

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/narrativecritica72wins>

NARRATIVE AND CRITICAL
HISTORY OF AMERICA

The United States

OF

North America

PART II



NARRATIVE AND CRITICAL
HISTORY OF AMERICA

EDITED

By JUSTIN WINSOR

LIBRARIAN OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. VII.—PART II.

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge

Copyright, 1888,
By HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY.

All rights reserved.

The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.
Electrotyped and Printed by H. O. Houghton & Company.

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL PARTIES. 1789-1850.

BY ALEXANDER JOHNSTON,

Professor of Jurisprudence and Political Economy in Princeton College.

ON the 4th of March, 1789, the United States of America had been without even the appearance of a national government for nearly half a year. The last real meeting of the Congress of the Confederation, with nine States present, had taken place October 10, 1788; the attendance had then run down, four States being represented October 15, two October 16 and October 21, and individual delegates attending thereafter "occasionally" until November 1, when the entries stop. Efforts to secure a meeting of the "Committee of States" were as complete a failure. The resolution for putting the new Constitution into force had been introduced into the old Congress July 14, 1788, and had hung suspended there for two months on the question of a capital city. Philadelphia, Lancaster, Pa., New York city, and Wilmington, Del., were rejected, in successive attempts to decide upon a capital. Baltimore was adopted August 4; and it was not until September 13, 1788, that "the present seat of Congress," New York city, where Congress had been sitting since 1785, was adopted by an unanimous vote. By the same resolution, the first Wednesday in January, 1789, was fixed for the choice of electors by the ratifying States, the first Wednesday in February for the electors to vote for President and Vice-President, and the first Wednesday in March "for commencing the proceedings under the said Constitution." The last-mentioned date happened to be March 4. The beginning and end of the successive administrations have thus been fixed, oddly enough, by no provision of the organic law, but by a mere resolution of the Congress of the Confederation.

On the appointed day, but eight Senators out of twenty-two appeared, and but thirteen Representatives out of fifty-nine. It was not until April 6 that it was possible to count the electoral votes, when Washington was declared President and John Adams Vice-President. The Vice-President was seated April 21, the President was inaugurated April 30, and the new government was in working order.

The first two Congresses (1789-93) marked out the lines which the subsequent development of the country has followed. The departments of

State, War, the Treasury, the Post-Office, and the Judiciary were organized, and a light-house and customs-revenue systems were begun (1789); the first steps were taken toward the establishment of the census, naturalization, patents and copyrights, territorial government, pensions, and intercourse with the Indian tribes. Provision was also made for the settlement of the present national capital at Washington, and the national and State debts were provided for (1790); arrangements were adopted for the admission of the new States of Kentucky and Vermont, and the first Bank of the United States was chartered (1791); the mint and coinage, the consular service, and the militia were regulated (1792); and interstate extradition of fugitives from justice and fugitive slaves was provided for (1793). Ratification by North Carolina and Rhode Island made the original number of States again complete; and the first ten amendments to the Constitution, subsequently ratified by the States, were adopted by Congress.

The contrast between this picture of legislative activity and the impotence of the system so recently defunct must have been very great. The United States no longer presented the "awful spectacle," as Hamilton had expressed it, of "a nation without a national government." But the contrast was enough to bring out to plain view the sharp dividing line between the two essential political parties of the country. Congress, a new and unfamiliar body, sitting at New York, was instantly recognized as a serious restriction on the only "republican governments" which the people had hitherto known, — the States. Jefferson, Washington's Secretary of State, was the natural leader of those who wished to construe the Federal government's powers strictly, so as to retain as much as possible to the State governments; and in 1793 his followers began to assume the name of the Republican party,¹ in opposition to the dominant Federalist party, of which Hamilton was now the recognized leader. Genet's mission (1793) brought out the fact that the Federalists were as cool towards "the rights of man" as the Republicans were warm; and for the next half dozen years American politics were largely Gallican and Anglican.

The momentum of the original Federalist movement was sufficient, in spite of the withdrawal of Madison and other former Federalists,² to re-

¹ Jefferson's theory of government, so far as it was not modified by political expediency, seems to have been much the same as that of Mr. Herbert Spencer in more recent times, and founded on the same desire for the exaltation of individual rights. The States were to him merely governmental agents, less likely to oppress the individual than the more distant, ignorant, and indifferent Federal government. The Federalists, on the contrary, were much disposed to the development of influential classes, such as protected manufacturers and national bankers, not for the sake of the classes, but for the purpose of forming a power within the

States, and in all the States, which should look to the Federal government for support, and should prevent any break-up of the Union through State supremacy. Outside of both the Republicans and the Federalists were the "Democrats," a purely French faction, leaning toward the Republicans, but not fully absorbed in their organization until after Jefferson's inauguration as President (1801).

