had 5,000 men, while Garfield had but half that number, and must march through a state where the majority of the people were hostile, to attack an enemy strongly intrenched in a mountainous country. Garfield, nothing daunted, concentrated his little force, and moved it with such rapidity, sometimes here and sometimes there, that Gen. Marshall, deceived by these feints, and still more by false reports, which were skilfully prepared for him, abandoned his position and many supplies at Paintville, and was caught in retreat by Garfield, who charged the full force of the enemy, and maintained a hand-to-hand fight with it for five hours. The enemy had 5,000 men and twelve cannon; Garfield had no artillery, and but 1,100 men. But he held his own until reinforced by Gens. Granger and Sheldon, when Marshall gave way, leaving Garfield the victor at Middle Creek, 10 Jan., 1862, one of the most important of the minor battles of the war. Shortly afterward Zollicoffer was defeated and slain by Gen. Thomas at Mill Spring, and the Confederates lost the state of Kentucky. Coming after the reverses at Big Bethel, Bull Run, and the disastrous failures in Missouri, Gen. Garfield's triumph over the Confederate forces at Middle Creek had an encouraging effect on the entire north. Marshall was a graduate of West Point, and had every advantage in numbers and position, yet seems to have been out-generaled at every point. He was driven from two fortified positions, and finally completely routed—all within a period of less than a fortnight in the month of January, 1862. In recognition of these services, especially acknowledged by Gen. Buell in his General Order No. 40 (20 Jan., 1862), President Lincoln promptly made the young colonel a brigadier-general, dating his commission from the battle of Middle Creek.

During his campaign of the Big Sandy, while Garfield was engaged in breaking up some scattered Confederate encampments, his supplies gave out, and he was threatened with starvation. Going himself to the Ohio river, he seized a steamer, loaded it with provisions, and, on the refusal of any pilot to undertake the perilous voyage, because of a freshet that had swelled the river, he stood at the helm for forty-eight hours

and piloted the craft through the dangerous channel. In order to surprise Marshall, then entrenched in Cumberland Gap, Garfield marched his soldiers 100 miles in four days through a blinding snow-storm. Returning to Louisville, he found that Gen. Buell was away, overtook him at Columbia, Tenn., and was assigned to the command of the 20th brigade. He reached Shiloh in time to take part in the second day's fight, was engaged in all the operations in front of Corinth, and in June, 1862, rebuilt the bridges on the Memphis and Charleston railroad, and exhibited noticeable engineering skill in repairing the fortifications of Huntsville. The unhealthfulness of the region told upon him, and on 30 July, 1862, under leave of absence, he returned to Hiram, where he lay ill for two months. On 25 Sept., 1862, he went to Washington, and was ordered on court-martial duty, and gained such reputation in this practice that, on 25 Nov., he was assigned to the case of Gen. Fitz-John Porter. In February, 1863, he returned to duty under Gen. Rosecrans, then in command of the Army of the Cumberland. Rosecrans made him his chief-of-staff, with responsibilities beyond those usually given to this office. In this field, Garfield's influence on the campaign in Middle Tennessee was most important. One familiar incident shows and justifies the great influence he wielded in its counsels. Before the battle of Chickamauga (24 June, 1863) Gen. Rosecrans asked the written opinion of seventeen of his generals on the advisability of an immediate advance. All others opposed it, but Garfield advised it, and his arguments were so convincing, though pressed without passion or prejudice, that Rosecrans determined to seek an engagement. Gen. Garfield wrote out all the orders of that fateful day (19 Sept.), excepting one—and that one was the blunder that lost the day. Garfield volunteered to take the news of the defeat on the right to Gen. George H. Thomas, who held the left of the line. It was a bold ride, under constant fire, but he reached Thomas and gave the information that saved the Army of the Cumberland. For this action he was made a major-general, 19 Sept., 1863, promoted for gallantry on a field that was lost. With a military future so bright before him, Garfield, always unselfish, yielded his own ambition to Mr. Lincoln's urgent request, and on 3 Dec., 1863, resigned his commission, and hastened to Washington to sit in congress, to which he had been chosen fifteen months before, as the suc-

cessor of Joshua R. Giddings. In the mean time Thomas had received command of the Army of the Cumberland, had reorganized it, and had asked Garfield to take command of a division. His inclination was to accept and continue the military career, which had superior attractions; but he yielded to the representations of the President and Secretary Stanton, that he would be more useful in the house of representatives.


Gen. Garfield was thirty-two years old when he entered congress. He found in the house, which was to be the theatre of his lasting fame, many with whom his name was for the next twenty years intimately associated. Schuyler Colfax was its speaker, and Conkling, Blaine, Washburne, Stevens, Fenton, Schenck, Henry Winter Davis, William B. Allison, and William R. Morrison were among its members. His military reputation had preceded him, and secured for him a place in the committee on military affairs, then the most important in congress. His first speech (14 Jan., 1864), upon a motion to print extra copies of Gen. Rosecrans's official report, was listened to with attention; and, indeed, whenever he spoke upon army matters this was the case. But the attention was given to the man for the information he possessed and imparted rather than to the orator; for in effective speech, as in every other matter in which Garfield succeeded, he came to excellence only by labor and practice. He was soon regarded as an authority on military matters, and his opinion was sought as an expert, experienced and careful. To these questions he gave all necessary attention, but they did not exhaust his capacity. He began at this time, and ever afterward continued, a thorough study of constitutional and financial problems, and to aid him in these researches he labored to increase his familiarity with the German and French languages. In this, his first session, he had to stand almost alone in opposition to the bill that increased the bounty paid for enlistment. He advocated liberal bounties to the veterans that re-enlisted, but would use the draft to secure raw recruits. History vindicated his judgment. In the same session he spoke on the subject of seizure and confiscation of rebel property, and on free commerce between the states. On 13 Jan., 1865, he discussed exhaustively the constitutional amendment to abolish slavery.

In the 39th congress (1865) he was changed, at his own request, from the committee on military affairs to the ways

and means committee, which then included Messrs. Morrison, of Illinois, Brooks and Conkling, of New York, and Allison, of Iowa. His reason for choosing this new field was that, the war being ended, financial questions would have supreme importance, and he wished to have his part in their solution. In the 40th congress (1867) he was restored to his old committee on military affairs, and made its chairman. In March, 1866, he made his first speech on the question of the public debt, foreshadowing, in the course of his remarks, that republican policy which resulted in the resumption of specie payment, 1 Jan., 1879. From this moment until the treasury note was worth its face in gold, he never failed, on every proper occasion, in the house and out, to discuss every phase of the financial question, and to urge upon the National conscience the demands of financial honor. In May, 1868, he spoke again on the currency, dealing a staggering blow to the adherents of George H. Pendleton, who, under the stress of a money panic, were clamoring for the government to "make the money-market easier." It may be said that he was at this, as at later times, the representative and champion of the sound-money men in congress, and first and last did more than any one else, probably, in settling the issues of this momentous question. In 1877 and 1878 he was again active in stemming a fresh tide of financial fallacies. He treated the matter this time with elementary simplicity, and gave in detail reasons for a hard-money policy, based not so much upon opinion and theory as upon the teachings of history.

In the 41st congress a new committee—that on banking and currency—was created, and Garfield was very properly made its chairman. This gave him new opportunities to serve the cause in which he was heartily enlisted, and no one now seeks to diminish the value of that service. The most noticed and most widely read of these discussions was a speech on the National finances, which he delivered in 1878, at Faneuil hall, Boston. It was circulated as a campaign document by thousands, and served to win a victory in Massachusetts and to subdue for a while the frantic appeals from the west for more paper money. He served also on the select committee on the census (a tribute to his skill in statistics) and on the committee on rules, as an appreciation of his practical and thorough knowledge of parliamentary law. In the 42d and 43d con-

gresses he was chairman of the committee on appropriations. In the 44th, 45th, and 46th congresses (the house being Democratic) he was assigned a place on the committee of ways and means. In reconstruction times, Garfield was earnest and aggressive in opposition to the theories advocated by President Johnson. He was a kind man, and not lacking in sympathy for those who, from mistaken motives, had attempted to sever their connection with the Federal Union; but he was not a sentimentalist, and had too earnest convictions not to insist that the results won by so much treasure and blood should be secured to the victors. An old soldier, he would not see Union victories neutralized by evasions of the constitution. On these topics no one was his superior in either branch of congress, and no opponent, however able, encountered him here without regretting the contest.



In 1876, Gen. Garfield went to New Orleans, at President Grant's request, in company with Senators Sherman and Matthews and other Republicans, to watch the counting of the Louisiana vote. He made a special study of the West Feliciana parish case, and embodied his views in a brief but significant report. On his return, he made, in January, 1877, two notable speeches in the house on the duty of congress in a presidential election, and claimed that the vice-president had a constitutional right to count the electoral vote. He was opposed to an electoral commission; yet, when the commission was ordered, Gen. Garfield was chosen by acclamation to fill one of the two seats allotted to Republican representatives. His colleague was George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts. Garfield discussed before the commission the Florida and Louisiana returns, on 9 and 16 Feb., 1877. Mr. Blaine left the house in 1877 for the senate, and this made Garfield the undisputed leader of the Republican party in the house. He was at this time its candidate for speaker.

The struggle begun in the second session of the 45th congress (1879), when the Democratic majority sought to control the president through the appropriations, gave Garfield a fine opportunity to display his powers as a leader in opposition. The Democratic members added to two general appropriation bills, in the shape of amendments, legislation intended to restrain the use of the army as a posse to keep the peace at elections, to repeal the law authorizing the employment of deputy U. S. marshals at the elections of members of congress, and to relieve jurors in the U. S. courts from the obligation of the test oath. The senate, which was Republican, refused to concur in these amendments, and so the session ended. An extra session was promptly called, which continued into midsummer. Contemporary criticism claims that, in this contest, Gen. Garfield reached, perhaps, the climax of his congressional career. A conservative man by nature, he revolted at such high-handed measures, and in his speech of 29 March, 1879, characterized them as a "revolution in congress." Against this insult to the spirit of the law he protested with unwonted vigor. Like Webster in 1832, he stood the defender of the constitution, and his splendid eloquence and resistless logic upheld the prerogatives of the executive, and denounced these attempts by the legislature to prevent or control elections, however disguised, as an attack upon the constitution. He warned the house that its course would end in nullification, and protested that its principle was the "revived doctrine of state sovereignty." (See speeches of 26 April, 10 and 11 June, and 19 and 27 June, 1879.) The result of it was that the Democrats finally voted \$44,600,000 of the \$45,000,000 of appropriations originally asked—a great party victory, to which Gen. Garfield largely contributed. His arguments had the more weight because not partisan, but supported by a clear analysis and statement of the relations between the different branches of the government. His last speech to the house was made on the appointment of special deputy marshals, 23 April, 1880. At the same time he made a report of the tariff commission, which showed that he was still a sincere friend to protection. He was already United States senator-elect from the state of Ohio, chosen after a nomination of singular unanimity, 13 Jan., 1880.

Where there is government by party, no leader can escape



We shall probably appoint a Com-  
mittee of five to remain and I hope  
we may call the proceedings - I hope  
I may be excused from signing for  
I probably need to be at home - Tell  
our friends we are anxious to have  
me stay - I hope to hear from you  
soon I am to every yours  
Jatwelfield



calumny; hence it assailed Garfield with great venom. In the presidential canvass of 1872, he, with other Republican representatives, was charged with having bought stock in the Credit Mobilier, sold to them at less than its value to influence their action in legislation affecting the Union Pacific railroad. A congressional investigation, reporting 13 Feb., 1875, seemed to establish these facts so far as Garfield was concerned. He knew nothing of any connection between the two companies, much less that the Credit Mobilier controlled the railway. Garfield denied that he ever owned the stock, and was vaguely contradicted by Oakes Ames, who had no evidence of his alleged sale of \$1,000 worth of the stock to Garfield, except a memorandum in his diary, which did not agree with Ames's oral testimony that he paid Garfield \$329 as dividend on the stock. Garfield admitted that he had received \$300 in June, 1868, from Ames, but claimed that it was a loan, and that he paid it in the winter of 1869. It was nowhere claimed that Garfield ever received certificate, or receipt, or other dividends, to which, if the owner of the stock, he was entitled, or that he ever asked for them. The innocence of Gen. Garfield was generally recognized, and, after the circumstances became known, he was not weakened in his district.

Another investigation in the same congress (43d) gave calumny a second opportunity. This was the investigation into the conduct of the government of the District of Columbia. It revealed startling frauds in a De Golyer contract, and Garfield's name was found to be in some way connected with it. The facts, corroborated in an open letter by James M. Wilson, chairman of the committee, were: In May, 1872, Richard C. Parsons, a Cleveland attorney, then marshal of the supreme court in Washington, having the interests of the patents owned by De Golyer in charge, was called away. He brought all his material to Garfield, and asked him to prepare the brief. The brief was to show the superiority of the pavement (the subject of patent) over forty other kinds, and did not otherwise concern the contract or have anything to do with its terms. The fraud, as is generally understood, was in the contract, not in the quality of the pavement. Garfield prepared the brief and delivered it to Parsons, but did not himself make the argument. Parsons sent Garfield subsequently \$5,000, which was a part of the fee Parsons had re-


ceived for his own services. As thoughtful people reviewed the case, there was no harsher criticism than that suggested by Gen. Garfield's own lofty standard of avoiding even the appearance of evil—that he had not shown his usual prudence in avoiding any connection, even the most honest, in any way, with any matter that could in any shape come up for congressional review. It was the unjust charges made in connection with these calumnies which sent the iron into his soul, and made wounds which he forgave but never forgot.

In June, 1880, the Republican convention to nominate a successor to President Hayes was held in Chicago, and to it came Garfield, naturally, at the head of the Ohio delegation. He sympathized heartily with the wish of that delegation to secure the nomination for John Sherman, and labored loyally for that end. There could be no criticism of his action, nor could there be any just criticism of his loyalty to his candidate, except (and that he never concealed) that he wished more to defeat the nomination of Grant than to secure that of Senator Sherman. He believed a third term such a calamity that patriotism required the sacrifice of all other considerations to prevent it. That view he shared with Mr. Blaine, also a candidate in this convention, whose instructions to his friends were, "Defeat a third term first, and then struggle for the prize of office afterwards. Success in the one case is vital; success in the other is of minor importance." On the thirty-third ballot Grant had 306 votes, the remaining 400 being divided between Blaine, Edmunds, and Washburne. The hope of the Grant men or the Blaine men to secure the prize faltered, and in the thirty-fourth ballot Wisconsin broke the monotony by announcing thirty-six votes for James A. Garfield. This put the spark to fuel that had been unconsciously prepared for it by the events of the long struggle. In all the proceedings, peculiar fitness had put Garfield to the front as the counsellor and leader of the anti-Grant majority, and the exhibition of his splendid qualifications won increasing admiration and trust. His tact and readiness in casual debate, and the beauty and force of the more elaborate effort in which he nominated Sherman, won the wavering convention. On the thirty-sixth ballot the delegates broke their ranks and rushed to him. He received 399 votes, and then his nomination (8 June, 1880) was made unanimous. Gen. Garfield left the convention before the

result was announced, and accepted the nomination by letter. This was a thoughtful document, and acceptable to the Republican voters. Disregarding precedent, he spoke in his own behalf in Ohio, New York, and other states. He spoke sensibly and with great discretion, and his public appearance is thought to have increased his popularity. He was elected (2 Nov., 1880) over his competitor, Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock, by the votes of every northern state except New Jersey, Nevada, and California. His inaugural address, 4 March, 1881, was satisfactory to the people generally, and his administration began with only one cloud in the sky. His cabinet was made up as follows: James G. Blaine, of Maine, secretary of state; William Windom, of Minnesota, secretary of the treasury; Wayne MacVeagh, of Pennsylvania, attorney-general; Thomas L. James, of New York, postmaster-general; Samuel J. Kirkwood, of Iowa, secretary of the interior; Robert T. Lincoln, of Illinois, secretary of war; William H. Hunt, of Louisiana, secretary of the navy. There was bitter dissension in the party in New York, and Garfield gave much consideration to his duty in the premises. He was willing to do anything except yield the independence of the executive in his own constitutional sphere. He would give to the New York senators, Conkling and Platt, more than their share of offices; but they should not be allowed to interfere with or control the presidential right of nomination. He made nominations to the senate—as many, it is said, as twelve—in that interest, and then (23 March, 1881) sent in the name of William H. Robertson, a leader in the other faction, as collector of the port of New York. Senator Conkling protested, and then openly resisted his confirmation. Yielding to him in the interest of senatorial courtesy, his Republican colleagues, in caucus, 2 May, 1881, agreed to let contested nominations lie over practically until the following December. This was a substantial victory for Mr. Conkling; but it was promptly met by the president, who, a few days afterward (5 May), withdrew all the nominations that were pleasing to the New York senator. This brought the other senators to terms. Mr. Conkling, recognizing defeat, and Mr. Platt with him, resigned their offices, 16 May, 1881. On 18 May, Collector Robertson was confirmed. The early summer came, and peace and happiness and the growing strength and popularity of his administration cheered the heart of its chief. At

a moment of special exaltation, on the morning of 2 July, 1881, he was shot by a disappointed office-seeker. The avowed object was to promote to the presidential chair Vice-President Arthur, who represented the Grant or "stalwart" wing of the party. The president was setting out on a trip to New England, anticipating especial pleasure in witnessing the commencement exercises of his alma mater at Williamstown. He was passing through the waiting room of the Baltimore and Potomac depot, at nine o'clock that morning, leaning on the arm of Mr. Blaine, when the assassin fired at him with a pistol. The first ball passed through his coat-sleeve; the second entered by the back, fractured a rib, and lodged deep in the body. The president was carried to the White House, where, under the highest medical skill, and with every comfort that money and devotion could bring, he lingered for more than ten weeks between life and death. The country and the world were moved by the dastardly deed; and the fortitude and cheerfulness with which the president bore his suffering added to the universal grief. Daily bulletins of his condition were published in every city in the United States and in all the European capitals. Many of the crowned heads of Europe sought by telegraphic inquiry more particular news, and repeated their wishes for his recovery. A day of national supplication was set apart and sacredly observed, and the prayers at first seemed answered. His physicians were hopeful, and gave expression to their hope. His condition seemed to improve; but when midsummer came, the patient failed so perceptibly that a removal was hazarded. On 6 Sept., 1881, he was taken to Elberon, N. J., by a special train. He bore the journey well, and for a while, under the inspiration of the invigorating sea-breezes, seemed to rally. But on 15 Sept., 1881, symptoms of blood-poisoning appeared. He lingered till the 19th, when, after a few hours of unconsciousness, he died peacefully. A special train (21 Sept.) carried the body to Washington, through a country draped with emblems of mourning, and through crowds of reverent spectators, to lie in state in the rotunda of the capitol two days, 22 and 23 Sept. The final services held here were never surpassed in solemnity and dignity, except on 27 Feb., 1882, when, in the hall of representatives, at the request of both houses of congress, his friend, James G. Blaine, then secretary of state, delivered a

memorial address, in the presence of the president and the heads of all the great departments of the government, so perfect that the criticism of two continents was unqualified praise. In a long train, crowded with the most illustrious of his countrymen, which in its passage, day or night, was never out of the silent watch of mourning citizens, who stood in city, field, and forest, to see it pass, Garfield's remains were borne to Cleveland and placed (26 Sept., 1882) in a beautiful cemetery, which overlooks the waters of Lake Erie. The accompanying illustration represents the imposing monument that now marks his last resting-place.



His tragic death assures to Garfield the attention of history. It will credit him with great services rendered in various fields, and with a character formed by a singular union of the best qualities—industry, perseverance, truthfulness, honesty, courage—all acting as faithful servants to a lofty and unselfish ambition. Without genius, which can rarely do more than produce extraordinary results in one direction, his powers were so many and well-trained that he produced excellent results in many. If history shall call Garfield great, it will be because the development of these powers was so complete and harmonious. It has no choice but to record that, by the wise use of them, he won distinction in many fields: a teacher so gifted that his students compare him with Arnold of Rugby; a soldier, rising by merit in rapid promotion to highest rank; a lawyer heard with profit and appropriation in the supreme court; an eloquent orator, whose own ardent faith kindled his hearers, speaking after thorough preparation and with practised skill, but refusing always to win victory by forensic trick or device; a party leader, failing in pre-eminence only because his moral honesty would not let him always represent a party victory as a necessity of national well-being. In all these characters he was the friend of learning, and would probably ask no other epitaph than the tribute of a friend, who said that, “among the public men of his era,

none had higher qualities of statesmanship and greater culture than James A. Garfield."

Garfield's speeches are almost a compendium of the political history of the stirring era between 1864 and 1880. Among those worthy of special mention, on account of the importance of the subjects or the attractive and forcible presentation of them, are the following: On the Enrolling and calling out of the National Forces (25 Jan., 1864); on the Reconstruction of the Southern States (February, 1866); on Civil-Service Reform, in the congress of 1870 and other congresses; on the Currency and the Public Faith (April, 1874); on the Democratic Party and the South (4 Aug., 1876), of which a million copies were distributed as a campaign document; the speech in opposition to the Wood bill, which was framed to break down the protective tariff (4 June, 1878); the speeches on Revolution in Congress (4 March and 4 April, 1879); on Congressional Nullification (10 June, 1879); on Treason at the Polls (11 June, 1879); and on the Democratic Party and Public Opinion (11 Oct., 1879). Among his speeches in congress, less political in character, were that on the National Bureau of Education (8 June, 1866); a series on Indian Affairs, covering a period of several years; one on the Medical and Surgical History of the Rebellion (2 March, 1869); two on the Census (6 April and 16 Dec., 1879); one on Civil-Service Reform; many addresses on the silver question; and one on National aid to education (6 Feb., 1872). He found time to make frequent orations and addresses before societies and gatherings outside of congress. His address on College Education, delivered before the literary societies of Hiram college (14 June, 1867), is an admirable plea for a liberal education, and on a subject in which the author was always deeply interested. On 30 May, 1868, he delivered an address on the Union Soldiers, at the first memorial service held at Arlington, Va. A eulogy of Gen. Thomas, delivered before the Army of the Cumberland, 25 Nov., 1870, is one of the happiest of his oratorical efforts. On the reception by the house of the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams, he spoke with a great wealth of historical allusion, and all his memorial addresses, especially those on his predecessor in congress, Joshua R. Giddings, Lincoln, and Profs. Morse and Henry, are worthy of study. But in all this series nothing will live longer than the simple words with which, from the balcony of the New York

custom-house, he calmed the mob frenzied at the news of Lincoln's death: "Fellow-citizens: Clouds and darkness are around him; His pavilion is dark waters and thick clouds; justice and judgment are the establishment of his throne; mercy and truth shall go before his face! Fellow-citizens! God reigns, and the Government at Washington lives."

After the death of President Garfield, a popular subscription for his widow and children realized over \$360,000. The income of this fund is to be paid to Mrs. Garfield during her life, after which the principal is to be divided among the children—four sons and a daughter. More than forty of Garfield's speeches in congress have been published in pamphlet-form, as has also his oration on the life of Gen. George H. Thomas. A volume of brief selections, entitled "Garfield's Words," was compiled by William R. Baich (Boston, 1881). His works have been edited by Burke A. Hinsdale (2 vols., Boston, 1882). The most complete life of President Garfield is that by James R. Gilmore (New York, 1880).

A monument to President Garfield, designed by John Q. A. Ward, was erected in Washington, D. C., by the Society of the army of the Cumberland, and dedicated on 12 May, 1887. It consists of a bronze statue of Garfield, 10½ feet high, standing on a circular pedestal 18 feet in height, with buttresses, on which are three reclining figures, representing a student, a warrior, and a statesman. The U. S. government gave the site and the granite pedestal, besides contributing to the cost of the statues, and furnishing cannon to be used in their casting. (See page 435.) The unusual attitude of the arms is explained by the fact that Gen. Garfield was left-handed.



*Lucretia R. Garfield.*

His wife, LUCRETIA RUDOLPH, born in Hiram, Portage co., Ohio, 19 April, 1832, was the daughter of a farmer named Mr. Zeb Rudolph. She first met her husband when both were students at Hiram, and was married 11 Nov., 1858, in Hudson, Ohio, soon after his accession to the presidency of the college. Seven children were born to them, of whom five are living.

## CHESTER ALAN ARTHUR.

CHESTER ALAN ARTHUR, twenty-first president of the United States, born in Fairfield, Franklin co., Vt., 5 Oct., 1830; died in New York city, 18 Nov., 1886. His father was Rev. William Arthur. His mother was Malvina Stone. Her grandfather, Uriah Stone, was a New Hampshire pioneer, who about 1763 migrated from Hampstead to Connecticut river, and made his home in Piermont, where he died in 1810, leaving twelve children. Her father was George Washington Stone. She died 16 Jan., 1869, and her husband died 27 Oct., 1875, at Newtonville, N. Y. Their children were three sons and six daughters, all of whom, except one son and one daughter, were living in 1894. Chester A. Arthur, the eldest son, prepared for college at Union Village in Greenwich, and at Schenectady, and in 1845 he entered the sophomore class of Union. While in his sophomore year he taught school for a term at Schaghticoke, Rensselaer co., and a second term at the same place during his last year in college. He joined the Psi-Upsilon society, and was one of six in a class of one hundred who were elected members of the Phi Beta Kappa society, the condition of admission being high scholarship. He was graduated at eighteen years of age, in the class of 1848. While at college he decided to become a lawyer, and after graduation attended for several months a law school at Ballston Spa, returned to Lansingburg, where his father then resided, and continued his legal studies. During this period he fitted boys for college, and in 1851 he was principal of an academy at North Pownal, Vt. In 1854, James A. Garfield, then a student in Williams college, taught penmanship in this academy during his winter vacation.

In 1853, Arthur, having accumulated a small sum of money, decided to go to New York city. He there entered the law office of Erastus D. Culver as a student, was admitted to the





H. B. Hall, Jr.

*Chester A. Arthur*



bar during the same year, and at once became a member of the firm of Culver, Parker & Arthur. Mr. Culver had been an anti-slavery member of congress from Washington county when Dr. Arthur was pastor of the Baptist church in Greenwich in that county. Dr. Arthur had also enjoyed the friendship of Gerrit Smith, who had often been his guest and spoken from his pulpit. Together they had taken part in the meeting convened at Utica, 21 Oct., 1835, to form a New York anti-slavery society. This meeting was broken up by a committee of pro-slavery citizens; but the members repaired to Mr. Smith's home in Peterborough, and there completed the organization. On the same day in Boston a women's anti-slavery society, while its president was at prayer, was dispersed by a mob, and William Lloyd Garrison was dragged through the streets with a rope around his body, threatened with tar and feathers, and for his protection lodged in jail by the mayor. From these early associations Arthur naturally formed sentiments of hostility to slavery, and he first gave them public expression in the Lemmon slave case. In 1852 Jonathan Lemmon, a Virginia slave-holder, determined to take eight of the slaves of his wife, Juliet—one man, two women, and five children—to Texas, and brought them by steamer from Norfolk to New York, intending to re-ship them from New York to Texas. On the petition of Louis Napoleon, a free colored man, on 6 Nov., a writ of habeas corpus was issued by Judge Elijah Paine, of the superior court of New York city, and after arguments by Mr. Culver and John Jay for the slaves, and H. D. Lapaugh and Henry L. Clinton for the slave-holder, Judge Paine, on 13 Nov., released the slaves on the ground that they had been made free by being brought by their master into a free state. The decision created great excitement at the south, and the legislature of Virginia directed its attorney-general to appeal to the higher courts of New York. The legislature of New York passed a resolution directing its governor to defend the slaves. In December, 1857, the supreme court, in which a certiorari had been sued out, affirmed Judge Paine's decision (*People v. Lemmon*, 5 Sandf., 681), and it was still further sustained by the court of appeals at the March term, 1860 (*Lemmon v. People*, 20 N. Y. Rep., 562). Arthur, as a law student, and after his admission to the bar, became an earnest advocate for the slaves. He went to

Albany to secure the intervention in their behalf of the legislature and the governor, and he acted as their counsel in addition to attorney-general Ogden Hoffman, E. D. Culver, Joseph Blunt, and (after Mr. Hoffman's death) William M. Evarts. Charles O'Connor was employed as further counsel for the slave-holder, and argued his side before the court of appeals, while Mr. Blunt and Mr. Evarts argued for the slaves. Until 1855 the street-car companies of New York city excluded colored persons from riding with the whites, and made no adequate provision for their separate transportation. One Sunday in that year a colored woman named Lizzie Jennings, a Sabbath-school superintendent, on the way home from her school, was ejected from a car on the Fourth avenue line. Culver, Parker & Arthur brought a suit in her behalf against the company in the supreme court in Brooklyn, the plaintiff recovered a judgment, and the right of colored persons to ride in any of the city cars was thus secured. The Colored People's Legal Rights Association for years celebrated the anniversary of their success in this case.

Mr. Arthur became a Henry Clay whig, and cast his first vote in 1852 for Winfield Scott for president. He participated in the first republican state convention at Saratoga, and took an active part in the Fremont campaign of 1856. On 1 Jan., 1861, Gov. Edwin D. Morgan, who on that date entered upon his second term, and between whom and Mr. Arthur a warm friendship had grown up, appointed him on his staff as engineer-in-chief, with the rank of brigadier-general. He had previously taken part in the organization of the state militia, and had been judge-advocate of the second brigade. When the civil war began, in April, 1861, his active services were required by Gov. Morgan, and he became acting quartermaster-general, and as such began in New York city the work of preparing and forwarding the state's quota of troops. In December he was called to Albany for consultation concerning the defences of New York harbor. On 24 Dec. he summoned a board of engineers, of which he became a member; and on 18 Jan., 1862, he submitted an elaborate report on the condition of the national forts both on the sea-coast and on the inland border of the state. On 10 Feb., 1862, he was appointed inspector-general, with the rank of brigadier-general, and in May he inspected the New York troops at Fredericksburg and

on the Chickahominy. In June, 1862, Gov. Morgan ordered his return from the Army of the Potomac, and he acted as secretary of the meeting of the governors of the loyal states, which was held at the Astor House, New York city, 28 June. The governors advised President Lincoln to call for more troops; and on 1 July he called for 300,000 volunteers. At Gov. Morgan's request, Gen. Arthur resumed his former work, resigned as inspector-general, and 10 July was appointed quartermaster-general. In his annual report, dated 27 Jan., 1863, he said: "Through the single office and clothing department of this department in the city of New York, from 1 Aug. to 1 Dec., the space of four months, there were completely clothed, uniformed, and equipped, supplied with camp and garrison equipage, and transported from this state to the seat of war, sixty-eight regiments of infantry, two battalions of cavalry, and four battalions of artillery." He went out of office 31 Dec., 1862, when Horatio Seymour succeeded Gov. Morgan, and his successor, Quartermaster-General S. V. Talcott, in his report of 31 Dec., 1863, spoke of the previous administration as follows: "I found, on entering on the discharge of my duties, a well-organized system of labor and accountability, for which the state is chiefly indebted to my predecessor, Gen. Chester A. Arthur, who by his practical good sense and unremitting exertion, at a period when everything was in confusion, reduced the operations of the department to a matured plan, by which large amounts of money were saved to the government, and great economy of time secured in carrying out the details of the same."

Between 1862 and 1872 Gen. Arthur was engaged in continuous and active law practice—in partnership with Henry G. Gardner from 1862 till 1867, then for five years alone, and on 1 Jan., 1872, he formed the firm of Arthur, Phelps & Knevals. He was for a short time counsel for the department of assessments and taxes, but resigned the place. During all this period he continued to take an active interest in politics; was chairman in 1868 of the central Grant club of New York; and became chairman of the executive committee of the republican state committee in 1879. On 20 Nov., 1871, he was appointed by President Grant collector of the port of New York, and assumed the office on 1 Dec.; was nominated to the senate 6 Dec., confirmed 12 Dec., and commissioned for four years 16

Dec. On 17 Dec., 1875, he was nominated for another term, and by the senate confirmed the same day, without reference to a committee—a courtesy never before extended to an appointee who had not been a senator. He was commissioned 18 Dec., and retained the office until 11 July, 1878, making his service about six and two thirds years.

The New York republican state convention, held at Syracuse, 22 March, 1876, elected delegates to the national convention in favor of the nomination of Senator Conkling for president. The friends of Mr. Conkling in the state convention were led by Alonzo B. Cornell, then naval officer in the New York custom-house. A minority, calling themselves reform republicans, and favoring Benjamin H. Bristow for president, were led by George William Curtis. At the national convention at Cincinnati, 14 June, sixty-nine of the New York delegates, headed by Mr. Cornell, voted for Mr. Conkling, and one delegate, Mr. Curtis, voted for Mr. Bristow. At the critical seventh ballot, however, Mr. Conkling's name was withdrawn, and from New York sixty-one votes were given for Rutherford B. Hayes, against nine for James G. Blaine; and the former's nomination was thus secured. At the New York republican state convention to nominate a governor, held at Saratoga, 23 Aug., Mr. Cornell and ex-Gov. Morgan were candidates, and also William M. Evarts, supported by the reform republicans led by Mr. Curtis. Mr. Cornell's name was withdrawn, and Gov. Morgan was nominated. In the close state and presidential canvass that ensued, Messrs. Arthur and Cornell made greater exertions to carry New York for the republicans than they had ever made in any other campaign; and subsequently Gen. Arthur's activity in connection with the contested countings in the southern states was of vital importance. Nevertheless, President Hayes, in making up his cabinet, selected Mr. Evarts as his secretary of state, and determined to remove Messrs. Arthur and Cornell, and to transfer the power and patronage of their offices to the use of a minority faction in the republican party. The president had, however, in his inaugural of 5 March, 1877, declared in favor of civil service reform—"a change in the system of appointment itself; a reform that shall be thorough, radical, and complete; that the officer should be secure in his tenure so long as his personal character remained untarnished, and the performance of his

duties satisfactory." In his letter of acceptance of 8 July, 1876, he had used the same words, and added: "If elected, I shall conduct the administration of the government upon these principles, and all constitutional powers vested in the executive will be employed to establish this reform." It became necessary, therefore, before removing Arthur and Cornell, that some foundation should be laid for a claim that the custom-house was not well administered. A series of investigations was thereupon instituted. The Jay commission was appointed 14 April, 1877, and during the ensuing summer made four reports criticising the management of the custom-house. In September, Sec. Sherman requested the collector to resign, accompanying the request with the offer of a foreign mission. The newspapers of the previous day announced that at a cabinet meeting it had been determined to remove the collector. The latter declined to resign, and the investigations were continued by commissions and special agents. To the reports of the Jay commission Collector Arthur replied in detail, in a letter to Sec. Sherman, dated 23 Nov. On 6 Dec., Theodore Roosevelt was nominated to the senate for collector, and L. Bradford Prince for naval officer; but they were rejected 12 Dec., and no other nominations were made, although the senate remained in session for more than six months. On 11 July, 1878, after its adjournment, Messrs. Arthur and Cornell were suspended from office, and Edwin A. Merritt was designated as collector, and Silas W. Burt as naval officer, and they took possession of the offices. Their nominations were sent to the senate 3 Dec., 1878. On 15 Jan., 1879, Sec. Sherman communicated to the senate a full statement of the causes that led to these suspensions, mainly criticisms of the management of the custom-house, closing with the declaration that the restoration of the suspended officers would create discord and contention, be unjust to the president, and personally embarrassing to the secretary, and saying that, as Collector Arthur's term of service would expire 17 Dec., 1879, his restoration would be temporary, as the president would send in another name, or suspend him again after the adjournment of the senate.

On 21 Jan., 1879, Collector Arthur, in a letter to Senator Conkling, chairman of the committee on commerce, before which the nominations were pending, made an elaborate reply to Sec. Sherman's criticisms, completely demonstrating the

honesty and efficiency with which the custom-house had been managed, and the good faith with which the policy and instructions of the president had been carried out. A fair summary of the merits of the ostensible issue is contained in Collector Arthur's letter of 23 Nov., 1877, from which the following extract is taken: "The essential elements of a correct civil service I understand to be: first, permanence in office, which of course prevents removals except for cause; second, promotion from the lower to the higher grades, based upon good conduct and efficiency; third, prompt and thorough investigation of all complaints, and prompt punishment of all misconduct. In this respect I challenge comparison with any department of the government under the present, or under any past, national administration. I am prepared to demonstrate the truth of this statement on any fair investigation." In a table appended to this letter Collector Arthur showed that during the six years he had managed the office the yearly percentage of removals for all causes had been only  $2\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. as against an annual average of 28 per cent. under his three immediate predecessors, and an annual average of about 24 per cent. since 1857, when Collector Schell took office. Out of 923 persons who held office when he became collector, on 1 Dec., 1871, there were 531 still in office on 1 May, 1877, having been retained during his entire term. In making promotions, the uniform practice was to advance men from the lower to the higher grades, and all the appointments except two, to the one hundred positions of \$2,000 salary, or over, were made in this method. The expense of collecting the revenue was also kept low; it had been, under his predecessors, between 1857 and 1861,  $\frac{59}{100}$  of one per cent. of the receipts; between 1861 and 1864,  $\frac{87}{100}$ ; in 1864 and 1865,  $1\frac{30}{100}$ ; between 1866 and 1869,  $\frac{74}{100}$ ; in 1869 and 1870,  $\frac{85}{100}$ ; in 1870 and 1871,  $\frac{60}{100}$ ; and under him, from 1871 to 1877, it was  $\frac{62}{100}$  of one per cent. The influence of the administration, however, was sufficient to secure the confirmation of Mr. Merritt and Mr. Burt on 3 Feb., 1879, and the controversy was remitted to the republicans of New York for their opinion. Mr. Cornell was nominated for governor of New York 3 Sept., 1879, and elected on 4 Nov.; and Mr. Arthur was considered a candidate for U. S. senator for the term to begin 4 March, 1881.



On retiring from the office of collector, Gen. Arthur resumed law practice with the firm of Arthur, Phelps, Knevals & Ransom. But he continued to be active in politics, and, in 1880, advocated the nomination of Gen. Grant to succeed President Hayes. He was a delegate at large to the Chicago convention, which met 2 June, and during the heated preliminary contest before the republican national committee, which threatened to result in the organization of two independent conventions, he conducted for his own side the conferences with the controlling anti-third term delegates relative to the choice of a temporary presiding officer, and the arrangement of the preliminary roll of delegates in the cases to be contested in the convention. The result of the conferences was an agreement by which all danger was avoided, and when, upon the opening of the convention, an attempt was made, in consequence of a misunderstanding on the part of certain Grant delegates, to violate this agreement, he resolutely adhered to it, and insisted upon and secured its observance. After the nomination, 10 June, of Gen. Garfield for president, by a combination of the anti-third term delegates, a general desire arose in the convention to nominate for vice-president some advocate of Grant and a resident of New York state. The New York delegation at once indicated their preference for Gen. Arthur, and before the roll-call began the foregone conclusion was evident: he received 468 votes against 283 for all others, and the nomination was made unanimous. In his letter of acceptance of 5 July, 1880, he emphasized the right and the paramount duty of the nation to protect the colored citizens, who were enfranchised as a result of the southern rebellion, in the full enjoyment of their civil and political rights, including honesty and order, and excluding fraud and force, in popular elections. He also approved such reforms in the public service as would base original appointments to office upon ascertained fitness, fill positions of responsibility by the promotion of worthy and efficient officers, and make the tenure of office stable, while not allowing the acceptance of public office to impair the liberty or diminish the responsibility of the citizen. He also advocated a sound currency, popular education, such changes in tariff and taxation as would "relieve any overburdened industry or class, and enable our manufacturers and artisans to compete successfully with those of other lands,"

national works of internal improvement, and the development of our water-courses and harbors wherever required by the general interests of commerce. During the canvass he remained chairman of the New York republican state committee. The result was a plurality for Garfield and Arthur of 21,000 in the state, against a plurality of 32,000 in 1876 for Tilden and Hendricks, the democratic candidates.

Vice-President Arthur took the oath of office 4 March, 1881, and presided over the extra session of the senate that then began, which continued until 20 May. The senate contained 37 republicans and 37 democrats, while senators Mahone, of Virginia, and Davis, of Illinois, who were rated as independents, generally voted, the former with the republicans and the latter with the democrats, thus making a tie, and giving the vice-president the right to cast the controlling vote, which he several times had occasion to exercise. The session was exciting, and was prolonged by the efforts of the republicans to elect their nominees for secretary and sergeant-at-arms, against dilatory tactics employed by the democrats, and by the controversy over President Garfield's nomination, on 23 March, for collector of the port of New York, of William H. Robertson, who had been the leader of the New York anti-third term delegates at the Chicago convention. During this controversy the vice-president supported Senators Conkling and Platt in their opposition to the confirmation. On 28 March he headed a remonstrance, signed also by the senators and by Postmaster-General James, addressed to the president, condemning the appointment, and asking that the nomination be withdrawn. When the two senators hastily resigned and made their unsuccessful contest for a reelection by the legislature of New York, then in session at Albany, he exerted himself actively in their behalf during May and June.

President Garfield was shot 2 July, 1881, and died 19 Sept. His cabinet announced his death to the vice-president, then in New York, and, at their suggestion, he took the oath as president on the 20th, at his residence, 123 Lexington avenue, before Judge John R. Brady, of the New York supreme court. On the 22d the oath was formally administered again in the vice-president's room in the capitol at Washington by Chief-Justice Waite, and President Arthur delivered the following inaugural address: "For the fourth time in the history of the republic its

chief magistrate has been removed by death. All hearts are filled with grief and horror at the hideous crime which has darkened our land; and the memory of the murdered president, his protracted sufferings, his unyielding fortitude, the example and achievements of his life, and the pathos of his death, will forever illumine the pages of our history. For the fourth time the officer elected by the people and ordained by the constitution to fill a vacancy so created is called to assume the executive chair. The wisdom of our fathers, foreseeing even the most dire possibilities, made sure that the government should never be imperilled because of the uncertainty of human life. Men may die, but the fabrics of our free institutions remain unshaken. No higher or more assuring proof could exist of the strength and permanence of popular government than the fact that, though the chosen of the people be struck down, his constitutional successor is peacefully installed without shock or strain, except the sorrow which mourns the bereavement. All the noble aspirations of my lamented predecessor which found expression in his life, the measures devised and suggested during his brief administration to correct abuses and enforce economy, to advance prosperity and promote the general welfare, to insure domestic security and maintain friendly and honorable relations with the nations of the earth, will be garnered in the hearts of the people, and it will be my earnest endeavor to profit and to see that the nation shall profit by his example and experience. Prosperity blesses our country, our fiscal policy is fixed by law, is well grounded and generally approved. No threatening issue mars our foreign intercourse, and the wisdom, integrity, and thrift of our people may be trusted to continue undisturbed the present assured career of peace, tranquillity, and welfare. The gloom and anxiety which have enshrouded the country must make repose especially welcome now. No demand for speedy legislation has been heard; no adequate occasion is apparent for an unusual session of congress. The constitution defines the functions and powers of the executive as clearly as those of either of the other two departments of the government, and he must answer for the just exercise of the discretion it permits and the performance of the duties it imposes. Summoned to these high duties and responsibilities, and profoundly conscious of their magnitude and gravity, I assume the trust imposed by the constitution,

relying for aid on Divine guidance and the virtue, patriotism, and intelligence of the American people."

He also on the same day appointed Monday, 26 Sept., as a day of mourning for the late president. On 23 Sept. he issued a proclamation convening the senate in extraordinary session, to meet 10 Oct., in order that a president *pro tem.* of that body might be elected. The members of the cabinet were requested to retain their places until the regular meeting of congress in December, and did remain until their successors were appointed, except Sec. Windom, who, desiring to become a candidate for senator from Minnesota, resigned from the treasury 24 Oct. Edwin D. Morgan was nominated and confirmed secretary of the treasury, but declined the appointment; and Charles J. Folger, of New York, was then nominated and confirmed, was commissioned 27 Oct., and qualified 14 Nov. He died in office 4 Sept., 1884. The other members of the cabinet of President Arthur, and the dates of their commissions, were as follows: State department, Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, 12 Dec., 1881; treasury, Walter Q. Gresham, of Indiana, 24 Sept., 1884; Hugh McCulloch, of Maryland, 28 Oct., 1884; war, Robert T. Lincoln, of Illinois, 5 March, 1881 (retained from Garfield's cabinet); navy, William E. Chandler, of New Hampshire, 12 April, 1882; interior, Henry M. Teller, of Colorado, 6 April, 1882; attorney-general, Benjamin H. Brewster, of Pennsylvania, 19 Dec., 1881; post-master-general, Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin, 20 Dec., 1881 (died in office, 25 March, 1883); Walter Q. Gresham, 3 April, 1883; Frank Hatton, of Iowa, 14 Oct., 1884. Messrs. Frelinghuysen, McCulloch, Lincoln, Chandler, Teller, Brewster, and Hatton remained in office until the end of the presidential term.

The prominent events of President Arthur's administration, including his most important recommendations to congress, may be here summarized: Shortly after his accession to the presidency he participated in the dedication of the monument erected at Yorktown, Va., to commemorate the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at that place, 19 Oct., 1781. Representatives of our French allies and of the German participants were present. At the close of the celebration the president felicitously directed a salute to be fired in honor of the British flag, "in recognition of the friendly relations so long and so happily subsisting between Great Britain and the United States, in the

trust and confidence of peace and good-will between the two countries for all the centuries to come, and especially as a mark of the profound respect entertained by the American people for the illustrious sovereign and gracious lady who sits upon the British throne." On 29 Nov., 1881, an invitation was extended to all the independent countries of North and South America to participate in a peace congress, to be convened at Washington 22 Nov., 1882. The president, in a special message, 18 April, 1882, asked the opinion of congress as to the expediency of the project. No response being elicited, he concluded, 9 Aug., 1882, to postpone indefinitely the proposed convocation, believing that so important a step should not be taken without the express authority of congress; or while three of the nations to be invited were at war; or still, again, until a programme should have been prepared explicitly indicating the objects and limiting the powers of the congress. Efforts were made, however, to strengthen the relations of the United States with the other American nationalities. Representations were made by the administration with a view to bringing to a close the devastating war between Chili and the allied states of Peru and Bolivia. Its friendly counsel was offered in aid of the settlement of the disputed boundary-line between Mexico and Guatemala, and was probably influential in averting a war between those countries.

On 29 July, 1882, a convention was made with Mexico for relocating the boundary between that country and the United States from the Rio Grande to the Pacific, and on the same day an agreement was also effected permitting the armed forces of either country to cross the frontier in pursuit of hostile Indians. A series of reciprocal commercial treaties with the countries of America to foster an unhampered movement of trade was recommended. Such a treaty was made with Mexico, 20 Jan., 1883, Gen. U. S. Grant and William H. Trescott being the U. S. commissioners, and was ratified by the senate 11 March, 1884. Similar treaties were made with Santo Domingo 4 Dec., 1884; and 18 Nov., 1884, with Spain, relative to the trade of Cuba and Porto Rico; both of which, before action by the senate, were withdrawn by President Cleveland, who, in his message of 8 Dec., 1885, pronounced them inexpedient. In connection with commercial treaties President Arthur advised the establishment of a monetary

union of the American countries to secure the adoption of a uniform currency basis, and as a step toward the general re-monetization of silver. Provision for increased and improved consular representation in the Central American states was urged, and the recommendation was accepted and acted upon by congress. A Central and South American commission was appointed, under the act of congress of 7 July, 1884, and proceeded on its mission, guided by instructions containing a statement of the general policy of the government for enlarging its commercial intercourse with American states. Reports from the commission were submitted to congress in a message of 13 Feb., 1885. Negotiations were conducted with the republic of Colombia for the purpose of renewing and strengthening the obligations of the United States as the sole guarantor of the integrity of Colombian territory, and of the neutrality of any interoceanic canal to be constructed across the isthmus of Panama. By correspondence upon this subject, carried on with the British government, it was shown that the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 19 April, 1850, can not be urged, and do not continue in force in justification of interference by any European power, with the right of the United States to exercise exclusive control over any route of isthmus transit, in accordance with the spirit and purpose of the so-called "Monroe doctrine." As the best and most practicable means of securing a canal, and at the same time protecting the paramount interests of the United States, a treaty was made with the republic of Nicaragua, 1 Dec., 1884, which authorized the United States to construct a canal, railway, and telegraph line across Nicaraguan territory by way of San Juan river and Lake Nicaragua. This treaty was rejected by the senate, but a motion was made to reconsider the vote. Before final action had been taken it was withdrawn, 12 March, 1885, by President Cleveland, who withheld it from re-submission to the senate, and in his message of 8 Dec., 1885, expressed his unwillingness to assert for the United States any claim of paramount privilege of ownership or control of any canal across the isthmus. Satisfaction was obtained from Spain of the old claim on account of the "Masonic," an American vessel, which had been seized at Manila unjustly, and under circumstances of peculiar severity. From the same government was also secured a recognition of the conclusiveness of the

judgments of the U. S. courts naturalizing citizens of Spanish nativity. From the British government a full recognition of the rights and immunities of naturalized American citizens of Irish origin was obtained, and all such that were under arrest in England or Ireland, as suspects, were liberated. Notice was given to England, under the joint resolution of congress of 3 March, 1883, of the termination of the fishery clauses of the treaty of Washington. A complete scheme for re-organizing the extra-territorial jurisdiction of American consuls in China and Japan, and another for re-organizing the whole consular service, were submitted to congress. The former recommendation was adopted by the senate. The balance of the Japanese indemnity fund was returned to Japan by act of 22 Feb., 1883, and the balance of the Chinese fund to China by act of 3 March, 1885. A bill that was passed by congress prohibiting the immigration of Chinese laborers for a term of twenty years was vetoed, 4 April, 1882, as being a violation of the treaty of 1880 with China, which permitted the limitation or suspension of immigration, but forbade its absolute prohibition. The veto was sustained and a modified bill, suspending immigration for ten years, was passed 6 May, 1882, which received executive approval, and also an amendatory act of 5 July, 1884. Outstanding claims with China were settled, and additional regulations of the opium traffic established. Friendly and commercial intercourse with Corea was opened under the most favorable auspices, in pursuance of the treaty negotiated on 22 May, 1882, through the agency of Com. R. W. Shufeldt, U. S. N. The friendly offices of the United States were extended to Liberia in aid of a settlement, favorable to that republic, of the dispute concerning its boundary-line, with the British possession of Sierra Leone. The flag of the international association of the Congo was, on 22 April, 1884, recognized first by the United States. A commercial agent was appointed to visit the Congo basin, and the government was represented at an international conference at Berlin, called by the emperor of Germany, for the promotion of trade and the establishment of commercial rights in the Congo region. The renewal of the reciprocity treaty with Hawaii was advised. Remonstrances were addressed to Russia against any proscriptive treatment of the Hebrew race in that country. The international prime meridian of Greenwich was established as

the result of a conference of nations, initiated by the U. S. government, and held at Washington, 1 Oct. to 1 Nov., 1884. In response to the appeal of Cardinal John McCloskey, of New York, the Italian government, on 4 March, 1884, was urged to exempt from the sale of the property of the propaganda the American college in Rome, established mainly by contributions from the United States, and in consequence of this interposition the college was saved from sale and virtual confiscation. On 3 Aug., 1882, a law was passed for returning convicts to Europe, and on 26 Feb., 1885, importation of contract-laborers was forbidden.

The suspension of the coinage of standard silver dollars, and the redemption of the trade dollars, were repeatedly recommended. The repeal of the stamp taxes on matches, proprietary articles, playing-cards, bank checks and drafts, and of the tax on surplus bank capital and deposits, was recommended. These taxes were repealed by act of congress of 3 March, 1883; and by executive order of 25 June, 1883, the number of internal revenue collection districts was reduced from 126 to 83. The tax on tobacco was reduced by the same act of congress; and in his last annual message, of 5 Dec., 1884, the president advised the repeal of all internal revenue taxes except those on distilled spirits and fermented liquors. Congress was advised to undertake the revision of the tariff, but "without the abandonment of the policy of so discriminating in the adjustment of details as to afford aid and protection to American labor." The course advised was the organization of a tariff commission, which was authorized by act of congress of 15 May, 1882. The report of the commission submitted to congress 4 Dec. was made the basis of the tariff revision act of 3 March, 1883. On 12 July, 1882, an act became a law enabling the national banks, which were then completing their twenty-year terms, to extend their corporate existence. Overdue five per cent. bonds to the amount of \$469,651,050, and six per cent. bonds to the amount of \$203,573,750, were continued (except about \$56,000,000 which were paid) at the rate of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. interest. The interest-bearing public debt was reduced \$478,785,950, and the annual interest charge \$29,831,880 during the presidential term. On 1 July, 1882, "An act to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea" was vetoed because not correctly or accurately phrased, although the object



was admitted to be meritorious and philanthropic. A modified bill passed congress, and was approved 2 Aug. The attention of congress was frequently called to the decline of the American merchant marine, and legislation was recommended for its restoration, and the construction and maintenance of ocean steamships under the U. S. flag. In compliance with these recommendations, the following laws were enacted: 26 June, 1884, an act to remove certain burdens from American shipping; 5 July, 1884, an act creating a bureau of navigation, under charge of a commissioner, in the treasury department; and 3 March, 1885, an amendment to the postal appropriation bill appropriating \$800,000 for contracting with American steamship lines for the transportation of foreign mails. Reasonable national regulation of the railways of the country was favored, and the opinion was expressed that congress should protect the people at large in their inter-state traffic against acts of injustice that the state governments might be powerless to prevent.

The attention of congress was often called to the necessity of modern provisions for coast defence. By special message of 11 April, 1884, an annual appropriation of \$1,500,000 for the armament of fortifications was recommended. In the last annual message an expenditure of \$60,000,000, one tenth to be appropriated annually, was recommended. In consequence, the fortifications board was created by act of 3 March, 1885, which made an elaborate report to the 49th congress, recommending a complete system of coast defence at an ultimate cost estimated at \$126,377,800. The gun-foundry board, consisting of army and navy officers, appointed under the act of 3 March, 1883, visited Europe and made full reports, advising large contracts for terms of years with American manufacturers to produce the steel necessary for heavy cannon, and recommending the establishment of one army and one navy gun factory for the fabrication of modern ordnance. This plan was commended to congress in a special message 26 March, 1884, and in the above-mentioned message of 11 April; also in the annual message of that year. In the annual message of 1881 the improvement of Mississippi river was recommended. On 17 April, 1882, by special message, congress was urged to provide for "closing existing gaps in levees," and to adopt a system for the permanent improvement of the naviga-

tion of the river and for the security of the valley. Special messages on this subject were also sent 8 Jan. and 2 April, 1884. Appropriations were made of \$8,500,000 for permanent work; and in 1882 of \$350,000, and in 1884 of over \$150,000, for the relief of the sufferers from floods, the amount in the latter year being the balance left from \$500,000 appropriated on account of the floods in the Ohio. These relief appropriations were expended under the personal supervision of the secretary of war. On 1 Aug., 1882, the president vetoed a river-and-harbor bill making appropriations of \$18,743,875, on the ground that the amount greatly exceeded "the needs of the country" for the then current fiscal year, and because it contained "appropriations for purposes not for the common defence or general welfare," which did not "promote commerce among the states, but were, on the contrary, entirely for the benefit of the particular localities" where it was "proposed to make the improvements." The bill, on 2 Aug., passed congress over the veto by 122 yeas to 59 nays in the house, and 41 yeas to 16 nays in the senate. In connection with this subject it was suggested to congress, in the annual messages of 1882, 1883, and 1884, that it would be wise to adopt a constitutional amendment allowing the president to veto in part only any bill appropriating moneys. A special message of 8 Jan., 1884, commended to congress, as a matter of great public interest, the cession to the United States of the Illinois and Michigan canal in order to secure the construction of the Hennepin canal to connect Lake Michigan by way of Illinois river with the Mississippi. Unlawful intrusions of armed settlers into the Indian territory for the purpose of locating upon lands set apart for the Indians were prevented, or the intruders were expelled by the army. On 2 July, 1884, the president vetoed the bill to restore to the army and place on the retired list Maj.-Gen. Fitz-John Porter, who, on the sentence of a court-martial, approved by President Lincoln 27 Jan., 1863, had been dismissed for disobedience of orders to march to attack the enemy in his front during the second battle of Bull Run. The reasons assigned for the veto were, (1) that the congress had no right "to impose upon the president the duty of nominating or appointing to office any particular individual of its own selection," and (2) that the bill was in effect an annulment of a final judgment of a court of last resort, after the lapse of

February 25  
1884

My dear Sir

It gives me  
pleasure to comply  
with your request

Very faithfully yours

Charles A. Arthur



many years, and on insufficient evidence. The veto was overruled in the house by 168 yeas to 78 nays, but was sustained in the senate by 27 to 27.