² The Democratic clubs, an American imitation of the Jacobin Club, were accused by Washington of having incited the resistance to the Excise Law in western Pennsylvania (1794). They were implicated in intrigues, little known

elect Adams with Washington in 1792-3, and to carry through Jay's treaty (1795), which gave the United States full possession of the Northwest, and removed the danger of war with Great Britain because of her aggressions on American commerce. The French Directory, claiming the United States as an active ally under the treaty of 1778, took great offence at Jay's treaty, refused to receive the American minister, and demanded tribute as the price of peace from the commission sent by Adams, who was elected President (1796-7), Jefferson being elected Vice-President with him. The war excitement arising from the abolition of the existing treaties with France, the formation of an army and navy, the organization of a navy department, several successful sea-fights with French vessels, and the persistent efforts of the President to re-establish friendly relations with France against the wishes of the Hamilton wing of his party and his own cabinet, made Adams's administration one of turmoil. The new government of Napoleon accepted the offer of peace; but in the mean time the Federalist majority in Congress had passed the Alien and Sedition Laws (1798), which their opponents considered not only a purely partisan measure, but a complete exposition of governmental tyranny over the individual. These laws authorized the arrest and deportation of dangerous aliens by the President, and the arrest and punishment of any one who should conspire to oppose any measure of government, or should defame any of its departments. The death of Washington (1799) took away a great pillar from the Federal party. Schisms in its own ranks did much; the skilful use by the Republicans of foolish prosecutions in doubtful States, under the Sedition Law, did more; and the natural tendency toward broadening the right of suffrage in all the States did still more for the downfall of the dominant party. Nevertheless, it was only after a struggle of the most doubtful and exciting nature that the Federalists were beaten, and Jefferson and Burr were elected President and Vice-President.¹

but much dreaded, in Kentucky and the West; in the Eastern States their most active work was in opposition to Jay's treaty.

¹ As the Constitution stood at first, each elector voted for two persons, without distinguishing the offices of President and Vice-President. The candidate who received most votes, provided they were more than a majority, became President, and the next highest Vice-President. The practice of making nominations through a Congressional caucus, begun in 1796, really took away the power of choice from the electors, making them vote for the party candidates. If each elector should vote for the same two persons, it is evident that the two highest candidates would always be a tie, and the House of Representatives would be called upon to choose between them. This is just what happened in 1800-1. Every Republican elector voted for Jefferson and Burr, who thus had 73 votes to 65 Federalist votes, but were tied. "It

was badly managed," wrote Jefferson, "not to have arranged with certainty what seems to have been left to hazard." One Federalist elector in Rhode Island seems to have been more acute, for he threw away his second vote to Jay; so that if the 8 votes of South Carolina had been Federalist, Adams would have had 73 votes, and Pinckney 72. New York's electors were then chosen by the legislature, and the real struggle came in April, 1800, on the election of the legislature. Burr's shrewd management overturned a Federalist majority of 900 in New York city, secured a majority of the legislature, and decided the presidential election. This will explain the action of the Republican congressional caucus in naming Burr as a candidate with Jefferson. In choosing between the two leading candidates, the House was to vote by States, each State having one vote; and the Federalists decided to vote for Burr for President. Congress met, fortunately, in the new cap-

As a preliminary to this struggle, Jefferson and Madison prepared and caused to be passed by the legislatures of the respective States what were called the Virginia and the Kentucky Resolutions (1798). Having been rejected or ignored by the other States, they were re-passed by the two legislatures the next year. Though these were purely dogmatic, and had no legislative force, few political actions in our history have been wider in their effects. They introduced the notion of a "compact" of some sort as the basis of the Constitution, — a notion derived, perhaps, from that of the Social Compact, so popular at the time when the authors of the Resolutions received their political training. Both condemned acts of the Federal government as unwarranted by the Constitution, as legislatures and even private individuals have since done and still do; but Jefferson's original draft asserted that "every State has a natural right" to "nullify" such action within its jurisdiction. The Kentucky Resolutions of 1799 declared that "a nullification" of such action was "the rightful remedy"; and the Virginia Resolutions asserted the right of "the States," in such cases, to "interpose" in order to arrest them.¹ Party passion had so drawn

ital city of Washington, far from the possibility of riotous interference with the vote. When the balloting began, in February, 1801, 8 States voted for Jefferson, 6 for Burr, and 2 had no vote, being equally divided. Some of the Federalists had made a private agreement not to allow the balloting to go to dangerous lengths; and at the close of the first week, on the 36th ballot, they refused to vote, thus giving Jefferson 10 States and the presidency. How far Burr was privy to the Federalist programme is not certain. His party believed him treacherous and did not re-elect him. The adoption of the 12th Amendment, in 1804, removed the old danger by compelling each elector to vote separately for President and Vice-President.