A new naval policy was adopted prescribing a reduction in the number of officers, the elimination of drunkards, great strictness and impartiality in discipline, the discontinuance of extensive repairs of old wooden ships, the diminution of navy-yard expenses, and the beginning of the construction of a new navy of modern steel ships and guns according to the plans of a skilful naval advisory board. The first of such vessels, the cruisers "Chicago," "Boston," and "Atlanta," and a steel despatch-boat, "Dolphin," with their armaments, were designed in this country and built in American workshops. The gun foundry board referred to above was originated, and its reports were printed with that of the department for 1884. A special message of 26 March, 1884, urged continued progress in the reconstruction of the navy, the granting of authority for at least three additional steel cruisers and four gun-boats, and the finishing of the four double-turreted monitors. Two cruisers and two gun-boats were authorized by the act of 3 March, 1885. An Arctic expedition, consisting of the steam whalers "Thetis" and "Bear," together with the ship "Alert," given by the British admiralty, was fitted out and despatched under the command of Commander Winfield Scott Schley for the relief of Lieut. A. W. Greely, of the U. S. army, who with his party had been engaged since 1881 in scientific exploration at Lady Franklin bay, in Grinnell Land; and that officer and the few other survivors were rescued at Cape Sabine 22 June, 1884. On recommendation of the president, an act of congress was passed directing the immediate return of the "Alert" to the English government.

The reduction of letter postage from three to two cents a half ounce was recommended, and was effected by the act of 3 March, 1883; the unit of weight was on 3 March, 1885, made one ounce, instead of a half ounce; the rate on transient newspapers and periodicals was reduced, 9 June, 1884, to one cent for four ounces, and the rate on similar matter, when sent by the publisher or from a news agency to actual subscribers or to other news agents, including sample copies, was on 3 March, 1885, reduced to one cent a pound. The fast-mail and free-delivery systems were largely extended; and also, on 3 March,

1883, the money-order system. Special letter deliveries were established 3 March, 1885. The star service at the west was increased at reduced cost. The foreign mail service was improved, the appropriation of \$800,000, already alluded to, was made, and various postal conventions were negotiated.

Recommendations were made for the revision of the laws fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses, and for prescribing by salaries the compensation of district attorneys and marshals. The prosecution of persons charged with frauds in connection with the star-route mail service was pressed with vigor (the attorney-general appearing in person at the principal trial), and resulted in completely breaking up the vicious and corrupt practices that had previously flourished in connection with that service. Two vacancies on the bench of the supreme court were filled—one on the death of Nathan Clifford, of Maine, by Horace Gray, of Massachusetts, commissioned on 20 Dec., 1881. For the vacancy occasioned by the retirement of Ward Hunt, of New York, Roscoe Conkling was nominated 24 Feb., 1882, and he was confirmed by the senate; but on 3 March he declined the office, and Samuel Blatchford, of New York, was appointed and commissioned 23 March, 1882.

Measures were recommended for breaking up tribal relations of the Indians by allotting to them land in severalty, and by extending to them the laws applicable to other citizens; and liberal appropriations for the education of Indian children were advised. Peace with all the tribes was preserved during the whole term of the administration. Stringent legislation against polygamy in Utah was recommended, and under the law enacted 22 March, 1882, many polygamists were indicted, convicted, and punished. The Utah commission, to aid in the better government of the territory, was appointed under the same act. The final recommendation of the president in his messages of 1883 and 1884 was, that congress should assume the entire political control of the territory, and govern it through commissioners. Legislation was urged for the preservation of the valuable forests remaining upon the public domain. National aid to education was also urged, preferably through setting apart the proceeds of the sales of public lands.

A law for the adjudication of the French spoliation claims was passed 20 Jan., 1885, and preparation was made for carrying it into effect. Congress was urged in every annual message

to pass laws establishing safe and certain methods of ascertaining the result of a presidential election, and fully providing for all cases of removal, death, resignation, or inability of the president, or any officer acting as such. In view of certain decisions of the supreme court, additional legislation was urged in the annual message of 1883 to supplement and enforce the 14th amendment to the constitution in its special purpose to insure to members of the colored race the full enjoyment of civil and political rights. The subject of reform in the methods of the public service, which had been discussed by the president in his letter of 23 Nov., 1877, while collector, to Sec. Sherman, and in his letter of 15 July, 1880, accepting the nomination for vice-president, was fully treated in all his annual messages, and in special messages of 29 Feb., 1884, and 11 Feb., 1885. The "act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States" was passed 16 Jan., 1883, and under it a series of rules was established by the president, and the law and rules at all times received his unqualified support, and that of the heads of the several departments. The final distribution of the moneys derived from the Geneva award among meritorious sufferers on account of the rebel cruisers fitted out or harbored in British ports was provided for by the act of 5 June, 1882. In the annual message of 1884 a suitable pension to Gen. Grant was recommended, and, upon his announcement that he would not accept a pension, a special message of 3 Feb., 1885, urged the passage of a bill creating the office of general of the army on the retired list, to enable the president in his discretion to appoint Gen. Grant. Such a bill was passed 3 March, 1885, and the president on that day made the nomination, and it was confirmed in open session amid demonstrations of approval, in a crowded senate-chamber, a few minutes before the expiration of the session.

The president attended, as the guest of the city of Boston, the celebration of the Webster Historical society at Marshfield, Mass., and made brief addresses in Faneuil Hall, 11 Oct., 1882, and at Marshfield, 13 Oct. He commended the Southern Exposition at Louisville, Ky., by a letter of 9 June, 1883, attended its opening, and delivered an address on 2 Aug. He aided in many ways the World's Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition at New Orleans; and on 16 Dec., 1884, in an address sent by telegraph from the executive mansion in Wash-

ington, he opened the exposition, and set in motion the machinery by the electric current. On 25 Sept., 1883, he was present at the unveiling of the Burnside monument at Bristol, R. I. On 26 Nov., 1883, he attended the unveiling of the statue of Washington on the steps of the sub-treasury building in New York city; and 21 Feb., 1885, he made an address at the dedication, at the national capital, of the Washington monument, which had been completed during his term.

President Arthur's name was presented to the republican presidential convention that met at Chicago 3 June, 1884, by delegates from New York, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Louisiana. On the first ballot he received 278 votes against 540 for all others, 276 on the second, 274 on the third, and 207 on the fourth, which resulted in the nomination of James G. Blaine. He at once telegraphed to Mr. Blaine, "As the candidate of the republican party you will have my earnest and cordial support," and in the canvass which ensued he rendered all possible assistance to the republican cause and candidates. The national convention, in its resolutions, declared that "in the administration of President Arthur we recognize a wise, conservative, and patriotic policy, under which the country has been blessed with remarkable prosperity, and we believe his eminent services are entitled to and will receive the hearty approval of every citizen." The conventions in all the states had also unanimously passed resolutions commendatory of the administration.


Mr. Arthur married, 29 Oct., 1859, Ellen Lewis Herndon, of Fredericksburg, Va., who died 12 Jan., 1880, leaving two children, Chester Alan Arthur, born 25 July, 1865, who resides in Europe, and Ellen Herndon Arthur, born 21 Nov., 1871, who lives in Albany with her aunt Mrs. McElroy. Their first child, William L. H. Arthur, was born 10 Dec., 1860, and died 8 July, 1863. Mrs. Arthur was the daughter of Commander William Lewis Herndon, of the United States navy, who, in 1851-'2, explored the Amazon river under orders of the government. He perished in a terrific gale at sea, 12 Sept., 1857, on the way from Havana to New York, while in command of the merchant-steamer "Central America."

In person, Mr. Arthur was tall, large, well-proportioned, and of distinguished presence. His manners were always affable. He was genial in domestic and social life, and warmly



beloved by his personal friends. He conducted his official intercourse with unvarying courtesy, and dispensed the liberal hospitalities of the executive mansion with ease and dignity, and in such a way as to meet universal commendation from citizens and foreigners alike. He had a full and strong mind, literary taste and culture, a retentive memory, and was apt in illustration by analogy and anecdote. He reasoned coolly and logically, and was never one-sided. The style of his state papers is simple and direct. He was eminently conscientious, wise, and just in purpose and act as a public official; had always the courage to follow his deliberate convictions, and remained unmoved by importunity or attack. He succeeded to the presidency under peculiarly distressing circumstances.

The factional feeling in the republican party, which the year before had resulted in the nomination of Gen. Garfield for president as the representative of one faction, and of him-



self for vice-president as the representative of the other, had measurably subsided during the canvass and the following winter, only to break out anew immediately after the inauguration of the new administration, and a fierce controversy was raging when the assassination of President Garfield convulsed the nation and created the gravest apprehensions. Cruel misjudgments were formed and expressed by men who would now hesitate to admit them. The long weeks of alternating hope and fear that preceded the president's death left the public mind perturbed and restless. Doubt and uneasiness were everywhere apparent. The delicacy and discretion displayed by the vice-president had compelled approval, but had not served wholly to disarm prejudice, and when he took the murdered president's

place the whole people were in a state of tense and anxious expectancy, of which, doubtless, he was most painfully conscious. All fears, however, were speedily and happily dispelled. The new president's inaugural was explicit, judicious, and reassuring, and his purpose not to administer his high office in the spirit of former faction, although by it he lost some friendships, did much toward healing the dissensions within the dominant party. His conservative administration of the government commanded universal confidence, preserved public order and promoted business activity. If his conduct of affairs be criticised as lacking aggressiveness, it may confidently be replied that aggressiveness would have been unfortunate, if not disastrous. Rarely has there been a time when an indiscreet president could have wrought more mischief. It was not a time for showy exploits or brilliant experimentation. Above all else, the people needed rest from the strain and excitement into which the assassination of their president had plunged them. The course chosen by President Arthur was the wisest and most desirable that was possible. If apparently negative in itself, it was positive, far-reaching, and most salutary in its results. The service which at this crisis in public affairs he thus rendered to the country must be accounted the greatest of his personal achievements, and the most important result of his administration. As such, it should be placed in its true light before the reader of the future; and in this spirit, for the purpose of historical accuracy only, it is here given the prominence it deserves. His administration, considered as a whole, was responsive to every national demand, and stands in all its departments substantially without assault or criticism.

The ex-president died suddenly, of apoplexy, at his residence, No. 123 Lexington avenue, New York, Thursday morning, 18 Nov., 1886. The funeral services were held on the following Monday, at the Church of the Heavenly Rest.\* President Cleveland and his cabinet, Chief-Justice Waite, ex-President

---

\* Arthur was an Episcopalian, as were Washington, Madison, Monroe, William Henry Harrison, Tyler, and Taylor; Buchanan, Lincoln, Johnson, Cleveland, and Benjamin Harrison, Presbyterians; Polk, Grant, and Hayes, Methodists; John Adams and his son, and Fillmore, Unitarians; Jefferson was accused of being an atheist; Van Buren, Dutch Reformed; and Garfield was a preacher of the Church of the Disciples.—EDITOR.

Hayes, James G. Blaine, Gens. Sherman, Sheridan, and Schofield, and the surviving members of President Arthur's cabinet, were present. On the same day a special train conveyed his remains to Albany, N. Y., where they were placed by the side of his wife in the family burial place in Rural cemetery. In June, 1889, a monument was erected over his grave that is represented in the vignette on a previous page. It is a polished granite sarcophagus, and on one side stands a beautiful heroic bronze figure of Sorrow.


MARY ARTHUR MCELROY, born in Greenwich, Washington co., N. Y., in 1842. She is the youngest child of the Rev. William Arthur and the sister of Chester A. Arthur. Her education was completed in Troy, at the seminary of which Mrs. Emma Willard was principal. In 1861 she married John E. McElroy, of Albany, and since that event she has resided in that city. During the administration of her brother she made her home in Washington in the winter season, and dispensed the hospitalities of the White House with rare social tact, the place being one for which she was peculiarly fitted by her personal character and previous associations.



*Mary A. McElroy.*

## GROVER CLEVELAND.


GROVER CLEVELAND, twenty-second and twenty-fourth president of the United States, was born in Caldwell, Essex co., N. J., 18 March, 1837. On the paternal side he is of English origin. Moses Cleveland emigrated from Ipswich, county of Suffolk, England, in 1635, and settled at Woburn, Mass., where he died in 1701. His grandson was Aaron, whose son, Aaron, was great-great-grandfather of Grover. The second Aaron's grandson, William, was a silversmith and watchmaker at Norwich, Conn. His son, Richard Falley Cleveland, was graduated at Yale in 1824, was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry in 1829, and in the same year married Anne Neal, daughter of a Baltimore merchant of Irish birth. These two were the parents of Grover Cleveland. The Presbyterian parsonage at Caldwell, where Mr. Cleveland was born, was first occupied by the Rev. Stephen Grover, in whose honor the boy was named; but the first name was early dropped, and he has been known as Grover Cleveland. When he was four years old his father accepted a call to Fayetteville, near Syracuse, N. Y., where the son had an academy schooling, and afterward was a clerk in a country store. The removal of the family to Clinton, Oneida co., gave Grover additional educational advantages in the academy there. In his seventeenth year he became a clerk and an assistant teacher in the New York institution for the blind in New York city, in which his elder brother, William, an alumnus of Hamilton college, now a Presbyterian clergyman at Forest Port, N. Y., was then a teacher. In 1855 Grover left Holland Patent, in Oneida co., where his mother then resided, to go to the west in search of employment. On his way he stopped at Black Rock, now a part of Buffalo, where his uncle, Lewis F. Allen, induced him to remain and aid him in the compilation of a volume of the "American Herd-Book," re-



H. B. Hall, Jr.

*Amos Chittenden*

D. Appleton & Co.



ceiving for six weeks' service \$60. He afterward assisted in the preparation of several other volumes of this work, and the preface to the fifth volume (1861) acknowledges his services. In August, 1855, he secured a place as clerk and copyist for the law firm of Rogers, Bowen & Rogers, in Buffalo, began to read Blackstone, and in the autumn of that year was receiving four dollars a week for his work. He was admitted to the bar in 1859, but for three years longer he remained with the firm that first employed him, acting as managing clerk at a salary of \$600, soon advanced to \$1,000, a part of which he devoted to the support of his widowed mother, who died in 1882. He was appointed assistant district attorney of Erie co., 1 Jan., 1863, and held the office for three years. At this time strenuous efforts were being made to bring the civil war to a close. Two of Cleveland's brothers were in the army, and his mother and sisters were dependent largely upon him for support. Unable to enlist, he borrowed money to send a substitute, and it was not till long after the war that he was able to repay the loan. In 1865, at the age of twenty-eight, he was the democratic candidate for district attorney, but was defeated by the republican candidate, his intimate friend, Lyman K. Bass. He then became a law partner of Isaac V. Vanderpool, and in 1869 became a member of the firm of Lanning, Cleveland & Folsom. He continued a successful practice till 1870, when he was elected sheriff of Erie county. At the expiration of his three-years' term he formed a law partnership with his personal friend and political antagonist, Lyman K. Bass, the firm being Bass, Cleveland & Bissell, and, after the forced retirement from failing health of Mr. Bass, Cleveland & Bissell. The firm was prosperous, and Cleveland attained high rank as a lawyer, noted for the simplicity and directness of his logic and expression and thorough mastery of his cases.

In the autumn of 1881 he was nominated democratic candidate for mayor of Buffalo, and was elected by a majority of 3,530, the largest ever given to a candidate in that city. In the same election the republican state ticket was carried in Buffalo by an average majority of over 1,600; but Cleveland had a partial republican, independent, and "reform" movement support. He entered upon the office, 1 Jan., 1882. He soon became known as the "veto mayor," using that prerogative fearlessly in checking unwise, illegal, or extravagant expendi-

ture of the public money, and enforcing strict compliance with the requirements of the state constitution and the city charter. By vetoing extravagant appropriations he saved the city nearly \$1,000,000 in the first six months of his administration. He opposed giving \$500 of the tax-payers' money to the Firemen's benevolent society, on the ground that such appropriation was not permissible under the terms of the state constitution and the charter of the city. He vetoed a resolution diverting \$500 from the Fourth-of-July appropriation to the observance of Memorial day for the same reason, and immediately subscribed one tenth of the sum wanted for the purpose. His admirable, impartial, and courageous administration won tributes to his integrity and ability from the press and the people irrespective of party.

On the second day of the democratic state convention at Syracuse, 22 Sept., 1882, on the third ballot, by a vote of 211 out of 382, Grover Cleveland was nominated for governor, in opposition to Charles J. Folger, then secretary of the U. S. treasury, nominated for the same office three days before by the republican state convention at Saratoga. In his letter accepting this nomination Mr. Cleveland wrote: "Public officers are the servants and agents of the people, to execute the laws which the people have made, and within the limits of a constitution which they have established. . . . We may, I think, reduce to quite simple elements the duty which public servants owe, by constantly bearing in mind that they are put in place to protect the rights of the people, to answer their needs as they arise, and to expend for their benefit the money drawn from them by taxation."

In the canvass that followed, Cleveland had the advantage of a united democratic party, and in addition the support of the entire independent press of the state. The election in November was the most remarkable in the political annals of New York. Both gubernatorial candidates were men of character and of unimpeachable public record. Judge Folger had honorably filled high state and federal offices. But there was a wide-spread disaffection in the republican ranks largely due to the belief that the nomination of Folger (nowise obnoxious in itself) was accomplished by means of improper and fraudulent practices in the nominating convention and by the interference of the federal administration. What were called the




"half-breeds" largely stayed away from the polls, and in a total vote of 918,894 Cleveland received a plurality of 192,854 over Folger, and a majority over all, including greenback, prohibition, and scattering, of 151,742. He entered upon his office 1 Jan., 1883, in the words of his inaugural address, "fully appreciating his relations to the people, and determined to serve them faithfully and well." With very limited private means, Gov. Cleveland lived upon and within his official salary, simply and unostentatiously, keeping no carriage, and daily walking to and from his duties at the capitol.

Among the salient acts of his administration were his approval of a bill to submit to the people a proposition to abolish contract labor in the prisons, which they adopted by an overwhelming majority; his veto of a bill that permitted wide latitude in the investments of savings banks; and the veto of a similar bill allowing like latitude in the investment of securities of fire insurance companies. He vetoed a bill that was a bold effort to establish a monopoly by limiting the right to construct certain street railways to companies heretofore organized, to the exclusion of such as should hereafter obtain the consent of property-owners and local authorities. His much-criticised veto of the "five-cent-fare" bill, which proposed to reduce the rates of fare on the elevated roads in New York city from ten cents to five cents for all hours in the day, was simply and solely because he considered the enactment illegal and a breach of the plighted faith of the state. The general railroad law of 1850 provides for an examination by state officers into the earnings of railroads before the rates of fare can be reduced, and as this imperative condition had not been complied with previous to the passage of the bill, he vetoed it. He vetoed the Buffalo fire department bill because he believed its provisions would prevent the "economical and efficient administration of an important department in a large city," and subject it to partisan and personal influences. In the second year of his administration he approved the bill enacting important reforms in the appointment and administration of certain local offices in New York city. His state administration was only an expansion of the fundamental principles that controlled his official action while mayor of Buffalo. Its integrity, ability, and success made him a prominent candidate for president.

The democratic national convention met at Chicago, 8 July,

1884. Three days were devoted to organization, platform, and speeches in favor of candidates. In the evening of 10 July a vote was taken, in which, out of 820 votes, Grover Cleveland received 392. A two third vote (557) was necessary to a nomination. On the following morning, in the first ballot, Cleveland received 683 votes, and, on motion of Thomas A. Hendricks (subsequently nominated for the vice-presidency), the vote was made unanimous. He was officially notified of his nomination by the convention committee at Albany, 29 July, and made a modest response, promising soon to signify



in a more formal manner his acceptance of the nomination, which he did by letter on 18 Aug., 1884. In it he said, among other things:

“When an election to office shall be the selection by the voters of one of their number

to assume for a time a public trust, instead of his dedication to the profession of politics; when the holders of the ballot, quickened by a sense of duty, shall avenge truth betrayed and pledges broken, and when the suffrage shall be altogether free and uncorrupted, the full realization of a government by the people will be at hand. And of the means to this end, not one would, in my judgment, be more effective than an amendment to the constitution disqualifying the president from re-election. . . .

“A true American sentiment recognizes the dignity of labor, and the fact that honor lies in honest toil. Contented labor is an element of national prosperity. Ability to work constitutes the capital and the wage of labor, the income of a vast number of our population, and this interest should be jealously protected. Our working-men are not asking unreasonable indulgence, but, as intelligent and manly citizens, they seek the same consideration which those demand who have other interests at stake. They should receive their full share of the care and attention of those who make and execute the laws, to the end that the wants and needs of the employers and the employed shall alike be subserved, and the prosperity of the

country, the common heritage of both, be advanced. As related to this subject, while we should not discourage the immigration of those who come to acknowledge allegiance to our government, and add to our citizen population, yet, as a means of protection to our working-men, a different rule should prevail concerning those who, if they come or are brought to our land, do not intend to become Americans, but will injuriously compete with those justly entitled to our field of labor. . . .

“In a free country the curtailment of the absolute rights of the individual should only be such as is essential to the peace and good order of the community. The limit between the proper subjects of governmental control, and those which can be more fittingly left to the moral sense and self-imposed restraint of the citizen, should be carefully kept in view. Thus, laws unnecessarily interfering with the habits and customs of any of our people which are not offensive to the moral sentiments of the civilized world, and which are consistent with good citizenship and the public welfare, are unwise and vexatious. The commerce of a nation to a great extent determines its supremacy. Cheap and easy transportation should therefore be liberally fostered. Within the limits of the constitution, the general government should so improve and protect its natural water-ways as will enable the producers of the country to reach a profitable market. . . . If I should be called to the chief magistracy of the nation by the suffrages of my fellow-citizens, I will assume the duties of that high office with a solemn determination to dedicate every effort to the country's good, and with a humble reliance upon the favor and support of the Supreme Being, who I believe will always bless honest human endeavor in the conscientious discharge of public duty.”

The canvass that followed was more remarkable for the discussion of the personal characters and qualifications of the candidates than for the prominent presentation of political issues. In the election (4 Nov.) four candidates were in the field, viz. : Grover Cleveland, of New York, democratic ; James G. Blaine, of Maine, republican ; Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, labor and greenback ; John P. St. John, of Kansas, prohibition. The total popular vote was 10,067,610, divided as follows: Cleveland, 4,874,986; Blaine, 4,851,981; Butler, 175,370; St. John, 150,369; blank, defective, and scattering, 14,904. Of the 401 electoral votes, Cleveland received 219, and Blaine 182.

In December the executive committee of the National civil service reform league addressed a letter to President-elect Cleveland, commending to his care the interests of civil-service reform. In his reply, dated 25 Dec., he declared that "a practical reform in the civil service was demanded"; that to it he was pledged by his "conception of true democratic faith and public duty," as well as by his past utterances. He added: "There is a class of government positions which are not within the letter of the civil-service statute, but which are so disconnected with the policy of an administration that the removal therefrom of present incumbents, in my opinion, should not be made during the terms for which they were appointed, solely on partisan grounds, and for the purpose of putting in their places those who are in political accord with the appointing power. But many now holding such positions have forfeited all just claim to retention, because they have used their places for party purposes in disregard of their duty to the people, and because, instead of being decent public servants, they have proved themselves offensive partisans, and unscrupulous manipulators of local party management. The lessons of the past should be unlearned, and such officials, as well as their successors, should be taught that efficiency, fitness, and devotion to public duty are the conditions of their continuance in public place, and that the quiet and unobtrusive exercise of individual political rights is the reasonable measure of their party service. . . . Selections for office not embraced within the civil-service rules will be based upon sufficient inquiry as to fitness, instituted by those charged with that duty, rather than upon persistent importunity or self-solicited recommendations on behalf of candidates for appointment."

When the New York legislature assembled, 6 Jan., 1885, Mr. Cleveland resigned the governorship of the state. On 27 Feb. was published a letter of the president-elect in answer to one signed by several members of Congress, in which he indicated his opposition to an increased coinage of silver, and suggested a suspension of the purchase and coinage of that metal as a measure of safety, in order to prevent a financial crisis and the ultimate expulsion of gold by silver. His inaugural address was written during the ten days previous to his setting out for Washington. On 4 March he went to the capital in company with President Arthur, and after the usual prelimi-



816 MADISON AVENUE.

March 7. 1890

Dear Madam:

Mr. Cleveland is now  
absent from the City and will  
not return in time to avail  
himself of your kind invitation  
for the afternoon of March 11<sup>th</sup>.

Yours very truly  
Ernest Cleveland

naries had been completed he delivered his inaugural address from the eastern steps of the capitol, in the presence of a vast concourse. At its conclusion the oath of office was administered by Chief-Justice Waite. He then reviewed from the White House the inaugural parade, a procession numbering more than 100,000 men. In the address he urged the people of all parties to lay aside political animosities in order to sustain the government. He declared his approval of the Monroe doctrine as a guide in foreign relations, of strict economy in the administration of the finances, of the protection of the Indians and their elevation to citizenship, of the security of the freedmen in their rights, and of the laws against Mormon polygamy and the importation of a servile class of foreign laborers. In respect to appointments to office he said that the people demand the application of business principles to public affairs, and also that the people have a right to protection from the incompetency of public employés, who hold their places solely as a reward for partisan service, and those who worthily seek public employment have a right to insist that merit and competency shall be recognized, instead of party subserviency or the surrender of honest political belief. On the following day he sent to the senate the nominations for his cabinet officers as follows: Secretary of state, Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware; secretary of the treasury, Daniel Manning, of New York; secretary of war, William C. Endicott, of Massachusetts; secretary of the navy, William C. Whitney, of New York; postmaster-general, William F. Vilas, of Wisconsin; attorney-general, Augustus H. Garland, of Arkansas; secretary of the interior, Lucius Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi. The nominations were promptly confirmed. On 12 March, 1885, President Cleveland withdrew from the senate, which met in extra session to take action on appointments and other business connected with the new administration, the Spanish reciprocity and Nicaragua canal treaties, in order that they might be considered by the new executive. On 13 March he issued a proclamation announcing the intention of the government to remove from the Oklahoma country, in Indian territory, the white intruders who sought to settle there, which was done shortly afterward by a detachment of soldiers. By his refusal at once to remove certain officials for the purpose of putting in their place members of his own party he came into conflict with many influen-

tial men, who advocated the speedy removal of republican office-holders and the appointment of democrats, in order to strengthen the party as a political organization. At the same time the republicans and some of the civil-service reformers complained of other appointments as not being in accord with the professions of the president. "Offensive partisanship" was declared by the president to be a ground for removal, and numerous republican functionaries were displaced under that rule, while the term became a common phrase in political nomenclature. When disturbances threatened to break out between the Cheyennes and the Arapahoes in Indian territory, Gen. Sheridan, at the request of the president, visited that country in order to study the cause of the troubles. He reported that the threatened outbreak was the result of the occupation of Indian lands by cattle-owners who leased vast areas from the Indians at a merely nominal rental. The legal officers of the government decided that these leases were contrary to law and invalid. The president thereupon issued a proclamation warning all cattle companies and ranchmen to remove their herds from Indian territory within forty days, and enforced the order, notwithstanding their strenuous objection.

In his message at the opening of the first session of the 49th congress on 8 Dec., 1885, President Cleveland recommended increased appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service, the abolition of duties on works of art, the reduction of the tariff on necessaries of life, the suspension of compulsory silver coinage, the improvement of the navy, the appointment of six general Indian commissioners, reform in the laws under which titles to the public lands are required from the government, more stringent laws for the suppression of polygamy in Utah, an act to prohibit the immigration of Mormons, the extension of the principle of civil-service reform, and an increase in the salaries of the commissioners, and the passage of a law to determine the order of presidential succession in the event of a vacancy. The senate, sitting in secret session for the consideration of the president's appointments, called for the papers on file in the departments relating to the causes for which certain officers had been removed. Upon the refusal of the president to submit the documents to their inspection, a dispute ensued, and threats were uttered by republican senators that no appointments should be confirmed unless their right to inspect



papers on the official files was conceded. On 1 March, 1886, he sent a long message to the senate, in which he took the ground that under the constitution the right of removal or suspension from office lay entirely within the power and discretion of the president; that sections of the tenure-of-office act requiring him to report to the senate reasons for suspending officers had been repealed; and that the papers that the senate demanded to see were not official, but were of a personal and private nature. Eventually most of the appointments of the president were ratified. During the first fiscal year of his administration the proportion of postmasters throughout the country removed or suspended was but little larger than had often followed a change of administration in the same political party.

In his second annual message he called the attention of congress to the large excess of the revenues of the country beyond the needs of government, and urged such a reduction as would release to the people the increasing and unnecessary surplus of national income, by such an amendment of the revenue laws as would cheapen the price of the necessaries of life and give freer entrance to such imported materials as could be manufactured by American labor into marketable commodities. He recommended the erection of coast defences on land, and the construction of modern ships of war for the navy; argued for the civilization of the Indians by the dissolution of tribal relations, the settlement of their reservations in severalty, and the correction of abuses in the disposition of the public lands. He urged the adoption of liberal general pension laws to meet all possible cases, and protested against special legislation for a favored few, as an injustice to the many who were equally deserving, and said:

“The American people, with a patriotic and grateful regard for our ex-soldiers—too broad and too sacred to be monopolized by any special advocates—are not only willing but anxious that equal and exact justice should be done to all honest claimants for pensions. In their sight the friendless and destitute soldier, dependent on public charity, if otherwise entitled, has precisely the same right to share in the provision made for those who fought their country’s battles as those better able, through friends and influence, to push their claims. Every pension that is granted under our present plan upon any other grounds than

actual service and injury or disease incurred in such service, and every instance of the many in which pensions are increased on other grounds than the merits of the claim, work an injustice to the brave and crippled but poor and friendless soldier, who is entirely neglected, or who must be content with the smallest sum allowed under general laws."

He approved a bill to regulate the questions arising between the railroads and the people, and appointed an interstate commerce commission under its provisions. A number of bills providing for the erection of public buildings in various parts of the country were vetoed, on the ground that they were not required by the public business; and while he approved 186 private pension bills, he vetoed 42 for various reasons; some being covered by general laws, others were to his mind unworthy and fraudulent, and others were not so favorable to the claimant as the general laws already passed. A dependent pension bill, permitting a pension of \$12 per month to all soldiers and sailors who served in the war for the Union, upon the ground of service and present disability alone, whether incurred in the service or since, was vetoed, on the ground that a sufficient time had not elapsed since the war to justify a general service pension; that its terms were too uncertain and yielding to insure its just and impartial execution; that the honest soldiers of the country would prefer not to be regarded as objects of charity, as was proposed, and that its enactment would put a wholly uncalled-for and enormous annual burden upon the country for very many years to come. The veto was sustained by congress. Vetoing an appropriation for the distribution of seeds to drought-stricken counties of Texas, he said:

"I can find no warrant for such an appropriation in the constitution; and I do not believe that the power and duty of the general government ought to be extended to the relief of individual suffering which is in no manner properly related to the public service or benefit. A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the government, the government should not support the people."

As he had done while governor, so now as president, Mr. Cleveland exercised the veto power with great freedom. This was particularly true during the session of congress which

ended 5 Aug., 1886, when of 987 bills which passed both houses he vetoed 115.

In October, 1886, accompanied by Mrs. Cleveland and several personal friends, the president made a tour of the west and south in response to invitations from those sections, which involved about 5,000 miles of railroad travel and occupied three weeks. He was enthusiastically received by the people, and made speeches at Indianapolis, St. Louis, Chicago, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Atlanta, and other cities. In December, 1887, departing from custom, he devoted his annual message to the presentation of a single subject, namely, the reduction of the tariff. He advocated a radical modification of the existing policy by the adoption of a law framed with a view to the ultimate establishment of the principles of free trade. The republicans immediately took up the issue thus presented, and the question at once became the predominant issue of the canvass. Cleveland was unanimously renominated by the national democratic convention in St. Louis on 5 June, 1888. The efforts of both parties were directed chiefly to the doubtful States



of Indiana, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Cleveland carried all the southern states, and in the north New Jersey and Connecticut, while of the doubtful states General Harrison received the votes of New York and Indiana. Of the electoral votes Harrison received 233, Cleveland 168. The popular vote for Cleveland numbered 5,540,329, that for Harrison 5,439,853.

At the close of his administration, on 4 March, 1889, Mr. Cleveland retired to New York city, where he re-entered upon the practice of his profession. As a private citizen he continued to exert a powerful influence upon his party and public sentiment by frequent expression of his opinions on important public questions. These expressions were always based upon an implicit belief that the integrity and justice of the people would not tolerate demagogism, but demanded of any leader the truth fearlessly spoken. Conscious of a strong public demand that he should again be the democratic candidate for president, and of the personal consequence to him of his every word and act, he constantly stated his views with the courage and candor

which had characterized his whole public life. A notable instance of this was his famous letter of 10 Feb., 1891, addressed to a public meeting in New York city, which had been called to protest against a bill then pending in congress for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. There was grave danger that the bill would be enacted. Behind it was a strong public sentiment, including probably a majority in congress of his own party. His opposition insured, it was believed, the failure of the bill, but also of all chance for his renomination. Yet, impelled by a sense of public duty which would not consider personal consequences, he declared his belief "that the greatest peril would be invited by the adoption of the scheme"; and he denounced "the dangerous and reckless experiment of free, unlimited, and independent silver coinage." The bill was defeated. Notwithstanding the opposition and predictions of many leaders of his party, the demand for his renomination steadily increased. The great cause of tariff reform, which as president he had championed and which had carried the country in the elections of 1890, was evidently to be the principal issue in the campaign of 1892, and he was the natural and logical leader. At the national democratic convention which met in Chicago 22 June, 1892, he was nominated on the first ballot, receiving more than two thirds of the votes of the convention, though bitterly and unanimously opposed by the delegation from his own state. In his speech of acceptance delivered to a great audience in Madison Square Garden, New York, and later in his formal letter of acceptance of 26 Sept., 1892, he emphasized the need of tariff reform, and made it the leading issue between the parties. In his letter he said of tariff taxation: "Such taxes, representing a diminution of the property rights of the people, are only justifiable when laid and collected for the purpose of maintaining our government, and furnishing the means for the accomplishment of its legitimate purposes and functions. . . . Opposed to this theory, the dogma is now boldly presented that tariff taxation is justifiable for the express purpose and intent of thereby promoting especial interests and enterprises. . . . The struggle for unearned advantage at the doors of the government tramples on the rights of those who patiently rely upon assurances of American equality. Every governmental concession to clamorous favorites invites corruption in political affairs by encouraging the expenditure of

money to debauch suffrage in support of a policy directly favorable to private and selfish gain. This in the end must strangle patriotism and weaken popular confidence in the rectitude of republican institutions. . . .

“Tariff reform is still our purpose. Though we oppose the theory that tariff laws may be passed having for their object the granting of discriminating and unfair governmental aid to private ventures, we wage no exterminating war against any American interests. We believe a readjustment can be accomplished, in accordance with the principles we profess, without disaster or demolition. We believe that the advantages of freer raw material should be accorded to our manufacturers, and we contemplate a fair and careful distribution of necessary tariff burdens, rather than the precipitation of free trade.”

He denounced “the attempt of the opponents of democracy to interfere with and control the suffrage of the states through federal agencies” as “a design, which no explanation can mitigate, to reverse the fundamental and safe relations between the people and their government.” He advocated “sound and honest money,” declaring: “Whatever may be the form of the people’s currency, national or state—whether gold, silver, or paper—it should be so regulated and guarded by governmental action, or by wise and careful laws, that no one can be deluded as to the certainty and stability of its value. Every dollar put into the hands of the people should be of the same intrinsic value or purchasing power. With this condition absolutely guaranteed, both gold and silver can safely be utilized upon equal terms in the adjustment of our currency.” He also urged “an honest adherence to the letter and spirit of civil service reform,” “liberal consideration for our worthy veteran soldiers and for the families of those who have died,” but insisting that “our pension roll should be a roll of honor, uncontaminated by ill desert and unvitiated by demagogic use.”

After a most vigorous campaign and a thorough discussion of important principles and measures, the democratic party won an overwhelming victory, reversing the electoral vote of 1888 and largely increasing its popular plurality, and carrying both the senate and house of representatives. The ticket carried twenty-three states, including the doubtful states of

New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Indiana, and for the first time in years in a presidential contest Illinois and Wisconsin. The popular vote was 5,553,142 for Cleveland, 5,186,931 for Harrison, 1,030,128 for Weaver, of "The People's Party," and 268,361 for Bidwell, the prohibitionist. In the electoral college Mr. Cleveland received 276 votes, General Harrison 145, and Mr. Weaver 23. On 4 March, 1893, Mr. Cleveland was for a second time inaugurated president, being the first instance in this country of a president re-elected after an interim. In the midst of a blustering snowstorm he delivered, uncovered, his inaugural address from the eastern steps of the capitol and took the oath of office administered by Chief-Justice Fuller. He immediately nominated, and the senate promptly confirmed, as his cabinet Walter Q. Gresham, of Indiana, secretary of state; John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky, secretary of the treasury; Daniel S. Lamont, of New York, secretary of war; Richard Olney, of Massachusetts, attorney-general; Wilson S. Bissell, of New York, postmaster-general; Hilary A. Herbert, of Alabama, secretary of the navy; Hoke Smith, of Georgia, secretary of the interior; and J. Sterling Morton, of Nebraska, secretary of agriculture.

Grave and difficult questions at once confronted his administration. A treaty for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the territory of the United States had, on 14 Feb., 1893, been concluded between President Harrison and commissioners representing a provisional government of the islands, and had been transmitted to the senate on the day following, but had not yet been acted upon. The provisional government had been established on 17 Jan., 1893, by the overthrow of the constitutional ruler of the islands. Serious doubts existed as to the authority and validity of the provisional government and as to the part taken by our government, through our minister and troops, in aiding its establishment. President Harrison, in his message to the senate submitting the treaty, declared that "the overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this government." On the other hand, the queen and her ministers filed with the treaty a protest, asserting that when she yielded to the provisional government she had yielded to the superior force of the United States. In order that this vital question of fact might be impartially investigated and determined, President

Cleveland at once withdrew the treaty from the senate and despatched to the islands Hon. James H. Blount, of Georgia, as a special commissioner to make full examination and report.

On 18 Dec., 1893, in a special message to congress, he transmitted the report of the commissioner with all the evidence and papers connected with the case. In his message, after reviewing all the facts and confirming the finding of the commissioner, he declared that he believed "that a candid and thorough examination of the facts will force the conviction that the provisional government owes its existence to an armed invasion by the United States. . . . The lawful government of Hawaii was overthrown, without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a shot, by a process every step of which, it may safely be asserted, is directly traceable to and dependent for its success upon the agency of the United States acting through its diplomatic and naval representatives."

Referring to the principles which should govern the case, he said: "I suppose that right and justice should determine the path to be followed in treating this subject. If national honesty is to be disregarded and a desire for territorial extension or dissatisfaction with a form of government not our own ought to regulate our conduct, I have entirely misapprehended the mission and character of our government and the behavior which the conscience of our people demands of their public servants. . . .

"The law of nations is founded upon reason and justice, and the rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized state are equally applicable as between enlightened nations. The considerations that international law is without a court for its enforcement, and that obedience to its commands practically depends upon good faith instead of upon the mandate of a superior tribunal, only give additional sanction to the law itself, and brand any deliberate infraction of it not merely as a wrong but as a disgrace. A man of true honor protects the unwritten word which binds his conscience more scrupulously, if possible, than he does the bond, a breach of which subjects him to legal liabilities; and the United States, in aiming to maintain itself as one of the most enlightened of nations, would do its citizens gross injustice if it applied to its international relations any other than a high standard of honor and morality. On

that ground the United States cannot properly be put in the position of countenancing a wrong after its commission any more than in that of consenting to it in advance. On that ground it can not allow itself to refuse to redress an injury inflicted through an abuse of power by officers clothed with its authority and wearing its uniform; and on the same ground, if a feeble but friendly state is in danger of being robbed of its independence and its sovereignty by a misuse of the name and power of the United States, the United States cannot fail to vindicate its honor and its sense of justice by an earnest effort to make all possible reparation. . . .

“These principles apply to the present case with irresistible force when the special conditions of the queen’s surrender of her sovereignty are recalled. She surrendered not to the provisional government, but to the United States. She surrendered not absolutely and permanently, but temporarily and conditionally until such time as the facts could be considered by the United States. . . .”

He concluded by informing congress that he should not again submit the treaty of annexation to the senate; that he had instructed our minister “to advise the queen and her supporters of his desire to aid in the restoration of the status existing before the lawless landing of the United States forces at Honolulu on 16 Jan. last, if such restoration could be effected upon terms providing for clemency as well as justice to all parties concerned”; and he commended the subject “to the extended powers and wide discretion of congress” for a solution of the problem “consistent with American honor, integrity, and morality.”

On 8 Aug., 1893, the president convened congress in special session because, as stated in his message of that date, of “the existence of an alarming and extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people,” and to the end that “through a wise and patriotic exercise of the legislative duty . . . present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.” The country was in the midst of a financial crisis, largely due, it was believed, to past unsound legislation, under which the gold reserve had been diminishing, silver accumulating, and expenditures exceeding revenue. Confidence had become impaired and credit shaken. Business interests and the conservative sentiment of



the country demanded the repeal of the provisions of the act of 14 July, 1890 (popularly known as the Sherman act), which required the monthly purchase of four and one half million ounces of silver and the issue of treasury notes in payment therefor. Such repeal the president strongly recommended, declaring that "our unfortunate financial plight is not the result of untoward events, nor of conditions related to our natural resources; nor is it traceable to any of the afflictions which frequently check natural growth and prosperity," but is "principally chargeable to congressional legislation touching the purchase and coinage of silver by the general government." Reviewing such legislation, he said: "The knowledge in business circles among our own people that our government cannot make its fiat equivalent to intrinsic value, nor keep inferior money on a parity with superior money by its own independent efforts, has resulted in such a lack of confidence at home in the stability of currency values that capital refuses its aid to new enterprises, while millions are actually withdrawn from the channels of trade and commerce, to become idle and unproductive in the hands of timid owners. Foreign investors, equally alert, not only decline to purchase American securities, but make haste to sacrifice those which they already have." He insisted that "the people of the United States are entitled to a sound and stable currency, and to money recognized as such on every exchange and in every market of the world. Their government has no right to injure them by financial experiments opposed to the policy and practice of other civilized states, nor is it justified in permitting an exaggerated and unreasonable reliance on our national strength and ability to jeopardize the soundness of the people's money. This matter rises above the plane of party politics. It vitally concerns every business and calling, and enters every household in the land."

The house promptly, and by a large majority, repealed the obnoxious provisions. In the senate a strong and determined minority resisted the repeal, and, taking advantage of the unlimited debate there permitted, delayed action for many weeks. In the heat of the contest a compromise was practically agreed upon in the senate, which was defeated only by the firm opposition of the president. He insisted upon unconditional repeal, which was finally enacted 1 Nov., 1893.

Soon after, one of the suggested measures of compromise,

which provided among other things for the immediate coinage of so much of the silver bullion in the treasury as represented the seigniorage (declared to be \$55,156,681), was embodied in a bill which passed both houses of congress. This bill the president vetoed as "ill-advised and dangerous." He said: "I believe that if the bill under consideration should become a law, it would be regarded as a retrogression from the financial intentions indicated by our recent repeal of the provision forcing silver bullion purchases; that it would weaken if it did not destroy returning faith and confidence in our sound financial tendencies; and that as a consequence our progress to renewed business health would be unfortunately checked, and a return to our recent distressing plight seriously threatened." He added: "Sound finance does not commend a further infusion of silver into our currency at this time unaccompanied by further adequate provision for the maintenance in our treasury of a safe gold reserve."

At the first regular session of the fifty-third congress, opened 4 Dec., 1893, the question of tariff revision was at once considered. In his message of that date the president, after reviewing the work and needs of the various departments of government, dwelt with special emphasis on the necessity of immediately undertaking this important reform. "After a hard struggle," he said, "tariff reform is directly before us. Nothing so important claims our attention, and nothing so clearly presents itself as both an opportunity and a duty—an opportunity to deserve the gratitude of our fellow-citizens, and a duty imposed upon us by our oft-repeated professions and by the emphatic mandate of the people. After full discussion, our countrymen have spoken in favor of this reform, and they have confided the work of its accomplishment to the hands of those who are solemnly pledged to it.

"If there is anything in the theory of a representation in public places of the people and their desires; if public officers are really the servants of the people; and if political promises and professions have any binding force, our failure to give the relief so long awaited will be sheer recreancy. Nothing should intervene to distract our attention or disturb our effort until this reform is accomplished by wise and careful legislation.

"While we should stanchly adhere to the principle that only the necessity of revenue justifies the imposition of tariff

duties and other federal taxation, and that they should be limited by strict economy, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that conditions have grown up among us which in justice and fairness call for discriminating care in the distribution of such duties and taxation as the emergencies of our government actually demand.

“Manifestly, if we are to aid the people directly through tariff reform, one of its most obvious features should be a reduction in present tariff charges upon the necessaries of life. The benefits of such a reduction would be palpable and substantial, seen and felt by thousands who would be better fed and better clothed and better sheltered. These gifts should be the willing benefactions of a government whose highest function is the promotion of the welfare of the people.

“Not less closely related to our people’s prosperity and well-being is the removal of restrictions upon the importation of the raw materials necessary to our manufactures. The world should be open to our national ingenuity and enterprise. This cannot be while federal legislation, through the imposition of high tariff, forbids to American manufacturers as cheap materials as those used by their competitors. It is quite obvious that the enhancement of the price of our manufactured products resulting from this policy not only confines the market for these products within our own borders, to the direct disadvantage of our manufacturers, but also increases their cost to our citizens.”

A tariff bill substantially following the lines suggested by the president and providing among other things for free wool, coal, iron ore, and lumber was framed by the committee on ways and means, and, with the addition of free sugar and an income tax, passed the house on 1 Feb., 1894. In the senate the bill was amended in many items, and generally in the direction of higher duties. After five months of prolonged discussion the bill, as amended, passed the senate by a small majority, all the democrats voting for it except Senator Hill, of New York. It was then referred to a conference committee of both houses to adjust the differences between them. A long and determined contest was there waged, principally over the duties upon coal, iron ore, and sugar. It was understood that a small group of democratic senators had, contrary to the express wishes and pledges of their party and by threats of de-

feating the bill, forced higher duties in important schedules. While the bill was pending before the conference committee the president, in a letter to Mr. Wilson, the chairman of the ways and means committee, which later was read to the house, strongly urged adherence to the position which the house had taken. He said: "Every true democrat and every sincere tariff reformer knows that this bill in its present form and as it will be submitted to the conference falls short of the consummation for which we have long labored, for which we have suffered defeat without discouragement, which, in its anticipation, gave us a rallying cry in our day of triumph, and which, in its promise of accomplishment, is so interwoven with democratic pledges and democratic success that our abandonment of the cause or the principles upon which it rests means party perfidy and party dishonor.

"One topic will be submitted to the conference which embodies democratic principle so directly that it can not be compromised. We have in our platforms and in every possible way declared in favor of the free importation of free raw materials. We have again and again promised that this should be accorded to our people and our manufacturers as soon as the democratic party was invested with the power to determine the tariff policy of the country. The party now has that power. We are as certain to-day as we have ever been of the great benefit that would accrue to the country from the inauguration of this policy, and nothing has occurred to release us from our obligation to secure this advantage to our people.

"It must be admitted that no tariff measure can accord with democratic principles and promises, or bear a genuine democratic badge, that does not provide for free raw material. Under the circumstances it may well excite our wonder that democrats are willing to depart from this the most democratic of all tariff principles, and that the inconsistent absurdity of such a proposed departure should be emphasized by the suggestion that the wool of the farmer be put on the free list and the protection of tariff taxation be placed around the iron ore and coal of corporations and capitalists."

The house, however, finally receded from its position in the belief that any other course would defeat or long delay any reduction of the tariff, and that the business interests of the coun-

try demanded an end to the conflict. The bill, as amended, passed both houses, and at midnight of 27 Aug., 1894, became a law without the signature of the president. In a published letter of the same date he gave his reasons for withholding his approval. While he believed the bill was a vast improvement over existing conditions, and would certainly lighten many tariff burdens which rested heavily on the people, he said: "I take my place with the rank and file of the democratic party who believe in tariff reform and well know what it is, who refuse to accept the results embodied in this bill as the close of the war, who are not blinded to the fact that the livery of democratic tariff reform has been stolen and worn in the service of republican protection, and who have marked the places where the deadly blight of treason has blasted the councils of the brave in their hour of might. The trusts and combinations—the communism of self—whose machinations have prevented us from reaching the success we deserved, should not be forgotten nor forgiven."

In July, 1894, serious labor troubles arose in Illinois and other states of the west, beginning with a strike of the employés of the Pullman Palace Car Company, and spreading over many of the railroads centering in Chicago. Travel was interrupted, the mails delayed, and interstate commerce obstructed. So widespread became the trouble, involving constant acts of violence and lawlessness, and so grave was the crisis, that military force was necessary, especially in Chicago, to preserve the peace, enforce the laws, and protect property. The president, with commendable firmness and promptness, fully met the emergency. Acting under authority vested in him by law, he ordered a large force of United States troops to Chicago to remove obstructions to the mails and interstate commerce, and to enforce the laws of the United States and the process of the federal courts; and on 8 and 9 July issued proclamations commanding the dispersion of all unlawful assemblages within the disturbed states. The governor of Illinois objected to the presence of the troops without his sanction or request. In answer to his protest the president telegraphed: "Federal troops were sent to Chicago in strict accordance with the constitution and laws of the United States upon the demand of the post-office department that obstruction of the mails should be removed, and upon the representations of

the judicial officers of the United States that process of the federal courts could not be executed through the ordinary means, and upon abundant proof that conspiracies existed against commerce between the states.

“To meet these conditions, which are clearly within the province of federal authority, the presence of federal troops in the city of Chicago was deemed not only proper, but necessary, and there has been no intention of thereby interfering with the plain duty of the local authorities to preserve the peace of the city.”

To a further protest and argument of the governor the president replied: “While I am still persuaded that I have transcended neither my authority nor duty in the emergency that confronts us, it seems to me that in this hour of danger and public distress discussion may well give way to active effort on the part of the authorities to restore obedience to the law and to protect life and property.”

The decisive action of the president restored order, ended the strike, and received the commendation of both houses of congress and of the people generally. The president then appointed a commission to investigate the causes of the strike. It is interesting to note in this connection that by special message to congress of 22 April, 1886, President Cleveland had strongly recommended legislation which should provide for the settlement by arbitration of controversies of this character.

Mr. Cleveland is the first of our chief magistrates who served a second term without being elected as his own successor.\* He is as distinguished for forcible speech as for

---

\* Except Grover Cleveland, no president has been re-elected unless he was a military man, or held a chief executive office during a war period. Washington was a soldier of the Revolution; Jefferson, governor of Virginia during that war; Madison, president during the second war with Great Britain; Monroe, a Revolutionary officer; Jackson, the hero of the War of 1812; Lincoln, a soldier and president during the war of the rebellion; and Grant, a soldier of the Mexican and civil wars.

Referring to the post-official career of the presidents, it appears that six of the twenty-three—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Johnson, and Hayes—became planters or farmers upon retiring from public life; that five—Van Buren, Fillmore, Tyler, Grant, and Cleveland—openly endeavored to obtain another term; that five—Van Buren, Polk, Fillmore, Pierce, and Grant—traveled extensively at the close of their official career; and that three—John Adams, Pierce, and Buchanan—sooner or later became recluses.—EDITOR.

forcible action. His many addresses, both while in and out of office, are marked by clearness of thought and directness of expression, which, with his courage and ability, have always appealed to the best sentiments of the people, and have formed and led a healthy public opinion. Several campaign lives of Mr. Cleveland appeared during his three presidential contests.

President Cleveland married, in the White House (see illustration, page 472), on 2 June, 1886, FRANCES FOLSOM, daughter of his deceased friend and partner, Oscar Folsom, of the Buffalo bar. Except the wife of Madison, Mrs. Cleveland is the youngest of the many mistresses of the White House, having been born in Buffalo, N. Y., in 1864. She is also the first wife of a president married in the White House, and the first to give birth to a child there, their second daughter having been born in the executive mansion in 1893.—His youngest sister, ROSE ELIZABETH, born in Fayetteville, N. Y., in 1846,



*Frances Cleveland.*

removed in 1853 to Holland Patent, N. Y., where her father was settled as pastor of the Presbyterian church, and where he died the same year. She was educated at Houghton seminary, became a teacher in that school, and later assumed charge of the Collegiate institute in Lafayette, Ind. She taught for a time in a private school in Pennsylvania, and then prepared a course of historical lectures, which she delivered before the students of Houghton seminary and in other schools. When not employed in this manner, she devoted herself to her aged mother in the homestead at Holland Patent, N. Y., until her mother's death in 1882. On the inauguration of the president she became the mistress of the White House, and after her brother's marriage she returned to Holland Patent, subsequently for a time connecting herself as part owner and instructor in an established institution in New York city. Miss Cleveland has published a volume of lectures and essays under the title "George Eliot's Poetry, and other Studies" (New York, 1885), and "The Long Run," a novel (1886).

## BENJAMIN HARRISON.

BENJAMIN HARRISON, twenty-third president of the United States, born in North Bend, Ohio, 20 Aug., 1833. He is the third son of John Scott Harrison (who was a son of President Harrison). It has been stated that his lineage can be traced to Harrison the regicide. He came directly from the Virginia Harrisons, who were distinguished in the early history of that colony; his great-grandfather, Benjamin Harrison, was one of the seven Virginia delegates to the congress which made the Declaration of Independence.\* The Harrisons owned large landed estates on the bank of the Ohio near the mouth of the Big Miami. Benjamin assisted in the work on his father's farm, which contained about four hundred acres. The products of the farm were annually shipped in flat boats to New Orleans, and his father usually went with the cargo, the crew being composed of men from the neighborhood who were familiar with the perils of transportation on the Mississippi river. His first studies were prosecuted in the log school-house, and at the age of fifteen he went to Farmers (now Belmont) College, at College Hill, a suburb of Cincinnati. After a two years' stay there he became a student at Miami University, Oxford, where an acquaintance formed at College Hill ripened into a permanent attachment for Miss Caroline L. Scott, who afterward became his wife. The young lady had faith in his star, and did not hesitate to ally her fortunes with his. They were married while he was yet a law student and before he

---

\* The descent of Benjamin Harrison from Pocahontas, daughter of Powhatan, is outlined in a recent work by Wyndham Robinson, entitled "Pocahontas and her Descendants through her Marriage at Jamestown, Virginia, in April, 1614, with John Rolfe, Gentleman." It may also be mentioned that he is among the eight presidents who have been of Welsh descent—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, William Henry Harrison, James A. Garfield, and Benjamin Harrison.—EDITOR.





Engraved by J. H. Smith, Jr. N.Y.