¹ The current interpretation of these terms is open to dispute. Madison's Resolutions carefully use the plural, — "the States"; and their author always declared that this was intentional; that the intention was to put on record the assertion of the right of a second Federal Convention, like that which framed the Constitution, to amend it, and decide disputes between the Federal government and a State, lest some new law should declare the proposal of such a convention a "seditious act." He writes, December 23, 1832: "In the Virginia Resolutions and report, the plural number, *States*, is in every instance used where reference is made to the authority which presided over the government. As I am now known to have drawn those documents, I may say, as I do with a distinct recollection, that the distinction was intentional. It was, in fact, required by the course of reasoning employed on the occasion. The Kentucky Resolutions, being less guarded, have been more

easily perverted." His distinction is put more exactly in Madison's *Works*, iv. 409: that a strictly constitutional "nullification" of an act of Congress would be imposed by a vote of three fourths of the States in convention; while under the Calhoun programme, nullification by a single State would hold good until reversed by such a three-fourths vote. Under the first theory, a three-fourths majority of the States would govern; under the second, a minority of more than one fourth could do as it pleased. To the same effect is Jefferson's letter of June 12, 1823: "The ultimate arbiter is the people of the Union, assembled by their deputies in convention, at the call of Congress, or of two-thirds of the States. Let them decide to which they mean to give an authority claimed by two of their organs." Von Holst insists on taking the word "interpose" as overthrowing the whole plea on behalf of Madison, and as being fully equivalent to "nullification" in the Kentucky Resolutions, ignoring the fact that it is the "States" that are to "interpose," and that Madison's interpretation is quite consistent with the literal language. The case is different as to Jefferson. It would be quite impossible to apply Madison's interpretation to the Kentucky Resolutions and obtain any consistent result. "Each State" is "an integral party" to the compact; and "each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress." Jefferson's letters contain some expressions supporting the Madison view, others supporting the Calhoun view, and one (his letter of Dec. 24, 1825) supporting nullification by a State legislature.

the Resolutions as certainly to blur, in the minds of those who read them, the original Jeffersonian idea, that the rights of the individual were the supreme object of political action, and that the States were to be supported as means to this end. The States were now to be supported in their own right, as sovereigns whom usurpers were seeking to oust. When the original idea had been lost sight of, it was not difficult to claim the authority of precedent for the assertion of State sovereignty for the benefit of a slave system.¹

Jefferson's inauguration marks the collapse of the Hamiltonian scheme for securing the perpetuity of the Union by the development of national classes. It was certainly, to all appearance, a critical moment. The vested interests which grow up so rapidly under any class system felt themselves to be imperilled. The positive virulence which then attended party conflict had given the defeated party the very lowest opinion of the morals, manners, and methods of its successful rival. Not only the army, the navy, and all national interests, but religion as well, were seriously felt to be in danger. All these might pass as temporary things; but it could not be considered hopeful for a federal union to have elected a President whose leading tenet was that each State was to be the judge, "as well of infractions" of the Constitution, "as of the mode and measure of redress." It required a long and dangerous war, and a tacit preparation to coerce New England into a support of it, to relieve the country from the standing peril involved in the belief of the dominant party that its political system was that of a "voluntary union."

The virulence of party conflict had its effect on the civil service. He who has read the customary language of Republican pamphlets concerning the "monarchists" and "stock-jobbers" who controlled the Federal government from 1789 until 1801, will not be inclined to believe that Jefferson found very many professed Republicans in the civil service of the United States. It was natural that he should undertake to remedy this injustice by removals from office for partisan reasons, which were novel only because they had not hitherto been necessary. It is just that he should be held responsible for the innovation; but in common justice the preceding ad-