*Benjamin Harrison*



had attained his majority. He graduated fourth in his class in 1852, Milton Saylor taking first honors and David Swing standing second. As a boy he distinguished himself as an off-hand debater in the Union Literary Society. From the first he showed an aptitude for thinking on his legs, and a gift of utterance which enabled him to express himself in apt words. At a town meeting, where an abolitionist abused Webster and Clay for the part they took in the Compromise measures of 1850, the citizens were amazed to see a slender, tow-headed boy of seventeen mount a bench and make a vigorous speech in vindication of the great statesmen. He studied law with Storer & Gwynne, of Cincinnati, and in 1853 married and was admitted to the bar. In 1854 he put up his sign as attorney at law in Indianapolis, where he has kept his residence ever since. It was not long before his ability became known. His first effort at the bar was in prosecuting a man charged with burglary. He received a few dollars by acting as crier for the United States Court, and was glad to take a five-dollar fee now and then for a case before a country justice, though one half of the fee was necessary to pay for the hire of a horse to take him to the place of trial. Whoever employed him could count on his doing his very best, whether the interests involved were small or great. Promptness and thoroughness are characteristics which have been manifest in his whole career, professional and political. In 1855 he formed a partnership with William Wallace, and when that gentleman was elected county clerk in 1861 he formed a partnership with W. P. Fishback, which was interrupted by his enlisting in the army in 1862, but the connection was resumed again in 1865, when the firm became Porter, Harrison & Fishback, and so continued until 1870, when Mr. Fishback retired, Judge Hines taking his place. Gov. Porter retiring, W. H. H. Miller became a partner in the firm, and upon Judge Hines retiring, Mr. John B. Elam became a member of the firm of Harrison, Miller & Elam, which continued until it was dissolved by Gen. Harrison's election to the presidency in 1888. While not always the senior in years, he was the senior in fact in every firm of which he was a member; such is the ungrudging testimony of all those who have been his partners.

Though breaking the chronological order of events somewhat, it is as well to complete here the sketch of his profes-

sional career. He has been concerned in the most important litigation in Indiana for nearly thirty years. He was employed in all sorts of cases, such as came to attorneys engaged in general practice before the era of professional specialists. The panorama of human life with all its disappointments and successes is unrolled before the busy lawyer who has such a practice. The exclusive devotion to special branches makes men strong in their lines; it narrows them also, and the lawyer whose work has a wider range acquires greater breadth of view, a happy versatility, and a flexibility of mind which enable him to pass from one subject to another without weariness and without distraction. Benjamin Harrison has amazed his associates in professional and official life by the ease and ability with which he despatches so much important business in a masterly style. For the exigencies of high station the



*Benjamin Harrison*

discipline of his professional life was an excellent preparation. As a lawyer he was thorough in the preparation and study of his cases, in the preliminary statement he was clear and exhaustive, putting court and jury in full possession of his theory of the case; as an examiner of witnesses he had no rival; and as an advocate his performances were characterized by clearness, cogency, and completeness which left nothing further to be said on his side of the case. It often happened that his colleagues who had prepared to assist in the argument threw away their notes and rested the case upon his single speech. As a cross-examiner he was unsurpassed. No rascally witness escaped him. No trumped-up story or false alibi could pass muster under his searching scrutiny. In a case where Gov. Hendricks was defending a man in the Federal Court against a charge of conspiring to violate the election laws, the Governor injudiciously put his client in the witness box. He denied his participation in the crime in the most positive manner; but little by little under Harrison's cross-examination he was driven to admit fact after fact, the cumulative force of which drove him at last to a practical confession of his guilt. In the celebrated Clem murder case several alibis, fabricated for the

principal actor in the conspiracy, were pulverized by his cross-examination. It was not his plan to confuse or persecute a witness, but to quietly, persistently, and courteously press for a full disclosure of the facts. He never attempted to brow-beat a witness, never excited the sympathy of a jury for a witness by any show of unfairness. His skill as a *nisi prius* lawyer was surpassed by his power before the higher and appellate courts. He put himself on paper admirably, and his briefs are models of strength and conciseness. He was deferential to the courts, courteous to his opponents, generous to his colleagues. He showed no fussy fear that he would be shouldered to the rear. It was not necessary. It soon became evident to his opponents and associates that he was the conspicuous figure in the fight. Unlike many able attorneys, he cared more for success than for an exhibition of his own powers. Lawyers who had never met him were sometimes led to think that his abilities had been overrated; no lawyer who ever encountered him in a forensic fight came out of it with such an opinion. His commanding abilities as a lawyer stood him in good stead in his political career, which began with the organization of the Republican party. He became conspicuous in Indiana politics in 1860, when, as a candidate for the office of reporter of the Supreme Court, he made a thorough canvass of the State. His first debate with Gov. Hendricks was in that year. By some mistake of the campaign committees he and Hendricks were announced to speak the same day in Rockville. Hendricks was then the Democratic candidate for governor, and was in the zenith of his fame as stump speaker. He courteously invited Harrison to divide time with him and made the opening speech. The local Republican managers were amazed at the temerity of a stripling who dared to measure strength with the Goliath of the Indiana Democracy, and showed their distrust of his ability by leaving the courthouse. Harrison, who had been seasoned and warmed for the work by speaking every day for weeks, assumed the aggressive, and as his few political friends began to show their appreciation by applause, the audience increased until the courtroom was packed with enthusiastic Republicans, who crowded about the speaker when he closed and showered their congratulations upon him. Mr. Voorhees was present, and, feeling the force of the impression made by

Harrison, arose when the speech was finished and said he would answer the speech that night in the same place.

Since 1860 he has taken an active part in every political canvass in Indiana. In that year he was elected reporter of the Supreme Court, and his official work may be found in ten volumes of the Indiana reports. His official and professional labors were onerous, but the tasks were lightened by the thought that he was paying for the modest cottage home which he had bought on credit. Then came the war, and Gov. Morton's call upon him to raise a regiment of volunteers. He enlisted, and in a few weeks was commissioned colonel of the 70th Indiana infantry. He made arrangements to have the duties of his office of reporter performed in his absence, several of his professional brethren undertaking to do the work without cost to him, so that his home could be paid for. The Democrats put the name of a candidate for the office on their State ticket in 1862. The Republicans, supposing that Harrison would be allowed to serve out his term, made no nomination. No votes were cast except for the Democrat, and in a mandamus suit brought by him to compel the clerk to give him the manuscript opinions of the judges, the Supreme Court, composed of Democrats, decided that Harrison's enlistment vacated the office, and that the Democrat who was elected by default should fill it for the unexpired term. At the next election, in 1864, while Harrison was still in the field, he was re-elected by an overwhelming majority, and after the close of the war assumed the office and served out his full term.

The following is a brief summary of his military record: Benjamin Harrison was mustered into service as colonel of the 70th regiment of Indiana infantry volunteers with the field and staff of that regiment at Indianapolis, Ind., to date from 7 Aug., 1862, to serve three years. The following remarks appear opposite his name on the muster-in roll of the field and staff: "Mustered into service as 2d lieutenant, 14 July, 1862; as captain, 22 July, 1862; and as colonel, 7 Aug., 1862." He was in command of his regiment from date of muster-in to 20 Aug., 1863; of the 2d brigade, 3d division, reserve corps, to about 20 Sept., 1863; of his regiment to 9 Jan., 1864; of the 1st brigade, 1st division, 11th army corps, to 18 April, 1864; of his regiment to 29 June, 1864; and of the 1st brigade, 3d division, 20th army corps, to 23 Sept., 1864,

when he was detailed for special duty in the State of Indiana. The exact date that he returned to duty in the field is not shown; but on 12 Nov., 1864, he was directed to report in person to the general commanding at Nashville, Tenn., and subsequently commanded the 1st brigade, provisional division, army of the Cumberland, to 16 Jan., 1865, when, upon his own application, he was relieved and directed to rejoin his proper command for duty in Gen. Sherman's army at Savannah, Ga. On his way *via* New York to rejoin his command at Savannah, he was stricken down with a severe fever and lay for several weeks at Narrowsburg, N. Y. When able to leave his bed he started for Savannah, but arrived too late to join Gen. Sherman, and was assigned to command the camp of convalescents and recruits at Blair's Landing, S. C., on the Pocotaligo river, and soon after joined Gen. Sherman's army at Raleigh. He resumed command of the 1st brigade, 3d division, 20th army corps, 21 April, 1865; was relieved therefrom 8 June, 1865, upon the discontinuance of the brigade by reason of the muster out of the troops composing it; and on the same date, 8 June, 1865, was mustered out and honorably discharged as colonel with the field and staff of his regiment, near Washington, D. C. He was brevetted brigadier-general of volunteers, 23 Jan., 1865, "for ability and manifest energy and gallantry in command of brigade." As a regimental commander he was in action at Russellville, Ky., 30 Sept., 1862; in the Atlanta campaign, at Resaca, Ga., 14-15 May, 1864; at Cassville, Ga., 24 May, 1864; at New Hope, Ga., 25 May, 1864; at Dallas, Ga., 27-28 May, 1864; and at Kenesaw Mountain, Ga., 10-28 June, 1864. As a brigade commander he participated in the operations at Kenesaw Mountain, Ga., 29 June to 3 July, 1864; in the battle of Peach Tree creek, Ga., 20 July, 1864; in the siege of Atlanta, Ga., 21 July to 2 Sept., 1864; and in the battle of Nashville, Tenn., 15-16 Dec., 1864; and was present at the surrender of Gen. Johnston's army at Durham's Station, N. C., 26 April, 1865.

At the close of his term of office as reporter of the Supreme Court he resumed the law practice and soon had his hands full of work, being retained in almost every important case in the Federal and State courts at Indianapolis. In 1876 Godlove S. Orth, the Republican candidate for governor, withdrew from the canvass while Gen. Harrison was taking a vacation

on the north shore of Lake Superior. Without consulting him, his name was put upon the ticket as candidate for governor, and when he arrived from the North an enthusiastic crowd met him at the station and escorted him to his home. The trading of horses while crossing the river did not work well, and though Gen. Harrison made a splendid canvass, running two thousand ahead of his ticket, the popularity of Gov. Hendricks, who was on the National ticket, pulled the whole Democratic State ticket through by a plurality of three thousand. The gallant fight made by Gen. Harrison in that losing battle imposed a debt of gratitude upon his party which has not been forgotten. In 1879 President Hayes appointed him a member of the Mississippi River Commission. In 1880 he was chairman of the Indiana delegation in the convention which nominated James A. Garfield. Some of his friends presented his name for the nomination in that convention, but he insisted that it should be withdrawn. His canvass of Indiana and other States during the campaign of 1880 was brilliant and effective. President Garfield offered him a place in his cabinet, which he declined. He was chosen United States senator in 1881, and served until 1887. His course in the senate was such as to win the esteem and friendship of his Republican colleagues and to command the respect of his political opponents. This was his first experience in a legislative body, but he soon took rank among the foremost debaters of the senate. Chairman of the Committee on Territories, he was persistent in his demand for the admission to statehood of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, and Idaho, and though not succeeding at the time, he had the pleasure afterward of putting his presidential signature to the laws making them all States of the Union. In his speeches in the senate he criticised Mr. Cleveland's vetoes of the pension bills, voted and spoke in favor of an increase of the navy, the reform of the civil service, a judicious tariff reform; he favored every measure of public policy which had received the approval of his party. He has always been a strong partisan, and has believed and acted in the belief that since the Republican party was organized it has done nothing of which Republicans should be ashamed, or at least nothing to justify a change of allegiance from it to the Democratic party. From one point of view, such a course in a public man may be criti-



EXECUTIVE MANSION,  
WASHINGTON

Nov 8, 1842

My dear Genl.

I have your most  
kind letter of the 8<sup>th</sup> inst, and the  
second volume of the History of  
New York which you have done me  
the favor to dedicate to me.  
For all this I am your grateful  
debtor.

Very sincerely Yours

Benjamin Harrison




cised. It may be doubted, however, if any Indiana Republican who has been confronted with the type of Democrats which have dominated that party for the last thirty years is to be censured for standing by his own party.

The Republican party leaders saw in 1888 that the only hope of winning against Cleveland was to put up a candidate who could carry some of the doubtful States. Early in the year the Republican leaders in Indiana and almost the entire Republican press of the State pronounced in favor of Harrison, and his name was presented by the solid delegation to the convention at Chicago. On the first ballot he received 83 votes, standing fifth on the list, John Sherman standing first with 225. Seven more ballots were taken, during which Chauncey M. Depew withdrew and his supporters went to Harrison, giving him the nomination on the eighth ballot by a vote of 544. There was great rejoicing on the part of his friends in Indiana, and as soon as the result was known there began a series of demonstrations which are without parallel in the history of presidential campaigns. On the day of the nomination a large delegation came to Indianapolis from Hendricks county in a special train and proceeded at once to Gen. Harrison's residence and called him out for a speech, and from that day until the election delegations kept coming from different parts of Indiana, from Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Kansas, Illinois, Iowa, and other States, all of which were received and welcomed by him in impromptu speeches which, by their appropriateness, variety, force, and elegance of style, won the approval of our best literary critics as well as of the public. In these ninety-four speeches he made no slip. He said nothing that needed apology or explanation from his friends. Verbatim reports of the addresses were printed from day to day in all the leading papers of the country, and he never in anything he said gave his political opponents ground for unfriendly criticism. It is an open secret that some of the members of the National Republican committee were terrified when they learned that the "Hoosier" candidate had commenced the campaign by these free-spoken, off-hand talks with his neighbors. They proposed that some one should go to Indianapolis and put a stop to the business. A gentleman who knew Gen. Harrison's ability told them not to be alarmed, and at the end of a week the fearful gentlemen had changed their

minds and said that if they would allow Gen. Harrison to go on in that way he would elect himself in spite of any blundering of the committee or campaign managers.

A few extracts from some of these speeches may give an idea of their quality. To the California delegation the day after the nomination he said: "I feel sure, too, my fellow-citizens, that we have joined now a contest of great principles, and that the armies which are to fight out this great contest before the American people will encamp upon the high plains of principle and not in the low swamps of personal defamation or detraction." To a number of veterans of the Union army: "We went not as partisans but patriots into the strife which involved the national life. . . . The army was great in its



assembling. It came with an impulse that was majestic and terrible. It was as great in its muster out as in the brilliant work which it had done in the field. . . . When the war was over . . . every man had in some humble place a chair by some fireside where he was loved and toward which his heart went forward with a quick step." To

the Tippecanoe club, composed of men who had voted for his grandfather in 1840: "I came among you with the heritage, I trust, of a good name, such as all of you enjoy. It is the only inheritance that has been transmitted in our family." Gen. Harrison was not in the habit of boasting of his lineage, of which he had reason to be proud. If it was ever the subject of conversation in his presence he never introduced it. To a delegation of farmers: "The law throws the ægis of its protection over us all. It stands sentinel about your country homes; . . . it comes into our more thickly populated community and speaks its mandate for individual security and public order. There is an open avenue through the ballot for the modification or repeal of laws which are unjust or oppressive. To the law we bow with reverence. It is the one king that commands our allegiance." To a delegation of railway employees: "Heroism has been found at the throttle and brake as well as upon the battlefield, and as well worthy of song and marble. The train-

man crushed between the platforms, who used his last breath not for prayer or messages of love, but to say to the panic-stricken who gathered around him, 'Put out the red light for the other train,' inscribed his name very high upon the shaft where the names of the faithful and brave are written." To an Illinois delegation: "It was on the soil of Illinois that Lovejoy died, a martyr to free speech. . . . Another great epoch in the march of liberty found on the soil of Illinois the theatre of its most influential event. I refer to that high debate in the presence of your people, but before the world in which Douglas won the senatorship and Lincoln the presidency and immortal fame. . . . The wise work of our fathers in constituting this Government will stand all tests of internal dissension and revolution and all tests of external assault, if we can only preserve a pure, free ballot." To a delegation of coal-miners: "I do not care now to deal with statistics. One fact is enough for me. The tide of emigration from all European countries has been and is toward our shores. The gates of Castle Garden swing inward; they do not swing outward to any American laborer seeking a better country than this. . . . Here there are better conditions, wider and more hopeful prospects for workmen than in any other land. . . . The more work there is to do in this country the higher the wages that will be paid for the doing of it. . . . A policy which will transfer work from our mines and our factories to foreign mines and foreign factories inevitably tends to a depression of wages here. These are truths that do not require profound study." To an Indiana delegation: "I hope the time is coming, and has even now arrived, when the great sense of justice which possesses our people will teach men of all parties that party success is not to be promoted at the expense of an injustice to any of our citizens." As early as 31 July, 1888, he said: "But we do not mean to be content with our own market; we should seek to promote closer and more friendly commercial relations with the Central and South American states, . . . those friendly political and commercial relations which shall promote their interests equally with ours." Addressing a company of survivors of his own regiment, he said: "It is no time now to use an apothecary's scale to weigh the rewards of the men who saved the country." To a club of railroad employees: "The laboring men of this land

may safely trust every just reform in which they are interested to public discussion and to the tests of reason; they may surely hope upon these lines, which are open to them, to accomplish, under our American institutions, all those right things they have conceived to be necessary to their highest success and well-being." Addressing a meeting on the day of Sheridan's funeral: "He was one of those great commanders who, upon the field of battle, towered a very god of war. . . . He rested and refreshed his command with the wine of victory, and found recuperation in the dispersion of the enemy that confronted him." To a delegation of farmers: "I congratulate you not so much upon the rich farms of your country as upon your virtuous and happy homes. The home is the best, as it is the first, school of citizenship."

All these campaign speeches, with a description of the circumstances of their delivery, are collected in a volume published by Lovell & Co., of New York. But more remarkable than these are the one hundred and forty addresses delivered during his trip to the Pacific coast and back—a journey of 10,000 miles, which was accomplished in thirty-one days, from 15 April to 15 May, 1890, without the variation of one minute from the prearranged schedule for arriving and departing from the hundreds of stations on the way. These addresses were non-political, and breathe throughout a spirit of high patriotism and a call to the high responsibilities of citizenship. In a letter to an American friend who had sent him the volume containing these speeches, the late Lord Coleridge says: "The speeches give me a very high idea of Mr. Harrison. We know very little here of your politicians, and it is pleasant to be brought face to face with any one so manly and high-minded as Mr. Harrison shows himself in the book you sent me. The perpetual demand which American customs make upon anyone of the least position in the way of speech-making must be very trying. In a degree (not within 1,000 miles of the president) I found it so myself when I was in America. But a private foreigner may say what he likes; a president, of course, must watch his words."

It was assumed that with Mr. Blaine in the cabinet President Harrison would be a very inconspicuous and unimportant person in the administration. It is one of the marked characteristics of the man that when he is assigned to a place

he assumes all its responsibilities. As a lawyer he never shouldered himself to the front, but when placed in the lead he was the leader. The simple fact is, he was not for a moment overshadowed by any member of his cabinet. He insisted upon knowing what was going on in each department and maintained an intelligent supervision of them all. Nor is it detracting from the just fame of Mr. Blaine to say that by reason of that gentleman's failing health the work of the State Department was much more than usual the work of the president. Those who have known him long did not fail to see his hand in the discussion of the legal rights of aliens domiciled here, contained in the dignified note to the Italian government concerning the New Orleans massacre. The statement of the basis of our liability for wrong inflicted upon the subjects of friendly nations when they are the result of dereliction of duty by the local authorities was masterly, and the dignified manner in which that government was informed that the United States would be just, but would not be forced to a hasty decision, was admirable. In the Chile affair, in which that government denied its responsibility for the assaults upon our sailors at Santiago and refused safe conduct to some of the members of the Balmaceda administration who had taken refuge at the United States legation, President Harrison was earnest and persistent in his demands, and, as the correspondence shows, after waiting patiently for a response, and becoming weary at last of the vacillating conduct of the Chilean government, made a peremptory request, which was promptly and satisfactorily answered. It is due to the republic of Chile to say that during the whole of the controversy the rival parties in that country kept it in a state of constant revolution. The evidence in the case showed that our sailors were outraged because they belonged to the U. S. navy, and that the authorities of Chile permitted, if they did not connive at it. In such a case it would have been pusillanimous on the part of the Government to have failed to demand reparation. The Bering sea controversy, now happily in settlement by arbitration, was full of difficulty when Mr. Blaine's sudden illness threw the burden of the matter for a time upon President Harrison. Lord Salisbury was delaying, the season for pelagic sealing was coming on, no *modus vivendi* had been agreed upon. President Harrison took measures for inter-

cepting the Canadian sealers, and it was not long until the terms of the treaty were arranged. The statement of the "five points" submitted to the arbitrators by the treaty is a good specimen of President Harrison's thorough and comprehensive work. Eastern journals that were not friendly to President Harrison have generously united in endorsing the conduct of the State Department during his administration, and have especially commended it for being thoroughly patriotic and American. And it may be said from the time of his nomination until he retired from the presidential office he bore himself with a dignity and ability commensurate with the responsibilities of his exalted station. His policy in regard to the tariff has been censured, but he simply maintained the views held by the majority of the Republican party, with which he has always been in sympathy. He is what may properly be called an out-and-out protectionist. His firm stand in favor of honest money gave confidence to the business interests of the country when they were imperilled by the wild schemes of the advocates of free-silver coinage. He was renominated for the presidency by the Republican national convention at Minneapolis without serious opposition. He failed of re-election. Public opinion has been much divided as to the causes of this result. It was certainly not on account of any failure upon the part of President Harrison to carry out the policy of his party, or to realize the expectation of his friends in the ability shown by him in performing the duties of his station. The fatal illness of Mrs. Harrison, and her death a few days before the election, cast a shadow over the closing months of his official life. His administration as a whole was business-like in its management of our domestic affairs, dignified, firm, and patriotic in its foreign policy, promoting the prosperity of our people at home and keeping peace with all nations. In his last message to congress, on 6 Dec., 1892, after giving a summary of the operations of the different departments, he said: "This exhibit of the work of the executive departments is submitted to congress and to the public in the hope that there will be found in it a due sense of responsibility, and an earnest purpose to maintain the national honor and to promote the happiness and prosperity of all our people. And this brief exhibit of the growth and prosperity of the country will give us a level from which to note the



increase or decadence that new legislative policies may bring to us. There is no reason why the national influence, power, and prosperity should not observe the same rates of increase that have characterized the past thirty years. We carry the great impulse and increase of these years into the future. There is no reason why, in many lines of production, we should not surpass all other nations, as we have already done in some. There are no near frontiers to our possible development. Retrogression would be a crime."

Upon retiring from the presidency, Gen. Harrison was engaged by the late Senator Stanford, to deliver a course of lectures at the Leland Stanford, Jr., university, in California, on constitutional law. These were delivered during the early months of 1894. Foreigners who have studied our institutions have expressed regrets that in America no provision is made for the dignified retirement of our ex-presidents, and they have suggested that some office with a life tenure be bestowed upon them with a suitable provision for their support out of the public treasury. The temper of our people and the genius of our institutions are not in accord with any such desire. The great volunteer generals of the war came back to the ranks and took their places with their fellow-citizens in the walks of private life. So our great political leaders, from the senate and from the presidency, when their term of office is over, come back to their homes and ordinary pursuits without any impairment of their dignity or their self-respect. In his retirement from the labors of his official station Gen. Harrison can realize the truth of what he said in a speech on the day of his nomination in 1888: "Kings sometimes bestow decorations upon those whom they desire to honor, but that man is most highly decorated who has the affectionate regard of his neighbors and friends." This he has in full measure. Judged by the standards of a few unprincipled and disappointed politicians who expected to thrive on the use and abuse of public patronage, Gen. Harrison is a cold-blooded man. But it is possible that such men are not as well qualified to judge of the temperature of a man's blood as his friends and intimates who have seen him in all the vicissitudes of his daily life, ministering with sympathy and self-sacrifice to relatives and friends who, overtaken by some great calamity, have found his heart as tender as a child's. The country takes little note of the petulant criticisms of its

public servants, but it will hold at their true worth the great and useful virtues of ability, wisdom, integrity, courage, and patriotism whenever they are exhibited by men in high official station. The engraving on page 500 is a view of his home in Indianapolis. His life has been written by Gen. Lewis Wallace (Philadelphia, 1888).

His wife, CAROLINE LAVINIA SCOTT, born in Oxford, Ohio, 1 Oct., 1832; died in Washington, D. C., 25 Oct., 1892, was the daughter of John W. Scott, who was a professor in Miami



*Carrie S. Harrison*

university at the time of her birth, and afterward became president of the seminary in Oxford. She was graduated at the seminary in 1852, the same year that Gen. Harrison took his degree at the university, and was married to him on 20 Oct., 1853. She was a musician, and was also devoted to painting, besides which she was a diligent reader, and gave part of her time to literary clubs, of several of which she was a member. Mrs. Harrison was a manager of the orphan asylum in

Indianapolis and a member of the Presbyterian church in that city, and until her removal to Washington taught a class in Sunday-school. They had two children. The son, Russell, was graduated at Lafayette in 1877 as a mining engineer, and, in addition to other engineering work, has been connected with the U. S. mints at New Orleans and Helena as assayer. He is now a resident of Montana, where he is engaged in journalism. The daughter, Mary, married James R. McKee, a merchant of Indianapolis.

## APPENDIX.

### PRESIDENTS, VICE-PRESIDENTS, AND CANDIDATES FOR THESE OFFICES, AND CABINET OFFICERS,

FROM THE ADOPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION TO THE PRESENT TIME.

1789.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.  
Thomas Jefferson, Sec. State.  
Samuel Osgood, }  
Timothy Pickering, } Post. Gen.

JOHN ADAMS.  
Alexander Hamilton, Sec. Treas.  
Henry Knox, Sec. War.  
Edmund Randolph, Att. Gen.

1793.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, *F.*  
*\* George Clinton, R.*  
*Thomas Jefferson, R.*

Thomas Jefferson, }  
Edmund Randolph, } Sec. State.  
Timothy Pickering, }  
Edmund Randolph, }  
William Bradford, } Att. Gen.  
Charles Lee, }

JOHN ADAMS, *F.*  
*Aaron Burr, R.*

Alexander Hamilton, }  
Oliver Wolcott, } Sec. Treas.  
Henry Knox, }  
Timothy Pickering, } Sec. War.  
James McHenry, }  
Timothy Pickering, } Post. Gen.  
Joseph Habersham, }

1797.

JOHN ADAMS, *F.*  
*Thomas Pinckney, F.*  
*Aaron Burr, R.*

Timothy Pickering, }  
John Marshall, } Sec. State.  
Oliver Wolcott, }  
Samuel Dexter, } Sec. Treas.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, *R.*  
*Samuel Adams, R.*

James McHenry, }  
Samuel Dexter, } Sec. War.  
Benjamin Stoddert, } Sec. Navy.  
Charles Lee, Att. Gen.  
Joseph Habersham, Post. Gen.

\* The names of unsuccessful candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency are printed in *italics*.

## 1801.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, *R.*  
*John Adams, F.*  
 James Madison, Sec. State.  
 Henry Dearborn, Sec. War.  
 Levi Lincoln, Att. Gen.  
 Joseph Habersham, } Post. Gen.  
 Gideon Granger, }

AARON BURR, *R.*  
*Charles C. Pinckney, F.*  
 Samuel Dexter, } Sec. Treas.  
 Albert Gallatin, }  
 Benjamin Stoddert, } Sec. Navy.  
 Robert Smith, }

## 1805.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, *R.*  
*C. C. Pinckney, F.*  
 James Madison, Sec. State.  
 Albert Gallatin, Sec. Treas.  
 Henry Dearborn, } Sec. War.  
 William Eustis, }  
 Gideon Granger, Post. Gen.

GEORGE CLINTON, *R.*  
*Rufus King, F.*  
 Robert Smith, } Sec. Navy.  
 J. Crowninshield, }  
 Levi Lincoln, }  
 Robert Smith, } Att. Gen.  
 J. Breckenridge, }  
 Cæsar A. Rodney, }

## 1809.

JAMES MADISON, *R.*  
*C. C. Pinckney, F.*  
 Robert Smith, } Sec. State.  
 James Monroe, }  
 William Eustis, Sec. War.  
 Cæsar A. Rodney, Att. Gen.

GEORGE CLINTON, *R.*  
*Rufus King, F.*  
 Albert Gallatin, Sec. Treas.  
 Paul Hamilton, Sec. Navy.  
 Gideon Granger, Post. Gen.

## 1813.

JAMES MADISON, *D.*  
*De Witt Clinton, F.*  
 James Monroe, Sec. State.  
 George W. Campbell, } Sec. Treas.  
 Alexander J. Dallas, }  
 William H. Crawford, }  
 William Jones, } Sec. Navy.  
 B. W. Crowninshield, }

ELBRIDGE GERRY, *D.*  
*Jared Ingersoll, F.*  
 John Armstrong, } Sec. War.  
 James Monroe, }  
 William Pinkney, } Att. Gen.  
 Richard Rush, }  
 Gideon Granger, } Post. Gen.  
 Return J. Meigs, }

## 1817.

JAMES MONROE, *D.*  
*Rufus King, F.*  
 John Quincy Adams, Sec. State.  
 John C. Calhoun, Sec. War.  
 William Wirt, Att. Gen.  
 Return J. Meigs, Post Gen.

DANIEL D. TOMPKINS, *D.*  
*J. E. Howard, F.*  
 William H. Crawford, Sec. Treas.  
 B. W. Crowninshield, } Sec. Navy.  
 Smith Thompson, }

## 1821.

JAMES MONROE, *D.*  
 John Q. Adams, Sec. State.  
 William H. Crawford, Sec. Treas.  
 William Wirt, Att. Gen.  
 R. J. Meigs, } Post. Gen.  
 John McLean, }

DANIEL D. TOMPKINS, *D.*  
 John C. Calhoun, Sec. War.  
 Smith Thompson, } Sec. Navy.  
 Samuel L. Southard, }

## 1825.

JOHN Q. ADAMS, D.  
*Andrew Jackson.*  
*William H. Crawford.*  
*Henry Clay.*  
 Henry Clay, Sec. State.  
 James Barbour, } Sec. War.  
 P. B. Porter, }  
 Samuel L. Southard, Sec. Navy.

JOHN C. CALHOUN, D.  
*Nathan Sanford.*  
*Nathan Macon.*  
*Andrew Jackson.*  
 Richard Rush, Sec. Treas.  
 William Wirt, Att. Gen.  
 J. McLean, Post. Gen.

## 1829.

ANDREW JACKSON, D.  
*John Q. Adams.*  
 Martin Van Buren, } Sec. State.  
 Edward Livingston, }  
 John H. Eaton, } Sec. War.  
 Lewis Cass, }  
 John McPherson Berrien, } Att. Gen.  
 Roger B. Taney, }

JOHN C. CALHOUN, D.  
*Richard Rush.*  
*William Smith.*  
 Samuel D. Ingram, } Sec. Treas.  
 Louis McLane, }  
 John Branch, } Sec. Navy.  
 Levi Woodbury, }  
 William T. Barry, Post. Gen.

## 1833.

ANDREW JACKSON, D.  
*Henry Clay.*  
*John Floyd.*  
*William Wirt.*  
 Edward Livingston, } Sec. State.  
 Louis McLane, }  
 John Forsyth, }  
 Lewis Cass, } Sec. War.  
 B. F. Butler, }  
 Levi Woodbury, } Sec. Navy.  
 Mahlon Dickerson, }

MARTIN VAN BUREN, D.  
*John Sergeant.*  
*Henry Lee.*  
*Amos Ellmaker.*  
*William Wilkins.*  
 Roger B. Taney, } Att. Gen.  
 Benj. F. Butler, }  
 Louis McLane, } Sec. Treas.  
 William J. Duane, }  
 Roger B. Taney, }  
 Levi Woodbury, }  
 William T. Barry, } Post. Gen.  
 Amos Kendall, }

## 1837.

MARTIN VAN BUREN, D.  
*William H. Harrison, W.*  
*Hugh L. White, W.*  
*Daniel Webster, W.*  
*Willie P. Mangum, W.*  
 John Forsyth, Sec. State.  
 Joel R. Poinsett, Sec. War.  
 Benj. F. Butler, } Att. Gen.  
 Felix Grundy, }  
 Henry D. Gilpin, }

RICHARD M. JOHNSON, D.  
*Francis Granger, W.*  
*John Tyler, W.*  
 Levi Woodbury, Sec. Treas.  
 Mahlon Dickerson, } Sec. Navy.  
 James K. Paulding, }  
 Amos Kendall, } Post. Gen.  
 John M. Niles, }

## 1841.

WILLIAM H. HARRISON, W.  
*Martin Van Buren, D.*  
*James G. Birney, L. P.*

JOHN TYLER, W.  
*Richard M. Johnson, D.*  
*Littleton W. Tazewell, D.*  
*James Knox Polk, D.*  
*Thomas Earl, L. P.*  
 John J. Crittenden, Att. Gen.  
 George E. Badger, Sec. Navy.  
 Francis Granger, Post. Gen.

Daniel Webster, Sec. State.  
 Thomas Ewing, Sec. Treas.  
 John Bell, Sec. War.

1841.

JOHN TYLER, *W.*

Daniel Webster, }  
 Abel P. Upshur, } Sec. State.  
 John C. Calhoun, }  
 Thomas Ewing, }  
 Walter Forward, } Sec. Treas.  
 John C. Spencer, }  
 John Bell, }  
 James M. Porter, } Sec. War.  
 John C. Spencer, }  
 William Wilkins, }

John J. Crittenden, }  
 Hugh S. Legaré, } Att. Gen.  
 John Nelson, }  
 George E. Badger, }  
 Abel P. Upshur, }  
 David Henshaw, } Sec. Navy.  
 Thos. W. Gilmer, }  
 John Y. Mason, }  
 Francis Granger, }  
 Charles A. Wickliffe, } Post. Gen.

1845.

JAMES K. POLK, *D.*  
*Henry Clay, W.*  
*James G. Birney, L. P.*  
 James Buchanan, Sec. State.  
 John Y. Mason, }  
 Nathan Clifford, } Att. Gen.  
 Isaac Toucey, }  
 Cave Johnson, Post. Gen.

GEORGE M. DALLAS, *D.*  
*Theodore Frelinghuysen, W.*  
*Thomas Morris, L. P.*  
 Robert J. Walker, Sec. Treas.  
 George Bancroft, }  
 John Y. Mason, } Sec. Navy.  
 William L. Marcy, Sec. War.

1849.

ZACHARY TAYLOR, *W.*  
*Lewis Cass, D.*  
*John P. Hale (—).*  
*Martin Van Buren, F. S.*  
 John M. Clayton, Sec. State.  
 George W. Crawford, Sec. War.  
 Thomas Ewing, Sec. Interior.  
 Jacob Collamer, Post. Gen.

MILLARD FILLMORE, *W.*  
*William O. Butler, D.*  
*Leicester King (—).*  
*Charles Francis Adams, F. S.*  
 William M. Meredith, Sec. Treas.  
 William B. Preston, Sec. Navy.  
 Reverdy Johnson, Att. Gen.

1850.

MILLARD FILLMORE, *W.*

Daniel Webster, Sec. State.  
 Charles M. Conrad, Sec. War.  
 William A. Graham, Sec. Navy.  
 Nathan K. Hall, Post. Gen.

Thomas Corwin, Sec. Treas.  
 Alex. H. H. Stuart, Sec. Interior.  
 John J. Crittenden, Att. Gen.

1853.

FRANKLIN PIERCE, *D.*  
*Winfield Scott, W.*  
*John P. Hale, L. P.*  
 William L. Marcy, Sec. State.  
 Jefferson Davis, Sec. War.  
 Robert McClelland, Sec. Interior.  
 James Campbell, Post. Gen.

WILLIAM R. KING, *D.*  
*William A. Graham, W.*  
*George W. Julian, L. P.*  
 James Guthrie, Sec. Treas.  
 James C. Dobbin, Sec. Navy.  
 Caleb Cushing, Att. Gen.

1857.

JAMES BUCHANAN, *D.*  
*John C. Frémont, R.*  
*Millard Fillmore, A.*  
 Lewis Cass, }  
 Jeremiah S. Black, } Sec. State.  
 Howell Cobb, }  
 John A. Dix, } Sec. Treas.  
 John B. Floyd, }  
 Joseph Holt, } Sec. War.  
 Isaac Toucey, Sec. Navy.

JOHN C. BRECKENRIDGE, *D.*  
*William L. Dayton, R.*  
*Andrew J. Donelson, A.*  
 Jacob Thompson, Sec. Interior.  
 Jeremiah S. Black, }  
 Edwin M. Stanton, } Att. Gen.  
 Aaron V. Brown, }  
 Joseph Holt, }  
 Horatio King, } Post. Gen.

1861.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, *R.**Stephen A. Douglas, D.**John C. Breckenridge, D.**John Bell, C. U.*

William H. Seward, Sec. State.

Simon Cameron, } Sec. War.

Edwin M. Stanton, }

Caleb B. Smith, } Sec. Interior.

John P. Usher, }

Gideon Welles, Sec. Navy.

HANNIBAL HAMLIN, *R.**Herschel V. Johnson, D.**Joseph Lane, D.**Edward Everett, C. U.*

Salmon P. Chase, } Sec. Treas.

Wm. P. Fessenden, }

Edward Bates, } Att. Gen.

James Speed, }

Montgomery Blair, } Post. Gen.

William Dennison, }

1865.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, *R.**George B. McClellan, D.*

William H. Seward, Sec. State.

Edwin M. Stanton, Sec. War.

John P. Usher, } Sec. Interior.

James Harlan, }

ANDREW JOHNSON, *R.**George H. Pendleton, D.*

Hugh McCulloch, Sec. Treas.

Gideon Welles, Sec. Navy.

James Speed, Att. Gen.

William Dennison, Post. Gen.

1865.

ANDREW JOHNSON.

William H. Seward, Sec. State.

Edwin M. Stanton, } Sec. War.

Ulysses S. Grant, }

Lorenzo Thomas, }

John M. Schofield, }

Hugh McCulloch, Sec. Treas.

Gideon Welles, Sec. Navy.

James Harlan, } Sec. Interior.

Orville H. Browning, }

James Speed, } Att. Gen.

Henry Stanbery, }

William M. Evarts, }

William Dennison, } Post. Gen.

Alex. W. Randall, }

1869.

ULYSSES S. GRANT, *R.**Horatio Seymour, D.*

E. B. Washburne, } Sec. State.

Hamilton Fish, }

George S. Boutwell, Sec. Treas.

John A. Rawlins, } Sec. War.

Wm. W. Belknap, }

SCHUYLER COLFAX, *R.**Francis P. Blair, Jr., D.*

Jacob D. Cox, } Sec. Interior.

Columbus Delano, }

Adolph E. Borie, } Sec. Navy.

George M. Robeson, }

George H. Williams, Att. Gen.

John A. J. Creswell, Post. Gen.

1873.

ULYSSES S. GRANT, *R.**Horace Greeley, D.**Charles O'Connor, S. O. D.**James Black, P.*

Hamilton Fish, Sec. State.

William W. Belknap, } Sec. War.

Alphonso Taft, }

J. Donald Cameron, }

John A. J. Creswell, } Post. Gen.

Marshall Jewell, }

James N. Tyner, }

George M. Robeson, Sec. Navy.

HENRY WILSON, *R.**Benjamin Gratz Brown, D.**John Q. Adams, S. O. D.*

Columbus Delano, } Sec. Interior.

Zachariah Chandler, }

Wm. A. Richardson, } Sec. Treas.

Benj. H. Bristow, }

Lot M. Morrill, }

George H. Williams, } Att. Gen.

Edward Pierrepont, }

Alphonso Taft, }

1877.

RUTHERFORD B. HAYES, *R.* WILLIAM A. WHEELER, *R.*  
*Samuel J. Tilden, D.* *Thomas A. Hendricks, D.*  
*Peter Cooper, I. N. P.*  
*Green C. Smith, P.*  
 William M. Everts, Sec. State.  
 R. W. Thompson, { Sec. Navy.  
 Nathan Goff, Jr., }  
 David M. Key, { Post. Gen.  
 Horace Maynard, }

*G. T. Stewart, P.*

John Sherman, Sec. Treas.  
 George W. McCrary, { Sec. War.  
 Alexander Ramsey, }  
 Carl Schurz, Sec. Interior.  
 Charles Devens, Att. Gen.

1881.

JAMES A. GARFIELD, *R.**Winfield S. Hancock, D.**James B. Weaver, G. B.**Neal Dow, P.*

James G. Blaine, Sec. State.  
 R. T. Lincoln, Sec. War.  
 W. H. Hunt, Sec. Navy.  
 Wayne MacVeagh, Att. Gen.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR, *R.**William H. English, D.*

William Windom, Sec. Treas.  
 S. J. Kirkwood, Sec. Interior.  
 Thomas L. James, Post. Gen.

1881.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR, *R.*

James G. Blaine, } Sec. State.  
 F. T. Frelinghuysen, }  
 Robert T. Lincoln, Sec. War.  
 William H. Hunt, } Sec. Navy.  
 W. E. Chandler, }  
 Wayne MacVeagh, } Att. Gen.  
 Benj. H. Brewster, }

William Windom, } Sec. Treas.  
 Charles J. Folger, }  
 S. J. Kirkwood, } Sec. Interior.  
 H. M. Teller, }  
 T. L. James, } Post. Gen.  
 Timothy O. Howe, }

1885.

GROVER CLEVELAND, *D.**James G. Blaine, R.**Benjamin F. Butler, L.**John P. St. John, P.*

Thomas F. Bayard, Sec. State.  
 William C. Endicott, Sec. War.  
 William C. Whitney, Sec. Navy.  
 William F. Vilas, } Post. Gen.  
 Don M. Dickinson, }

THOMAS A. HENDRICKS, *D.**John A. Logan, R.**William Daniels, P.*

Daniel Manning, } Sec. Treas.  
 Charles S. Fairchild, }  
 Augustus H. Garland, Att. Gen.  
 Lucius Q. C. Lamar, } Sec. Interior.  
 William F. Vilas, }

1889.

BENJAMIN HARRISON, *R.**Grover Cleveland, D.**Clinton P. Fisk, P.**Belva A. B. Lockwood, N. E. R.*

James G. Blaine, Sec. State.  
 Redfield Proctor, } Sec. War.  
 Stephen B. Elkins, }  
 Benjamin F. Tracy, Sec. Navy.  
 John Wanamaker, Post. Gen.

LEVI PARSONS MORTON, *R.**Allen Granbery Thurman, D.*

William Windom, } Sec. Treas.  
 Charles Foster, }  
 William H. H. Miller, Att. Gen.  
 John W. Noble, Sec. Interior.  
 Jeremiah M. Rusk, Sec. Agric.

1893.

GROVER CLEVELAND, *D.**Benjamin Harrison, R.**James B. Weaver, P.*

Walter Q. Gresham, Sec. State.  
 Daniel S. Lamont, Sec. War.  
 Hilary A. Herbert, Sec. Navy.  
 Wilson S. Bissell, Post. Gen.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON, *D.**Whitelaw Reid, R.**James G. Field, P.*

John G. Carlisle, Sec. Treas.  
 Richard Olney, Att. Gen.  
 Hoke Smith, Sec. Interior.  
 J. Sterling Morton, Sec. Agric.



## I N D E X.

---

- Adam and Eve, 76.
- Adams, Abigail, 60, 61, 87.  
 Charles Francis, 60, 61, 133, 134, 135, 178, 258, 319.  
 Henry, 36, 130, 136.  
 JOHN, biography of, 36-60; mentioned, 10, 20, 23, 60, 61, 68, 72, 84, 121, 187, 251.  
 JOHN QUINCY, biography of, 120-133; mentioned, 60, 78, 109, 110, 113, 117, 152, 153, 154, 159, 167, 198, 199, 209, 219, 228, 250, 278, 279, 291.  
 Samuel, 39, 52, 54, 79, 442.
- African colonization, 255.
- Agassiz, Professor Louis, 397.
- Akerman, Amos T., 387.
- Alabama claims, 382.
- Albany regency, 179.
- Alexander of Russia, 125.
- Alexandria, Va., 25, 26.
- Alfred the Great, 27.
- Alleghany mountains, 13.
- Allen, Lewis F., 468.  
 William, 404.
- Ambassador to England, 335.
- Ambrister, Robert, 127, 151.
- Amelia Court-House, Va., 368.
- American college, Rome, 458.  
 constitutions, 50.  
 credit, 51.  
 Herd book, 468.  
 loyalists, 48.  
 merchant marine, 459.  
 system, 198.  
 Speaker, 336.
- Ames, Oakes, 437.
- Amiens, treaty of, 104.
- Ampudia, General, 238, 239.
- Anderson, Major Robert, 297, 302.
- Andrew, John A., 135.
- Anti-masons, the, 130, 162.
- Antietam, battle of, 311, 319.
- Appalachicola massacre, 150.
- Appleton, William H., 326.
- Appomattox Court-House, 327, 370, 372.
- Arbuthnot, Alexander, 127, 151.
- Arctic expedition, 461.
- Arista, General, 223, 238, 239.
- Arlington estate, Va., 33.
- Armistead, Miss Mary, 195.
- Armstrong, General John, 144, 147, 191.
- Army of the Cumberland, 359, 432, 442.  
 Northern Virginia, 360.  
 the Potomac, 311, 319, 359, 360, 362, 366, 447.
- Arnold, Benedict, 14, 71.  
 Isaac N., 333.  
 of Rugby, 441.
- ARTHUR, CHESTER ALAN, biography of, 444-467; mentioned, 335, 416, 447.  
 Mrs. Ellen Herndon, 464.  
 Rev. William, 444, 467.
- Ashburton, Lord, 284.  
 treaty, 210.
- Asken, John A., 337.
- Atkinson, General Henry, 235.
- Atlanta captured, 322.
- Atlanta, siege of, 497.
- Bacon, Edmund, 85.  
 William R., 346.
- Bad Axe, battle of, 236.
- Badeau's Life of Grant, 394.
- Badger, George E., 193, 207.
- Ball, Thomas, 29, 332.
- Ballou, Miss Eliza, 426.
- Bancroft, George, 19, 85, 108, 117, 181, 222, 230.

- Banks, Nathaniel P., 245, 358, 359, 360.  
 Barbary pirates, 80.  
 Barnburner faction, 117.  
 Barry, William T., 155.  
 Bass, Lyman K., 469.  
 Bates, Edward, 307.  
 Bayard, James A., 125.  
     Richard H., 205.  
     Thomas F., 335, 475.  
 Beaumarchais, P. A. C. de, 73.  
 Beauregard, Pierre G. T., 309, 354.  
 Beecher, Henry Ward, 394.  
 Belknap, William W., 387.  
 Bell, John, 193, 219, 307, 337.  
 Belmont, battle of, 351.  
 Benicia barracks, 345.  
 Benton, Thomas H., 117, 144, 153, 154,  
     162, 164, 166, 199, 200, 204, 261, 281.  
 Bering sea case, 503.  
 Berlin decrees, 104.  
 Bermuda Hundred, 361.  
 Bernard, Governor, 38.  
 Berrien, John M., 155.  
 Biddle, Nicholas, 161.  
 Bienvenu plantation, 148.  
 Big Bethel, battle of, 431.  
 Birney, James G., 211.  
 Bissell, Wilson S., 252, 482.  
 Black Hawk, 119, 235, 236, 237, 302.  
 Black, Jeremiah S., 290.  
 Blair, Francis P., 158, 163, 166, 200, 326.  
     Montgomery, 200, 307.  
 Blaine, James G., 405, 435, 438, 439, 440,  
     448, 464, 467, 473, 502, 503.  
 Blatchford, Samuel, 462.  
 Bliss, Miss Elizabeth, 244.  
 Blount, James H., 483.  
 Boice, Adolph E., 387.  
 Bolivar, General Simon, 192.  
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, 27, 80, 112.  
 Boone, Daniel, 300.  
 Boston Athenæum, 29.  
     Gazette, 38, 40.  
     Latin school, 133.  
     Massacre, 39.  
     Public Library, 12.  
     Tea-party, 44.  
     United States frigate, 43.  
 Botetourt, Lord, 65.  
 Botts, John Minor, 206.  
 Boutwell, George S., 387.  
 Bowdoin, James, 22.  
 Bowen, General, 357.  
 Boylston, Miss Susannah, 36.  
 Braddock, General, 7, 36.  
 Brady, John R., 452.  
 Branch, John, 155.  
 Brandywine, battle of, 14.  
 Breckinridge, John C., 273, 290, 307, 360,  
     361.  
 Brent, Richard, 196, 202.  
 Brewster, Benjamin H., 454.  
 Bridport, Lord, 27.  
 Bristow, Benjamin H., 387, 405, 448.  
     Commercial treaty, 49.  
 British flag honored, 454.  
     and Hessian prisoners, 71.  
 Brooks, Peter C., 133.  
 Brougham, Lord, 27.  
 Brown, Aaron V., 217, 290.  
     Henry K., 29, 332.  
     Major Jacob, 239.  
     Matthew, 85.  
 Browne, Sir Thomas, 257.  
 Bryant, William C., 166.  
 BUCHANAN, JAMES, biography of, 277-  
     299; mentioned, 178, 212, 222, 257,  
     270, 272, 338.  
 Buckland, Ralph P., 397.  
 Buckner, General Simon B., 353.  
 Bucktails, the, 171.  
 Buell, General Don Carlos, 310, 353, 354,  
     430, 431, 432.  
 Buena Vista, battle of, 240.  
 Buffalo Historical Society, 261.  
 Bull Run, battle of, 309, 460.  
 Bunker Hill, battle of, 12.  
 Burgoyne's army, 70.  
     surrender, 42.  
 Burke, Edmund, Reflections, 75.  
 Burnside, General Ambrose E., 318, 320.  
     in Knoxville, 359.  
     monument, 464.  
 Burr, Colonel Aaron, 53, 54, 58, 78, 143,  
     169.  
     Samuel J., 193.  
 Burt, Silas W., 449, 450.  
 Bushnell, Dr. Horace, 194.  
 Butler, Benjamin F., 171, 182, 473.  
     General Benjamin F., 360.  
     William Allen, 181.  
 Cabell, Joseph C., 83, 85.  
 Calhoun, John C., mentioned, 113, 117,  
     127, 128, 149, 157, 158, 160, 166, 175,  
     179, 196, 201, 211, 251, 282.

- Calhoun, Mrs. John C., 157.  
 John, surveyor, 303.
- Calumet Club, Chicago, 394.
- Cameron, J. Donald, 387.  
 Simon, 307.
- Campbell, James, 269.
- Canada rebellion, 176.
- Canadian sealers, 503.
- Canby, General E. R. S., 245, 367.
- Cannon, Newton, 219.
- Carleton House, New York, 211.
- Carlisle, John G., 482.
- Carpenter, Frank B., 332.
- Carpenter's Hall, 10, 11.
- Carroll, Arthur E., 275.
- Cartwright, Rev. Peter, 303.
- Cass, General Lewis, mentioned, 158, 177,  
 178, 268, 272, 290.
- Catherine of Russia, 45.
- Cedar Creek, battle of, 400.
- Central American affairs, 285, 286.
- Cerro Gordo, battle of, 348.
- Chalmette plantation, 147.
- Chamberlain, Daniel H., 409.
- Chamberlayne, William, 30.
- Champion Hill, battle of, 358.
- Chancellorsville, battle of, 320.
- Chandler, William E., 454.  
 Zachary, 387.
- Chantrey, Sir Francis, 29.
- Chapultepec, battle of, 267, 349.
- Charles the First, 185.
- Charlotte, Queen, 61.
- Chase, Salmon P., 307, 317, 340.
- Chatham, Earl of, 8, 10, 107.
- Chattanooga, battle of, 359.
- Chegary institute, N. Y., 214.
- Cherokees and Creeks, 145, 159.
- Chesapeake and Ohio canal, 93.
- Chesapeake, United States frigate, 81,  
 104.
- Chester, Thomas L., 1.
- Chicago conventions, 451, 464, 499.
- Chickamauga, battle of, 432.
- Childress, Joel and Elizabeth, 231.
- Choate, Rufus, 205.
- Christian, Letitia, 196.  
 Robert, 196, 214.
- Churubusco, battle of, 349.
- Cipher despatches, 414.
- Civil-service reform, 380, 406, 410, 421,  
 442.
- Clarendon, Lord, 289.
- Clarke, George Rogers, 71, 333.
- Clay, General Green, 190.  
 Henry, mentioned, 104, 125, 127, 128,  
 152, 153, 154, 158, 177, 179, 191, 196,  
 199, 201, 202, 204, 206, 221, 222, 224,  
 225, 250, 256.
- Claypole, the printer, 24.
- Clayton-Bulwer treaty, 284, 286, 288, 291,  
 456.  
 John Middleton, 242.
- Clem murder case, 494.
- CLEVELAND, GROVER, biography of, 468-  
 491; mentioned, 35, 252, 466, 498.  
 Moses, 468.  
 Mrs. Frances, 491.  
 Richard Falley, 468.  
 Rose Elizabeth, 468.
- Clifford, Nathan, 462.
- Clinton, DeWitt, 105, 170, 171.  
 George, 17, 53, 104, 170.  
 Henry L., 445.
- Clintonian Federalists, 171.  
 Republicans, 171.
- Cobb, Howell, 290.
- Cobbett, William, 167.
- Coke upon Lyttleton, 64.
- Cold Harbor, battle of, 322.
- Coleridge, Chief-Justice, 502.
- Coles, Miss Mary, 106.
- Colfax, Schuyler, 433.
- Commercial treaties, 453.
- Compromise measures, 268, 271, 287, 493.
- Confederate envoys, 326, 331.  
 States, 307.
- Congressional nullification, 442.
- Conkling, Mrs. Margaret C., 32.  
 Roscoe, 385, 405, 439, 448, 449, 452,  
 462.
- Conrad, Charles M., 252.  
 Robert T., 243.
- Constellation, United States frigate, 57.
- Constitution, History of the, 117.
- Constitutional amendment, 343.
- Conway, Miss Nelly, 88.  
 Moncure, D., 1.
- Coolidge, Thomas J., 118.
- Cooper Institute, New York, 306.
- Cooper, J. Fenimore, 166.  
 Thomas Apthorpe, 214.
- Corcoran, William Wilson, 259.
- Corinth, battle of, 355.
- Cornell, Alonzo B., 416, 448, 450.
- Cornwallis, Lord, 14, 46, 71, 72, 90, 454.

- Corporal's guard, the, 209.  
 Corwin, Thomas, 252.  
 Cowen's law reports, 179.  
 Cox, General Jacob D., 387.  
 Craigie mansion, 12.  
 Craik, Dr. James, 17, 25, 26.  
 Crampton's dismissal, 269.  
 Cranch, Judge William, 251.  
 Crawford, George W., 242.  
     Thomas, 29.  
     William H., 113, 127, 128, 149, 153,  
         156, 157, 173, 198.  
 Credit Mobilier, 437.  
 Creek Indian treaty, 149.  
 Creswell, John A. J., 387.  
 Crittenden compromise, 296.  
     John J., 193, 207, 252, 296.  
 Crockett, Colonel David, 146, 181.  
 Cromwell, Oliver, 185, 243.  
 Crook, General George, 398.  
 Culver, Erastus D., 444.  
 Cumberland Gap, Va., 432.  
     road bill, 114.  
 Curtis, George Ticknor, 298.  
     George William, 448.  
 Cushing, Caleb, 269, 296.  
 Custis, Eleanor Parke, 31, 34, 35.  
     George W. P., 31, 32.  
     John Parke, 9, 31, 34.  
     Martha Parke, 9, 31.  
  
 Dallas, George M., 221, 230.  
 Dana, Francis, 120, 124.  
     Richard H., 136.  
 Dandridge, John, 9, 29.  
     Mrs. Elizabeth, 244.  
 Darwin, Erasmus, 63.  
 Davie, William R., 57.  
 Davies, Henry E., 249.  
     Rev. Samuel, 8.  
 Davis, Judge David, 452.  
     Henry Winter, 433.  
     Jefferson, 269, 273, 307, 325, 326.  
     Mrs. Sarah K., 244.  
     Rev. Thomas, 26.  
 Davila, Discourses on, 53.  
 Dawson, Moses, 193.  
 Deane, Silas, 43, 69.  
 Dearborn, Henry, 79.  
 Decatur, Commodore Stephen, 80.  
 Decatur's apophthegm, 237.  
 Declaration of Independence, 13, 69, 492.  
 De Golyer contract, 437.  
  
 Delano, Columbus, 387.  
 Democratic party, 442.  
 Dennison, William, 308, 430.  
 Dent, Captain George, 395.  
     Ellen Wrenshall, 395.  
     Frederick, 395.  
     Miss Julia, 395.  
     Miss Julia B., 349.  
 Depew, Chauncey M., 499.  
 Derby, Earl of, 258.  
 Devens, General Charles, 408.  
 Dickinson, Charles, 143.  
     college, Pennsylvania, 277.  
     Daniel S., 340.  
     John, 41, 42, 61.  
 Dix, General John A., 296.  
 Dobbin, James C., 269.  
 Dodge, General Henry, 236.  
 Donelson, Andrew J., 168.  
     Colonel John, 139, 140, 167.  
     Fort, capture of, 352.  
     Mrs. Emily, 168.  
     Rachel, 139.  
 Douglas, Stephen A., 268, 271, 272, 273,  
     289, 304, 305, 306.  
 Downing, Major Jack, 167.  
 Draper, Lyman C., 88.  
 Dred Scott decision, 180.  
 Drexel, Joseph W., 393.  
 Duane, William J., 163, 164.  
 Duché, Rev. Dr. Jacob, 11.  
 Du Simitière, Pierre Eugene, 29.  
 Dutch government, the, 45.  
  
 Early, General Jubal, 322, 363, 364.  
 Eaton, John H., and wife, 155, 157, 168.  
 Edward, Ninian W., and wife, 333, 334.  
 Edwards, Dr. Jonathan, 8.  
 Elberon, N. J., 440.  
 Elliot's Debates, 106.  
 Ellsworth, Oliver, 57, 89.  
 Emancipation proclamation, 316.  
 Embargo act of 1807, 82.  
 Emmons, William, 180.  
 Emory, General William H., 384.  
 Endicott, William C., 475.  
 Enforcement act, 378, 380.  
 Epaminondas, 27.  
 Eppes, Francis, 82.  
     John Wayles, 87.  
 Era of good feeling, 116, 126.  
 Ericsson's inventions, 166.  
 Este, Judge David K., 194.

- Evarts, William M., 3, 408, 446.  
 Everett, Edward, 28, 128, 133, 252, 270.  
 Ewell's army corps, 361.  
 Ewing, Andrew, 345.  
     Thomas, 193, 205, 207.
- Fairfax of Belvoir, 4, 5, 26.  
     William, 5.
- Faneuil Hall, Boston, 434, 463.  
 Farragut, Admiral D. G., 160, 310.  
 Fauquier, Governor Francis, 63.  
 Federal taxation, 90.  
 Federalists, the, 128, 153.  
 Fenian outbreaks, 372.  
 Fessenden, William P., 308.  
 Fifty-four forty, or fight, 212.  
 Filibustering expeditions, 270.
- FILLMORE, MILLARD, biography of, 246-  
     261; mentioned, 183, 466, 490.  
     Millard Powers, 259.  
     Mrs. Abigail, 258.  
     Mrs. Caroline C., 259.  
     Nathaniel, 246, 247.
- Finch, Judge Sherman, 397.  
 Fish, Hamilton, 387.  
 Fishback, William P., 493.  
 Fisher's Hill, battle of, 399.  
 Fiske, Professor John, 28.  
 Fitzhugh, Mary Lee, 33.  
 Five Forks, battle of, 327, 368.  
 Fleming, Miss Anna, 106.  
     Sir Thomas, 106.
- Florida acquired, 126, 152.  
 Floyd, General John B., 163, 290, 353.  
 Folger, Charles J., 454, 470.  
 Folsom, Miss Frances, 491.  
 Foot's resolutions, 160.  
 Foote, Admiral, 352.  
 Force bill, the, 199.  
 Ford, Worthington C., 1, 28, 84.  
 Ford's theater, Washington, 329.  
 Forest Lawn cemetery, 259.  
 Forrest, Edwin, 182.  
     General N. B., 345, 353.
- Fort Barrancas, 147.  
     Bowyer, 147.  
     Crawford, 235, 236.  
     Donelson, 310.  
     Duquesne, 8.  
     Harrison, 234.  
     Henry, 310, 352.  
     Mimms, 145.  
     Necessity, 6.
- Fort Pitt, 8.  
     Sumter, 273.
- Forward, Walter, 208.  
 Franklin, Benjamin, 37, 43, 47, 48, 50, 68,  
     69, 70, 72, 73.  
     Square, New York, 21.
- Fraunce's Tavern, New York, 17.  
 Frederick the Great, 13, 261.  
 Fredericksburg, battle of, 320.  
 Freeman, Edward A., 134.  
 Freemasons, the, 130.  
 Freesoil banner, 177.  
     party, 180.
- Frelinghuysen, Frederick T., 454.  
     Theodore, 175, 280.
- Fremont, General John C., 257, 289, 290,  
     312, 430, 446.
- French Directory, the, 142.  
     indemnity, 130.  
     in Mexico, 326.  
     spoliation claims, 165, 462.  
     West Indies, 55.
- Frothingham, Rev. N. L., 133.
- Fry, Colonel Joshua, 6.  
     Joseph R., 243.
- Frye, William, 405.
- Fugitive slave law, 253, 268.
- Fuller, Chief-Justice, 482.
- Gag rule in Congress, 131, 132.
- Gaines, General Edmund P., 235, 238.
- Gallatin, Albert, 79, 125, 136, 170.
- Gambier, Lord, 125.
- Gardiner, Miss Julia, 214, 215.
- Gardiners of Gardiner's island, 214.
- Gardner, Henry G., 447.
- Garfield, Abram, and wife, 426.
- GARFIELD, JAMES ABRAM, biography of,  
     426-443; mentioned, 261, 334, 392,  
     421, 451, 465, 498.  
     Mrs. Lucretia R., 443.
- Garland, Augustus H., 348, 475.  
     Mrs. Mary S., 35.
- Garnett, Muscoe R. H., 35.
- Garrison, William Lloyd, 445.
- Gates, General Horatio, 15, 17.
- Gay, Sidney Howard, 106.
- Geauga seminary, 427.
- Genet, Edmund Charles, 24, 96, 121.
- Geneva arbitration, the, 135.
- Gentleman's Magazine, the, 69.
- Gentry, Meredith P., 338.
- George the Third, 44, 45, 50, 61.

- Germantown, battle of, 14.  
 Gerry, Elbridge, 56, 57.  
 Gettysburg, battle of, 320.  
 Gibraltar, surrender of, 48.  
 Giddings, Joshua R., 432, 442.  
 Giles, William B., 196, 202.  
 Gilman, Daniel C., 118.  
 Goose Nest Prairie, 302.  
 Gordon, General John B., 424.  
 Gouverneur, Samuel L., 117.  
 Graham, William A., 252.  
 Granger, Francis, 193, 207.  
     Gideon, 79.  
 Grant Club, New York, 447.  
     Frederick D., 395, 396.  
     Jesse R., 347.  
     Matthew, 346.  
     Mrs. Julia D., 395.  
 GRANT, ULYSSES SIMPSON, biography of,  
     347-394; mentioned, 155, 310, 320,  
     321, 334, 341, 396, 400, 403, 416, 438,  
     447.  
 Gray, Judge Horace, 462.  
 Grayson, William, 99, 109, 110.  
 Greeley, Horace, 135, 326, 382.  
     Lieutenant A. W., 461.  
 Green, General Duff, 155, 158.  
 Greenough, Horatio, 29.  
 Gresham, Walter Q., 454, 482.  
 Greytown bombarded, 269.  
 Gridley, Jeremiah, 38.  
 Grierson's raid, 359.  
 Grinnell Land, 461.  
 Grover, Rev. Stephen, 468.  
 Grund, Francis J., 180.  
 Grundy, Felix, 217, 283.  
 Gun-foundry board, 459.  
 Guthrie, James, 269.  
  
 Haines's Bluff, battle of, 355.  
 Hale, Edward Everett, 28.  
     John P., 262, 265.  
     Sir Matthew, 2, 64.  
 Hall, Nathan K., 249, 252.  
 Halleck, Fitz-Greene, 182, 183.  
     General Henry W., 311, 352, 354.  
 Hamer, Thomas L., 347.  
 Hamilton, Alexander, 22, 23, 24, 25, 53,  
     54, 55, 58, 70, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 89,  
     94, 95, 97, 98, 110, 116, 260.  
 Hamiltonian Federalism, 178.  
 Hammond, George, 76.  
 Hampden Sidney college, 186.  
  
 Hampton Roads, 331.  
     General Wade, 409, 410.  
 Hancock, John, 39.  
     General Winfield S., 363, 373, 374,  
     439.  
 Harris, Isham G., 345.  
     Senator Ira, 329.  
 Harrison, Benjamin, of Virginia, 68, 69,  
     185, 186, 492.  
 HARRISON, BENJAMIN, biography of, 492-  
     506; mentioned, 396, 479, 482.  
     Colonel John, 185.  
     gold medal, 191.  
     John Scott, 193, 194, 492.  
     Landing, Va., 310.  
     Mrs. Anna, 194.  
     Mrs. Caroline L., 506.  
     the Regicide, 492.  
 HARRISON, WILLIAM HENRY, biography  
     of, 185-193; mentioned, 175, 177, 202,  
     204, 207, 220, 283, 334.  
 Hartranft, General John T., 405.  
 Harvard university, 36, 133, 136.  
 Hatton, Frank, 454.  
 Haven, Solomon G., 249.  
 Hawaiian Islands, 482.  
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 166, 262, 275.  
 HAYES, RUTHERFORD B., biography of,  
     379-425; mentioned, 387, 448, 467.  
     Mrs. Lucy Ware, 425.  
 Hayne, Robert T., 160.  
 Healy, George P. A., 275, 332.  
 Hendricks, Thomas A., 472, 494, 495,  
     498.  
 Henry, James B., 286.  
     Patrick, 10, 31, 64, 67, 68, 74, 99, 106,  
     186, 333.  
 Herbert, Hilary A., 482.  
 Hermitage, the, 137, 166.  
 Herndon, Ellen Lewis, 464.  
     Captain William L., 464.  
 Hessians and British, 70.  
 Hoar, Ebenezer, 337.  
     George F., 435.  
 Hoes, Hannah and Mary, 169.  
 Hoffman, Miss Matilda, 183.  
     Ogden, 446.  
 Holland, William H., 180.  
 Hollywood Cemetery, 117, 213, 215.  
 Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 166.  
 Holy Alliance, the, 147.  
 Holt, Judge Joseph, 297.  
 Hone, Mayor Philip, 84.

- Hood, General John B., 322, 365.  
 Hooker, General Joseph, 320.  
 Hopkins, General, 234.  
   President, 429.  
 Horseshoe Bend, 145.  
 Houdon, Jean Antoine, 29.  
 Houston, General Samuel, 146.  
 Howard, General Oliver O., 243.  
 Howe, Lord William, 42.  
   Timothy O., 454.  
 Howells, William D., 333, 425.  
 Hubbard, Samuel D., 252.  
 Hull and Decatur, 125.  
   Captain Isaac, 105, 148.  
   General William, 189.  
 Hulseman letter, the, 254.  
 Humphrey, General David, 18.  
 Hunker faction, the, 177.  
 Hunt, Judge Ward, 462.  
   William H., 439.  
 Hunter, General David, 313, 362, 363.  
 Hutchinson, Elizabeth, 137.  
   Governor, 39, 40.
- Inaugural addresses, 193.  
 Indian legislation, 462.  
   Territory, 475, 476.  
 Inflation bill, the, 385.  
 Ingham, Samuel D., 155.  
 Inman, Henry, 184.  
 Insolvent laws, 174.  
 Instructions, draft of, 66.  
 Irving, Washington, 6, 17, 34, 166, 174, 180, 183, 247.  
 Italian republics, 51.
- JACKSON, ANDREW, biography of, 137-167; mentioned, 105, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 170, 191, 198, 200, 201, 202, 204, 213, 217, 218, 263, 279, 280, 282, 283, 337.  
   Hugh, 137.  
   Isaac R., 193.  
   Mrs. Rachel, 141, 167, 168.  
   Mrs. Sarah T., 168.  
   Thomas J., 245.  
 Jacksonians, 175, 199.  
 James, Thomas L., 416, 439, 452.  
 Japanese treaty, the, 254.  
 Jay, John, 23, 47, 49, 53, 55, 58, 73, 78, 90, 97, 98, 110.  
 Jay's English treaty, 77, 101, 102, 142, 187.
- JEFFERSON, THOMAS, biography of, 62-85; mentioned, 22, 23, 37, 50, 52, 54, 58, 59, 60, 86, 87, 101, 102, 107, 108, 112, 114, 115, 117, 124, 142, 169, 176, 180, 187, 195, 291, 333.  
   Lucy Elizabeth, 86.  
   Mary and Martha, 74, 86.  
   Peter, 62.  
   portraits, 85.  
 Jewell, Marshall, 387.
- JOHNSON, ANDREW, biography of, 336-346; mentioned, 135, 317, 372, 374, 435.  
   Louisa, 121.  
   Thomas, 121.  
   Mrs. Andrew, 345.  
   Reverdy, 242.  
   Richard M., 202, 220.  
   Sarah Bush, 301.  
 Johnson's law reports, 179.  
 Johnston, Albert Sidney, 310, 353, 354.  
   Harriet L., 299.  
   Henry E., 299.  
   Joseph E., 309, 322, 327, 341, 357, 360, 361, 365, 367, 370.  
 Jones, James C., 220.  
   John P., 385.  
   Joseph, 167.  
 Juarez, President, 318.  
 Jumonville, death of, 6.
- Kansas and Nebraska, 270, 271, 272, 338.  
 Kendall, Amos, 155, 156, 157, 158, 163.  
 Kennedy, John P., 252.  
 Kent, James, 172.  
 Kenyon college, Ohio, 397, 424.  
 Keokuk, Indian chief, 236.  
 Key, David M., 408.  
 King, Rufus, 97, 113, 172, 180.  
 King's Mountain, battle of, 147.  
 Kirkland, Mrs. Caroline M., 28.  
 Kirkwood, Thomas J., 439.  
 Kitchen cabinet, the, 155, 158, 161.  
 Knox, General Henry, 15, 22, 25, 74, 75.  
   James and Samuel, 216.  
 Kortright, Elizabeth and Lawrence, 117, 118.  
 Kosciuszko, Thaddeus, 79.  
 Kossuth, General Louis, 254.  
 Koszta, Martin, 269.
- Lady Franklin bay, 461.  
 Lafayette, General, 74, 75, 114, 118.  
   Madame, 118.

- La Force, prison of, 118.  
 Lake of the Woods, 108.  
 Lamar, Lucius Q. C., 475.  
 Lamont, Daniel S., 482.  
 Lane, Elliott T., 299.  
   Miss Harriet, 286, 289.  
 Laurens Court-House, 336.  
   Henry, 45.  
 La Vengeance, frigate, 56.  
 Lear, Colonel Tobias, 26.  
 Lee, Arthur, 43.  
   Francis Lightfoot, 70.  
   General Robert E., 33, 311, 314, 322,  
     326, 341, 361, 366, 369, 370, 371.  
   Henry, of Massachusetts, 163.  
   Mrs. Robert E., 276.  
   Richard Henry, 26, 42, 68, 99, 110, 185.  
 Legaré, Hugh S., 208, 211.  
 Leigh, Benjamin Watkins, 203.  
 Lemmon, Jonathan, 445.  
 Lenox Library, 24.  
 Leonard, Daniel, 40.  
 Leopard and Chesapeake, 81, 104, 123.  
 Lewis, Andrew, 34.  
   Captain George, 34.  
   Edward P. C., 35.  
   Fielding, 33.  
   Lawrence, 33, 34, 35.  
   Morgan, 169.  
   William B., 152, 155, 157.  
 Lexington, battle of, 16.  
 Leyden, ministry of, 120.  
 LINCOLN, ABRAHAM, biography of, 303-  
   335; mentioned, 132, 134, 161, 178,  
   180, 255, 258, 261, 290, 293, 294, 297,  
   339, 367, 370, 431, 442, 443, 460.  
   John, 300.  
   Levi, 79.  
   Mordecai, 300.  
   Mrs. Mary, 333, 334.  
   Park, Chicago, 394.  
   Robert T., 332, 334, 439, 454.  
   Samuel, 300.  
   Thomas, 301.  
   William W., 332, 334.  
 Lindenwald, 177, 178, 183.  
 L'Insurgente, frigate, 57.  
 Lippincott's Magazine, 135.  
 Literary vandalism, 259, 260.  
 Little Belt, sloop of war, 104.  
 Livingston, Edward, 158, 160.  
   Edward P., 170.  
   Robert R., 20, 68, 112, 175.  
 Longacre, James B., 104.  
 Longfellow, Henry W., 12, 166, 262, 397.  
 Long Island, battle of, 13.  
 Longstreet, General James, 359, 360.  
 Lossing, Benson J., 2, 13, 28, 32, 33.  
 Louisiana difficulties, 384.  
 Loyal legion, order of, 424.  
 Luzerne, Chevalier de la, 48.  
 McCauley, Miss Eliza, 336, 345.  
 McCarte mansion, 148.  
 McCay, Spruce, 138.  
 McClellan, General George B., 309, 311,  
   323, 324.  
 McClelland, Robert, 269.  
 McCloskey, Cardinal, 458.  
 McCrary, George, 408.  
 McCulloch, Hugh, 454.  
 McDowell, General Irwin, 309.  
 McDuffie, George, 219.  
 McElroy, John E., 467.  
   Mrs. Mary A., 467.  
 McIntosh, Mrs. Caroline C., 259.  
 McKee, James R., 506.  
 McLane, Louis, 158, 163.  
 McLean, John, 208.  
   House, Virginia, 369.  
 McMurdo, John, 195.  
 McNeil, General John H., 274.  
 Macaulay, Lord, 28.  
 Mackenzie, William L., 181.  
 Maclay, William, 20.  
 Macomb, General Alexander, 181.  
 MacVeagh, Wayne, 439.  
 Madison, Ambrose, 88.  
   and Jefferson, 136.  
   Captain Isaac, 88.  
 MADISON, JAMES, biography of, 88, 106;  
   mentioned, 14, 24, 65, 73, 79, 81, 82,  
   109, 113, 115, 116, 117, 170, 187, 189,  
   191, 195.  
   Mrs. Dolly, 184.  
 Madison Square Garden, 480.  
 Mahone, Senator, 452.  
 Malvern Hill, battle of, 310.  
 Mangum, Willie P., 175, 202.  
 Manning, Daniel, 475.  
 Marble cemetery, New York, 117.  
 Marbois, Count F. Barbé-, 81, 112.  
 Marcellus, a signature, 121.  
 Marcy, William L., 119, 156, 222, 268, 269.  
 Marshall, General Humphrey, 431.  
   Chief-Justice, 26, 28, 56, 58, 99, 109, 174.



- Marshall's Life of Washington, 73, 76.  
 Martin, Rev. Thomas, 88.  
 Mason and Dixon's line, 127, 273.  
 Mason, George, 70, 94, 99, 109.  
   James M., 318.  
   John Y., 270.  
 Mason and Slidell, 134.  
 Massachusetts cavalry, 135.  
   Historical Society, 15.  
 Matthews, Senator, 435.  
 Maximilian, Emperor, 292, 318.  
 Mayo, Robert, 167.  
 Mead, Larkin G., sculptor, 329.  
 Meade, General George G., 320, 360, 365.  
 Meadows, Great, battle of, 6, 7.  
 Meikleham, Mrs. S. R., 87.  
 Mercer, Colonel Hugh, 107.  
 Merchant marine, the, 379.  
 Meredith, William M., 242.  
 Merritt, General Edwin A., 416, 449, 450.  
 Mexican boundary, 126, 435.  
   treaty of 1883, 455.  
 Milan decrees, the, 104, 122.  
 Miller, William H. H., 439.  
 Millions for defence, 56.  
 Missionary Ridge, battle of, 321.  
 Mississippi valley, the, 48, 90.  
 Missouri compromise, the, 127, 198, 212, 293.  
 Mobile evacuated, 371.  
 Molino del Rey, battle of, 267, 319.  
 Monmouth, battle of, 14.  
 Monroe, Colonel James, 118.  
   doctrine, the, 114, 115, 127, 147, 174, 285, 292, 326, 378, 456, 475.  
   Mrs. Elizabeth, 118.  
 MONROE, JAMES, biography of, 107-118;  
   mentioned, 55, 81, 99, 150, 171, 172, 186, 213, 278, 414.  
   Spence, 107.  
 Montgomery, Henry, 193.  
 Monticello, Va., 64, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 74, 82, 83.  
 Montpelier, Va., 102, 104.  
 Morgan, General John, 399.  
   Governor Edwin D., 446, 447, 454.  
   William, 130.  
 Mormon polygamy, 475, 476.  
 Morrill, Lot M., 387.  
 Morris, Gouverneur, 55, 72, 93, 110.  
   Robert, 186.  
 Morse and Henry, 442.  
   John T., Jr., 60, 84, 133.  
 Morse, Mrs. S. F. B., 2.  
 Morton, J. Sterling, 482.  
   Oliver P., 405, 496.  
 Mosquito Indians, 285, 286.  
 Mount McGregor, 393.  
 Mount Vernon, 7, 9, 10, 17, 19, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 35.  
 Moustier, Count, quoted, 20.  
 Mulligan, Colonel James, 399.  
 Murphy, Colonel, dismissed, 355.  
 Murray, William Vans, 57.  
 Napoleon, Emperor, 57, 104, 122, 123, 143, 147.  
   the Third, 134, 292, 318.  
 Nashville, battle of, 323, 365, 497.  
 National United States banks, 458.  
   debt reduced, 387.  
   republicans, 201, 202.  
 Nebraska bill, the, 305.  
 Nelson, General Thomas, 72.  
 Nesselrode, Count, 279.  
 New England governments, 69.  
 New Orleans, battle of, 147.  
 New Orleans expedition, 463.  
 New York city riots, 319.  
 New York Historical Society, 85.  
 Newfoundland fisheries, 44, 48.  
 Nicholas, Colonel W. C., 78.  
   of Russia, 280.  
 Nichols, Francis T., 409, 410.  
 Nicholson, A. O. P., 177, 231.  
 Nickajack expedition, 139.  
 Nicola, Colonel Lewis, 14.  
 Nicolay, John G., 333.  
 North, Lord, government of, 44, 45.  
 Northwest Territory, 187.  
 Norton, Rev. John, 60.  
 Notes on Virginia, 73.  
 O'Connor, Charles, 446.  
 Offensive partisanship, 476.  
 Offutt, Denton, 302.  
 Okechobee, battle of, 237.  
 Old Hickory, 144, 166.  
 Old Point Comfort, 81.  
 Olney, Richard, 482.  
 Omnibus bill, the, 251.  
 Ord, General E. O. C., 365.  
 Oregon question, the, 210, 224.  
 Orne, Colonel, 7.  
 Orth, Godlove S., 497.  
 Ostend manifesto, the, 270.

- Oswald, Richard, 47.  
 Otis, James, eloquence of, 37, 38.  
 Overton, Judge Thomas, 139, 143, 150.
- Page, William, 332.  
 Paine, Judge Elijah, 445.  
 Paine's Rights of Man, 75.  
     Thomas, 79, 121, 137.  
 Pakenham, Sir Edward, 147.  
 Palfrey, John G., 135.  
 Palmerston, Lord, 134.  
 Palo Alto, battle of, 244, 348.  
 Panic of 1837, 165.  
 Panthemont, convent of, 87.  
 Parker, Edmund, 262.  
     General Ely S., 377.  
 Parsons, Theophilus, 121.  
 Parton, James, 84, 137, 167.  
 Patterson, David T., 346.  
     Mrs. Martha, 346.  
 Paulding, James Kirke, 28, 183.  
 Payne, John, 106.  
     Miss Dorothy, 106.  
 Peace Congress, the, 1882, 455.  
 Peale, Charles Wilson, 29, 31.  
     Rembrandt, 29, 85.  
 Pemberton, General John C., 320, 357.  
 Pendleton, Edmund, 10, 31, 68, 99.  
     George H., 402, 434.  
 Perkins, Charles C., 3, 29.  
 Perry's Japanese treaty, 269.  
 Peter the Great, 261.  
 Petersburg evacuated, 327, 328.  
 Philippe, Louis, 281.  
 Phillips, Captain John, 246.  
     Exeter academy, 334.  
 Pickens, Governor, 296.  
 Pickering, Thomas, 111, 121.  
 Pierce, Benjamin, 262.  
 PIERCE, FRANKLIN, biography of, 262-  
     276; mentioned, 178, 287, 289.  
     Mrs. Jane A., 275.  
 Pierrepoint, Edwards, 387.  
 Pierson, Hamilton W., 85.  
 Pillow, Gideon J., 217, 266, 353.  
 Pinckney, Charles C., 53, 55, 58, 78, 104,  
     111.  
     Thomas, 53, 54.  
 Pinkney, William, 112.  
 Pitt, William, 89.  
 Platt, Thomas C., 439, 452.  
 Pleasant Hill, battle of, 245.  
 Pocahontas of Virginia, 492.
- Pocket veto, 158.  
 Polk, Colonel Thomas, 216.  
 POLK, JAMES KNOX, biography of, 216-  
     232; mentioned, 177, 211, 250, 264,  
     284, 337.  
     Mrs. Sarah C., 231, 232.  
     Samuel, 216.  
 Pollock or Polk, Robert, 216.  
 Polygamy in Utah, 420, 462.  
 Ponca Indians, 422.  
 Pontiac, Indian chief, 144.  
 Pope, General John, 311, 350, 367.  
 Pope's Creek, Va., 1, 3.  
 Popular sovereignty, 305.  
 Port Hudson surrendered, 358.  
 Porter, Admiral David, 365, 367.  
     General Fitz-John, 310, 392, 460.  
 Postage, reduction of, 461.  
 Potter, Clarkson N., 414.  
 Prentiss, Sergeant S., 262.  
 Prescott, William H., 166.  
 President, United States frigate, 104.  
 Presidential nicknames, 182.  
 Preston, Captain, 39.  
     W. Ballard, 242.  
     William C., 184, 209.  
 Price, General Sterling, 351.  
 Priestly, Dr. Joseph, 79.  
 Prince of Wales, 299, 389.  
 Prince, John, 182.  
     L. Bradford, 449.  
 Princeton College, 33.  
 Princeton, United States steamer, 214.  
 Proctor, Colonel Henry, 189.  
 Prophet, the Indian, 188.  
 Public debt, the, 379, 420.  
 Publicola, a signature, 121.  
 Puritan and Blackleg, 128.  
 Putnam, General Israel, 15.
- Quincy, John, 120.  
     Josiah, 39, 133.
- Railway strikes, 411, 489.  
 Raleigh tavern, the, 66.  
 Ramsay, David, 28.  
 Randall, Henry S., 84.  
 Randolph, Edmund, 74, 94, 95, 109, 111.  
     Isham, 62.  
     John, 128, 136, 154, 199.  
     Mrs. Maria, 87.  
     Sarah N., 85, 87.  
     Thomas J., 85.

- Randolph, Thomas M., 74, 86.  
 Ransom, Colonel, 265.  
 Rathbone, Major Henry R., 329.  
 Rawlings, John A., 387.  
 Raymond, Henry J., 340.  
 Red river expedition, 360.  
 Reed, William B., 293.  
 Reeder, Andrew H., 272.  
 Religious Freedom act, 70.  
 Resaca de la Palma, 244, 348.  
 Resumption act, 415.  
 Richardson, William M., 387.  
 Richmond captured, 327.  
   Inquirer, 198, 212.  
   evacuated, 368.  
 Riverside park, New York, 394.  
 Rives, William C., 106, 203, 205, 207.  
 Robards, Captain Lewis, 139, 140, 141,  
   167.  
 Robertson, Donald, 88.  
   General, 139.  
   William H., 439, 452.  
 Robeson, George M., 387.  
 Robinson, Wyndham, 492.  
 Rogers, Randolph, 332.  
   William K., 398.  
 Rolfe, John, Gentleman, 492.  
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 449.  
 Rosecrans, General W. S., 355, 359, 398,  
   433.  
 Rudolph, Miss Lucretia, 443.  
 Rupert of debate, 258.  
 Rutledge, John, 11, 43, 97.  
 Russell, Jonathan, 125.  
   Lord John, 319.
- Sabine Cross-Roads, battle of, 245.  
 St. Augustine, seizure of, 151.  
 St. Clair, General Arthur, 186.  
 St. Eustatius, plunder of, 46.  
 St. Gaudens, Augustus, 332.  
 St. John, John P., 473.  
 St. John's church, 67.  
   college, 33.  
 Salisbury, Marquis of, 503.  
 Sanford, Nathan, 172.  
 Santa Anna, General, 240, 266.  
 Santo Domingo treaty, 378, 455.  
 Sartoris, Mrs. Algernon, 395.  
 Saviour of society, 163.  
 Schell, Augustus, 450.  
 Schley, Captain W. S., 461.  
 Schofield, General John M., 387, 467.
- Schouler, James, 116, 117, 167.  
 Schurz, General Carl, 408.  
 Scott, Miss Caroline L., 492, 506.  
   John W., 506.  
   General Winfield, 118, 149, 160, 181,  
   182, 236, 237, 240, 242, 266, 268, 270,  
   288, 294, 298.  
 Scylla and Charybdis, 55.  
 Seminole Indians, 145, 181.  
 Semple, Mrs. Letitia, 214.  
 Seneca Indians, 1.  
 Seven Pines, battle of, 310.  
 Sevier, General John, 143.  
 Sewall, Jonathan, 38.  
 Seward, William H., 132, 306, 307, 317,  
   331, 341.  
 Seymour, Horatio, 375, 447.  
 Sharpe, Governor, 7.  
 Shaw, Major, quoted, 15.  
 Shays's rebellion, 18.  
 Sheffield, Lord, 50.  
 Shelburne, Lord, 47.  
 Shelby, Governor William, 191.  
 Shepard, Edward M., 181.  
   Rev. Thomas, 60.  
 Sheridan, General Philip H., 322, 323,  
   361, 362, 364, 366, 368, 371, 373, 384,  
   457, 467, 476, 497.  
 Sherman, General William T., 3, 29, 322,  
   360, 362, 363, 366, 370, 396.  
 Roger, 68.  
   Senator John, 403, 407, 435, 438, 449,  
   499.  
 Sherwood Forest, 212, 213, 215.  
 Shields, General James, 266, 304.  
 Shiloh, battle of, 148, 310, 353, 354.  
 Shirley, Governor, 8.  
 Sigel, General Franz, 360, 361.  
 Silver coinage, 413, 414, 458, 480, 486, 504.  
 Simpson, Miss Hannah, 347.  
 Singleton, Richard, 184.  
 Skelton, Bathurst, 86.  
   Mrs. Martha, 66, 86.  
 Slater education fund, 424.  
 Slidell, John, 284, 318.  
 Small, Dr. William, 63.  
 Smith, Caleb B., 307.  
   General E. Kirby, 327, 371.  
   Gerrit, 445.  
   Hoke, of Georgia, 482.  
   Miss Abigail, 37.  
   Richard, 243.  
   Robert, 79.

- Smith, William, 60, 202, 207.  
 Soulé, Pierre, 270.  
 Southard, William L., 207, 280.  
 South Mountain, battle of, 311.  
 Spanish reciprocity, 475.  
 Sparks, Dr. Jared, 2, 9, 28.  
 Spartan firmness, 170.  
 Specie payments, 385, 420.  
 Speed, James, 308.  
 Spencer, Ambrose, 172.  
   John C., 249.  
 Spoils system, 129, 156.  
 Squatter sovereignty, 293.  
 Stalwart Republicans, 440.  
 Stanford university, 505.  
 Stanton, Edwin M., 297, 308, 344.  
 Stark, Colonel John, 140.  
 State department, 503, 504.  
   rights, 202.  
   sovereignty, 436.  
 Stevens, Edwin A., 35.  
 Stevenson, Andrew, 184.  
 Stewart, Alexander T., 387.  
 Stirling, Earl of, 107.  
 Stone, Uriah, pioneer, 444.  
 Stoneman, General George S., 367.  
 Stowe, Mrs. Harriet B., 333.  
   Professor Calvin E., 262.  
 Story, Judge Joseph, 397.  
 Strikes in Illinois, 489.  
 Stuart, Alexander H. H., 242, 252, 256.  
   General J. E. B., 322.  
   Gilbert, 29, 35, 60, 105, 118.  
   John T., 303.  
 Sullivan, General, 42.  
 Sumner, William G., 167.  
 Sumter, Fort, attack on, 295, 297.  
   General, 137.  
 Swing, Professor David, 493.  
 Symmes, Miss Anna, 187.  
   John Cleves, 187.
- Taft, Judge Alonzo, 387, 404.  
 Talcott, General S. V., 447.  
 Talleyrand, Marquis, 46, 56, 57, 102, 112.  
 Talmadge, Nathaniel P., 209.  
 Taney, Roger B., 158, 164.  
 Tariff bill, 1884, 488.  
   of abominations, 159.  
   reform, 481.  
 Tayloe, Colonel Ogle, 257.  
 Taylor, Colonel Richard, 333.  
   General Richard, 244, 245.
- Taylor, Hancock, 233, 244.  
   James,  
     Mrs. Margaret, 243.  
 TAYLOR ZACHARY, 233-245; mentioned,  
   155, 178, 222, 250, 251, 304, 348.  
 Tazewell, Littleton W., 198.  
 Tecumseh, 144, 145, 187, 188, 189.  
 Teller, Henry M., 454.  
 Tennessee legislature, 153.  
 Tenure-of-office bill, 374.  
 Terry, General Alfred H., 365.  
 Thames, battle of the, 190, 191.  
 Thomas, General George H., 323, 359,  
   365, 431, 432, 442, 443.  
   General Lorenzo, 344.  
 Thompson, Colonel Jeff., 351.  
   Jacob, 290.  
   Richard W., 408.  
 Thompson's Presidents, 261.  
 Thurman, Allen G., 401.  
 Tilden, Samuel J., 245, 386, 406, 414.  
 Timberlake, Mrs., 157.  
 Tippecanoe, battle of, 189, 234.  
 Todd, John, 333.  
   Mrs. Dorothy P., 101, 106.  
   Miss Mary, 332.  
   Robert S., 333, 334.  
 Tompkins, Daniel D., 113, 169, 170.  
 Topeka convention, 293.  
 Toucey, Isaac, 290.  
 Trumbell, John, 29.  
   Lyman, 304.  
 Truxton, Captain, 57.  
 Tucker, George F., 118.  
   Professor George, 84.  
 Twiggs, Colonel David E., 150.  
 Tyler, Judge John, 94, 99, 195.  
 TYLER, JOHN, 195-213; mentioned, 192,  
   222, 283.  
   Lyon Gardiner, 198, 213, 215.  
   Mrs. Julia Gardiner, 213-214.  
   Mrs. Letitia, 214.  
   Mrs. Priscilla, 214.  
 Tyner, James A., 387.
- Underwood, Judge, 372.  
 Union Club, New York, 119.  
   Pacific railway, 136, 437.  
 United States bank, 161, 162, 170, 195,  
   200, 203, 205.  
   navy, 461.  
 University of New York, 171.  
 Upham, Charles W., 28.

- Upshur, Abel Parker, 208.  
 Usher, John Palmer, 308.  
 Utah commission, 462.
- Valentia, General, 266.  
 Vallandigham, Clement L., 319, 323.  
 Valley Forge, sufferings of, 14.  
 Van Alen, James J., 169.  
 Van Buren, Abraham, 169, 181, 182, 183.  
   John, 181, 182.  
 VAN BUREN, MARTIN, biography of, 169-  
   181; mentioned, 134, 155, 157, 162,  
   166, 192, 199, 200, 203, 205, 211, 219,  
   221, 283.  
   Mrs. Angelica, 184.  
   Mrs. Hannah, 181.  
 Vanderbilt, William H., 394.  
 Vanderlyn, John, 118.  
 Van Ness, William P., 169, 183.  
 Van Vechten, Abraham, 171.  
 Vassall mansion, the, 12.  
 Vauguyon, Duc de la, 45, 46.  
 Vergennes, Count, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 73.  
 Vernon, Admiral, 4.  
 Vicksburg, siege of, 320, 356, 358.  
 Victoria, Queen, 389.  
 Vilas, William T., 475.  
 Virgil, the poet, 69.  
 Virginia dynasty, the, 170.  
   Jefferson's, 62, 63.  
   University Magazine, 215.  
   University of, 35.  
 Virginius outrage, the, 383.  
 Volk, Leonard W., 332.  
 Volney, Count C. F., 79.  
 Von Holst, Herman E., 167, 176, 261.  
 Voorhees, Senator, 495.
- Waite, Chief-Justice, 452, 466, 475.  
 Waldo, Samuel P., 117.  
 Wales, Prince of, 299, 389.  
 Walker, Robert J., 222.  
   William, 269.  
 Wallace, General Lewis, 261, 505.  
 War Democrats, 166.  
 War of 1812, the, 104.  
 Ward, John Q. A., 443.  
 Warren, General Gouverneur K., 364.  
   General Joseph, 39.  
 Washburne, Elihu B., 376, 387.  
 Washington, Andrew, 1.  
   Augustine, 3.  
   Bushrod, 28.  
   Washington, capture of, 147.  
   Washington, Elizabeth, 33.  
 WASHINGTON, GEORGE, biography of,  
   1-29; mentioned, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34,  
   35, 41, 52, 68, 74, 76, 83, 93, 97, 101,  
   106, 107, 142.  
   Henry A., 84.  
   John, 1.  
   Lawrence, 4, 5.  
   Levi, 158.  
   Mrs. Martha, 29, 31, 32, 35.  
   Mrs. Mary, 2, 34.  
 Washington treaty, 381, 457.  
 Waters, Henry F., 1.  
 Wayles, John, 66, 86.  
   Martha, 86.  
 Wayne, General Anthony, 186.  
 Waxham settlement, 137.  
 Webb, Miss Lucy Ware, 425.  
 Webster, Daniel, 85, 117, 133, 142, 160,  
   175, 193, 201, 202, 205, 207, 208, 210,  
   252, 253, 256, 260, 268, 284, 436.  
   Historical society, 463.  
 Weed, Thurlow, 288.  
 Weems, Mason L., 28.  
 Welles, Gideon, 307.  
 Wellington, Duke of, 147, 155, 157.  
 Wentworth, John, 36, 41.  
 Wertmuller, Adolph U., 29.  
 Western Reserve, the, 426.  
 West India trade, 174.  
 Wheatland, Pa., 286, 298, 299.  
 Whisky frauds, 386.  
 White House, the, 86, 142, 215, 276, 346,  
   425, 467, 491.  
 White, Hugh L., 175, 202, 219, 337.  
 Whitney, William C., 475.  
 Whittier, John G., 166.  
 Wickliffe, Charles S., 208.  
 Wileland's Oberon, 121.  
 Wilderness, battle of, 322, 361, 467.  
 William and Mary college, 5, 62, 63, 71,  
   107, 195, 198, 215.  
 Williams college, 428, 429.  
 Williams, George H., 387.  
 Wilmot proviso, 172, 177, 178, 223, 227.  
 Wilson, James Grant, 261, 350, 359, 394.  
   James M., 437.  
 Winchester, battle of, 364, 369.  
 Winchester, General James, 188, 189.  
 Windom, William, 439, 454.  
 Windsor Castle, England, 389.  
 Winthrop, John, statue, 442.

Wirt, William, 113, 162, 163, 199.

Wise, Henry A., 213.

Woodbury, Dr. Robert, 244.

Levi, 262, 264.

Worth, General, 266, 348.

Wright, Silas, 250, 264.

Wythe, George, 63, 64, 70, 99.

X. Y. Z. despatches, 56, 57, 102.

Yates, Governor Richard, 350.

York, Sir Joseph, 46.

Yorktown, battle of, 14.

monument, 454.

surrender of, 454.

Young, John Russell, 394.

Yucatan's appeal, 284.

Zollicoffer, General, killed, 431.

THE END.

## D. APPLETON & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

---

"No library of military literature that has appeared in recent years has been so instructive to readers of all kinds as the Great Commanders Series, which is edited by General James Grant Wilson."—*New York Mail and Express*.

---

**G***REAT COMMANDERS.* A Series of Brief Biographies of Illustrious Americans. Edited by General JAMES GRANT WILSON. 12mo, cloth, gilt top, \$1.50 per volume.

This series forms one of the most notable collections of books that has been published for many years. The success it has met with since the first volume was issued, and the widespread attention it has attracted, indicate that it has satisfactorily fulfilled its purpose, viz., to provide in a popular form and moderate compass the records of the lives of men who have been conspicuously eminent in the great conflicts that established American independence and maintained our national integrity and unity. Each biography has been written by an author especially well qualified for the task, and the result is not only a series of fascinating stories of the lives and deeds of great men, but a rich mine of valuable information for the student of American history and biography.

The volumes of this series thus far issued, all of which have received the highest commendation from authoritative journals, are :

**ADMIRAL FARRAGUT.** By Captain A. T. MAHAN, U. S. N.  
**GENERAL TAYLOR.** By General O. O. HOWARD, U. S. A.  
**GENERAL JACKSON.** By JAMES PARTON.  
**GENERAL GREENE.** By Captain FRANCIS V. GREENE, U. S. A.  
**GENERAL J. E. JOHNSTON.** By ROBERT M. HUGHES, of Va.  
**GENERAL THOMAS.** By HENRY COPPÉE, LL. D.  
**GENERAL SCOTT.** By General MARCUS J. WRIGHT.  
**GENERAL WASHINGTON.** By General BRADLEY T. JOHNSON.  
**GENERAL LEE.** By General FITZHUGH LEE.

These are volumes of especial value and service to school libraries, either for reference or for supplementary reading in history classes. Libraries, whether public, private, or school, that have not already taken necessary action, should at once place upon their order-lists the **GREAT COMMANDERS SERIES**.

The following are in press or in preparation :

**General Hancock.** By General FRANCIS A. WALKER.  
**General Sherman.** By General MANNING F. FORCE.  
**General Grant.** By General JAMES GRANT WILSON.  
**Admiral Porter.** By JAMES F. SOLEY, late Assistant Sec. of Navy.  
**General Sheridan.** By General HENRY E. DAVIES.

"This series of books promises much, both by their subjects and by the men who have undertaken to write them. They are just the reading for young men and women; delightful reading for men and women of any age."—*The Evangelist*.

---

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 72 Fifth Avenue.

# APPLETONS' CYCLOPÆDIA OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY.

*Complete in six volumes, royal 8vo, containing about 800 pages each. With sixty-one fine steel portraits and some two thousand smaller vignette portraits and views of birthplaces, residences, statues, etc.*

APPLETONS' CYCLOPÆDIA OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY, edited by General JAMES GRANT WILSON, President of the New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, and Professor JOHN FISKE, formerly of Harvard University, assisted by over two hundred special contributors, contains a biographical sketch of every person eminent in American civil and military history, in law and politics, in divinity, in literature and art, in science and in invention. Its plan embraces all the countries of North and South America, and includes distinguished persons born abroad, but related to American history. As events are always connected with persons, it affords a complete compendium of American history in every branch of human achievement. An exhaustive topical and analytical Index enables the reader to follow the history of any subject with great readiness.

*From the Hon. GEORGE BANCROFT.*

"It is the most complete volume that exists on the subject. The tone and guiding spirit of the book are certainly very fair, and show a mind bent on a discriminate, just, and proper treatment of its subject."

*From the Hon. JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.*

"The portraits are remarkably good. To any one interested in American history or literature, the Cyclopædia will be indispensable."

*From NOAH PORTER, D. D., LL. D., ex-President of Yale College.*

"The selection of names seems to be liberal and just. The portraits, so far as I can judge, are faithful, and the biographies trustworthy."

*From the Hon. WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE.*

"A most valuable and interesting work."

*From the Hon. ROBERT C. WINTHROP.*

"I have examined it with great interest and great gratification. It is a noble work, and does enviable credit to its editors and publishers."

*From J. B. FORAKER, ex-Governor of Ohio.*

"I have carefully examined 'Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography,' and do not hesitate to commend it to favor. It is admirably adapted to use in the family and the schools, and is so cheap as to come within the reach of all classes of readers and students."

*From FRANCES E. WILLARD, President N. W. C. T. U.*

"This book of American biography has come to me with a most unusual charm. It sets before us the faces of great Americans, both men and women, and gives us a perspective view of their lives. Where so many noble and great have lived and wrought, one is encouraged to believe the soil from which they sprang, the air they breathed, and the sky over their heads, to be the best this world affords, and one says, 'Thank God, I also am an American!' We have many books of biography, but I have seen none so ample, so clear-cut, and breathing so strongly the best spirit of our native land. No young man or woman can fail to find among these ample pages some model worthy of imitation."

*From the Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D. D.*

"I congratulate you on the beauty of the volume, and the thoroughness of the work."

*From CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.*

"Every day's use of this admirable work confirms me in regard to its comprehensiveness and accuracy."

*Price, per volume, cloth or buckram, \$5.00; sheep, \$6.00; half calf or half morocco, \$7.00. Sold only by subscription. Descriptive circular, with specimen pages, sent on application. Agents wanted for districts not yet assigned.*

---

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 72 Fifth Avenue.





JOHN BACH MCMASTER.

**H**ISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, from the Revolution to the Civil War. By JOHN BACH MCMASTER. To be completed in five volumes. Vols. I, II, and III now ready. 8vo, cloth, gilt top, \$2.50 each.

In the course of this narrative much is written of wars, conspiracies, and rebellions; of Presidents, of Congresses, of embassies, of treaties, of the ambition of political leaders, and of the rise of great parties in the nation. Yet the history of the people is the chief theme. At every stage of the splendid progress which separates the America of Washington and Adams from the America in which we live, it has been the author's purpose to describe the dress, the occupations, the amusements, the literary canons of the times; to note the changes of manners and morals; to trace the growth of that humane spirit which abolished punishment for debt, and reformed the discipline of prisons and of jails; to recount the manifold improvements which, in a thousand ways, have multiplied the conveniences of life and ministered to the happiness of our race; to describe the rise and progress of that long series of mechanical inventions and discoveries which is now the admiration of the world, and our just pride and boast to tell how, under the benign influence of liberty and peace, there sprang up, in the course of a single century, a prosperity unparalleled in the annals of human affairs.

"The pledge given by Mr. McMaster, that 'the history of the people shall be the chief theme,' is punctiliously and satisfactorily fulfilled. He carries out his promise in a complete, vivid, and delightful way. We should add that the literary execution of the work is worthy of the indefatigable industry and unceasing vigilance with which the stores of historical material have been accumulated, weighed, and sifted. The cardinal qualities of style, lucidity, animation, and energy, are everywhere present. Seldom indeed has a book in which matter of substantial value has been so happily united to attractiveness of form been offered by an American author to his fellow-citizens."—*New York Sun*.

"To recount the marvelous progress of the American people, to describe their life, their literature, their occupations, their amusements, is Mr. McMaster's object. His theme is an important one, and we congratulate him on his success. It has rarely been our province to notice a book with so many excellences and so few defects."—*New York Herald*.

"Mr. McMaster at once shows his grasp of the various themes and his special capacity as a historian of the people. His aim is high, but he hits the mark."—*New York Journal of Commerce*.

"... The author's pages abound, too, with illustrations of the best kind of historical work, that of unearthing hidden sources of information and employing them, not after the modern style of historical writing, in a mere report, but with the true artistic method, in a well-digested narrative. . . . If Mr. McMaster finishes his work in the spirit and with the thoroughness and skill with which it has begun, it will take its place among the classics of American literature."—*Christian Union*.

"... This phase of American history is treated more intelligently and its effects more clearly traced than in any previous history. Take it all in all, the history promises to be the ideal American history. Not so much given to dates and battles and great events as in the fact that it is like a great panorama of the people, revealing their inner life and action. It contains with all its sober facts the spice of personalities and incidents which relieves every page from dullness."—*Chicago Inter-Ocean*.

"The author gives the events as they appear in the records of the time, with the comments which they evoked in the journals and pamphlets of the day. His own opinion is seldom intruded, and the reader is thus left to form his judgment from the evidence presented."—*The Critic*.

---

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 72 Fifth Avenue.

D. APPLETON & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

---

**T**HE HISTORY OF BIMETALLISM IN THE UNITED STATES. By J. LAURENCE LAUGHLIN, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Political Economy in Harvard University; author of "The Study of Political Economy," etc. With Sixteen Charts and numerous Tables. 8vo. Cloth, \$2.25.

"Prof. Laughlin's excellent work is timely and valuable. It re-enforces the suggestions of political sagacity and business prudence by the warnings of scientific investigation and foresight."—*New York Times*.

"The book is not a treatise on the theory of bimetallism, but is a history of bimetallism, the theory being discussed only so far as the hard facts in the country's experience have directly borne upon some part of the theory."—*Chicago Evening Journal*.

**F**INANCIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, FROM 1774 TO 1789, embracing the Period of the American Revolution. New edition, thoroughly revised. By ALBERT S. BOLLES, Professor in the Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania; Editor of "The Banker's Magazine." 8vo. Cloth, \$2.50.

**F**INANCIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, FROM 1789 TO 1860. By ALBERT S. BOLLES. 8vo. Cloth, \$3.50.

**F**INANCIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, FROM 1861 TO 1885. By ALBERT S. BOLLES. 8vo. Cloth, \$3.50.

"The difficulties, dangers, and triumphs of the Government's fiscal operations early in the war are well portrayed, and the wonderful course of the debt-paying outlined. The inception and progress of the national banks are described; also the system of internal taxation, the tariff, the whisky frauds, etc. The book is the best financial history the country has thus far."—*Chicago Tribune*.

"These volumes have been accepted as standard authorities on the subject-matter, both in this country and in Europe. We are thus put in possession of the entire facts in the fiscal policies of the latest born among the nations of the earth. It is manifest that they must embrace a mass of events which in their relations and sequence are of the highest interest and value to the student of human society."—*Philadelphia Times*.

**A** CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF OUR FINANCIAL POLICY DURING THE SOUTHERN REBELLION. By SIMON NEWCOMB. 16mo. Cloth, \$1.00.

"The objects of the essay are to trace our present financial system to its effects on the power of our Government, the permanence of our institutions, the future well-being of society, and other great national interests; to show how certain principles of social science are illustrated in its workings; and incidentally to inquire in what ways it may be improved."—*From the Preface*.

---

D. APPLETON & CO., 72 Fifth Avenue, New York.

D. APPLETON & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

---

**PUBLIC DEBTS: An Essay in the Science of Finance.**

By HENRY C. ADAMS, Ph. D., of the University of Michigan, and Cornell University. 8vo. Cloth, \$2.50.

**CONTENTS.**—Part I. PUBLIC BORROWING AS A FINANCIAL POLICY. Modern Public Debts; Political Tendencies of Public Debts; Social Tendencies of Public Debts; Industrial Effects of Public Borrowing; When may States Borrow Money?—Part II. NATIONAL DEFICIT FINANCIERING. Financial Management of a War; Classification of Public Debts; Liquidation of War Accounts; Peace Management of a Public Debt; Payment of Public Debts.—Part III. LOCAL DEFICIT FINANCIERING. Comparison of Local with National Debts; State Indebtedness between 1830 and 1850; Municipal Indebtedness; Policy of Restricting Governmental Duties.

“Dr. Adams has rendered an important service, in this painstaking treatise, both to financial science in general and to American financial history in particular. The social, political, and industrial effects of public borrowing and of interest paying are methodically unfolded. The mysteries and sophisms that have grown up like weeds about public debts are cleared away in language addressed to scholars, but not too creditable to be understood by any reader of fair education.”—*New York Evening Post*.

“Thoroughly admirable in its care and detail, and altogether the worthiest of recent publications on economics.”—*Boston Commercial Bulletin*.

**MONEY AND THE MECHANISM OF EXCHANGE.**

By W. STANLEY JEVONS, Professor of Logic and Political Economy in Owens College, Manchester. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.75.

“Prof. Jevons writes in a sprightly but colorless style, without trace of either prejudice or mannerism, and shows no commitment to any theory. The time is not very far distant, we hope, when legislators will cease attempting to legislate upon money before they know what money is; and, as a possible help toward such a change, Prof. Jevons deserves the credit of having made a useful contribution to a department of study too much neglected, but of late years, we are gratified to say, becoming less so.”—*New York Financier*.

“The author offers us what a clear-sighted, cool-headed, scientific student has to say on the nature, properties, and natural laws of money, without regard to local interests or national bias. His work is popularly written, and every page is replete with solid instruction of a kind that is just now lamentably needed by multitudes of our people who are victimized by the grossest fallacies.”—*Popular Science Monthly*.

**ELEMENTS OF ECONOMICS.** By HENRY DUNNING

MACLEOD, M. A., Barrister-at-Law, selected by the Royal Commissioners for the Digest of the Law to prepare the Digest of the Law of Bills of Exchange, Bank Notes, etc. Lecturer on Political Economy in the University of Cambridge. In two volumes. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.75 each.

“The author attempts to establish an exact science of economics on a mathematical basis—to establish ‘a new inductive science’; and he presents what he calls ‘a new body of phenomena brought under the dominion of mathematics.’”—*New York World*.

“A work which is destined to be of inestimable value to publicists and students. Mr. Macleod treats of the relation between value and quantity of labor and cost of production, holding that the relation between supply and demand is the sole regulator of value, and that value is the inducement to the production of profits.”—*St. Louis Republican*.

---

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 72 Fifth Avenue.

D. APPLETON & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

---

**T**HE FARMER'S SIDE. By Hon. W. A. PEPPER, U. S. Senator from Kansas. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00.

"This politico-economical treatise discusses such subjects as the General Average Progress of the Country, the Progress of Agriculture, the Mortgage Burden, the Changed Condition of the Farmer, the Farmer's Competitors, the Settlement of the New West, the Destroying Power of Usury, Contraction of the Currency, etc. These are all stirring questions of the day, and Senator Pepper states his side quite clearly. The book will be of great interest to politicians and politico-economists generally."—*Rochester Union and Advertiser*.

"The book will be interesting not only as an exhibit of what a leading advocate of paternal government thinks on that subject, but as a valuable compilation and collection of statistics on a question of living interest."—*Cincinnati Commercial Gazette*.

"The author performed a very useful service in the compilation of this work. In it he has condensed a vast amount of valuable statistical matter bearing upon the various industries of the country during the past forty years. . . . It deserves a wide circulation and a careful reading."—*Farm, Stock, and Home, Minneapolis, Minn.*

**S**ELECTED SPEECHES AND REPORTS ON FINANCE AND TAXATION, FROM 1859 TO 1878. By JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary of the Treasury. 8vo. Cloth, \$2.50.

"Whatever opinions sound thinkers may entertain with respect to some of the doctrines which Mr. Sherman has upheld upon occasion, there is no man in the country whose opinions with respect to financial matters are subjects of greater interest than are Mr. Sherman's."—*New York Evening Post*.

**C**URRENCY AND BANKING. By BONAMY PRICE, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Oxford. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

"The idea that the government stamp on the coin gives to money its value, the author disposes of in a sentence, yet it is a large part of the money argument."—*Hartford Courant*.

"This discussion on the subject of currency is very clear and satisfactory, as well as timely."—*New-Englander*.

**P**APER-MONEY INFLATION IN FRANCE: How it Came, What it Brought, and How it Ended. By ANDREW D. WHITE, President of Cornell University. 8vo. Paper, 50 cents.

A paper read before several Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, of both political parties, at Washington, April 12, and before the Union League Club, at New York, April 13, 1876.

**N**OMISMA; or, "Legal Tender." By HENRI CERNUSCHI, author of "Bi-Metallic Money." 12mo. Cloth, \$1.25.

**CONTENTS.**—Evidence given before the United States Monetary Commission, by the author and others, February 5, 6, 7, and 8, 1877.—Monetary Pacification by the Rehabilitation of Silver.—Silver Vindicated.—Appendix.

---

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 72 Fifth Avenue.