¹ The transformation of the United Colonies into the United States in 1776, and the quiet assumption of the title "State" by the individual commonwealths, have had momentous consequences. It is easy to show that there is no attribute implied in any scientific use of the word "state" which has ever pertained to any of the American commonwealths, with the single exception of Texas. "State sovereignty" is an unscientific phrase because it is historically false. Sovereignty has been claimed and asserted for the States, on paper, just as the sovereignty of Poland might be asserted, but it has never been put to the test of action, with the exception of the period 1860-65. The "States" have not

even been willing to act, except as the United States. "State Rights," on the contrary, are the consequence of the persistent and practically unanimous determination of the whole people that their governmental system shall be a federal system, and that the equal rights of all the States shall be maintained and respected. State Rights rest on the national will, the only secure foundation for them. The unscientific habit of using terms which are historically untrue has led, as Von Holst notes, to the necessity in the United States of giving two meanings to such political words as "state," one for paper the other for practice.

ministration should share the responsibility. Jefferson's removals were not numerous; but they served as precedents for a far more sweeping and more causeless system of removals twenty-eight years afterwards.

The leaders of the new dominant party were not generally men of recognized intellectual standing, outside of the controlling personality of Jefferson himself and of his Secretary of State, Madison. It was anything but pleasant to Federalists that Gallatin, a naturalized Swiss, who had been "dancing around a whisky-pole" in western Pennsylvania seven years before, should now take Hamilton's old place of Secretary of the Treasury; but Gallatin proved one of the ablest secretaries the Treasury has had. Monroe was governor of Virginia, and was soon to go abroad on diplomatic service. There was no great leader in the Senate: much was expected from John Breckinridge, of Kentucky, but he died in Jefferson's second term. In the House, John Randolph, like Burr, was "a crooked gun," more dangerous to his own party than to its opponents, and was soon in open rebellion. The main reliance was on tolerable political managers, like Varnum of Massachusetts and Giles of Virginia, and on unbending Republicans, like Macon of North Carolina, whose only policy was to pay off the debt, oppose a navy, support Jefferson, and keep the Federalists out of office. The Federalists were in reality even more weak. Their general training had prepared them to look upon political defeat as a personal affront, and their ablest men showed a strong tendency to retire to private life, where they could criticise the administration with impunity. Politics was for some years a mere question of votes, until the new issues, growing out of foreign relations, brought into Congress such men as Crawford and Calhoun on one side, and Josiah Quincy on the other.

Most of the States had had property qualifications as limitations either on the right of suffrage or on the composition of the legislature. The Republican policy had been to remove such limitations in the States which they controlled, and to diminish the time of residence required for naturalization. The bulk of the new voters, therefore, went to them, and they were continually making their hold stronger on the States which had come under their control. New England and Delaware remained Federalist, and Maryland was doubtful; the other States could be counted upon almost certainly as Republican. Under the New England system, governmental powers were practically divided among a multitude of little town republics; and restrictions on the right of suffrage, intrenched in these towns, had to be conquered in a thousand successive strongholds. The towns, too, sufficient to themselves, cared little for the exclusion from national life involved in their system; and for nearly twenty years New England was excommunicated from national politics. It was not until the rise of manufactures and of dissenting sects had reinforced continuous agitation that the Republican revolution penetrated New England and overcame the tenacious resistance of her people.

The new regime opened brilliantly. The acquisition of the great terri-

tory of Louisiana, involving almost inevitably the additional territory of Oregon, gave the United States control of the entire country drained by the Mississippi and its branches. The almost coincident invention of the steamboat (1807) gave an unexpected utility to western rivers and added force to migration, so that settlement moved westward rapidly. With the increase of settlement, the Mississippi began to assume its natural function in the national development. Flowing from north to south across the great central basin of the continent, which makes up nearly two thirds of the area of the United States outside of Alaska, it clamps that part of the country into what seems an indissoluble national unity; and while this part of the country remains intact, the smaller Atlantic and Pacific basins would find it practically impossible to break away. The acquisition of Louisiana was a point of Republican policy, though Jefferson admitted that it was unwarranted by the Constitution. The Federalists felt, as Quincy expressed it afterwards, that "this is not so much a question concerning sovereignty, as it is who shall be sovereign." It has often been noted that the "strict construction" party began its control of the government by straining the interpretation of the Constitution to the uttermost. It is far more worthy of note, as more permanent and far-reaching in its consequences, that the party which had come into power as the maintainer of a "voluntary union" had carried through a measure which was destined in the end to transfer the basis of the national existence from the Atlantic States to the far larger central basin, and thus to give natural, stronger than any mere political or constitutional, guarantees for the perpetuity of the Union.

The acquisition of Louisiana, the rapid payment of the debt, the nullity of the Federal party, and the wealth which the country was gaining, both by the carrying trade for the inveterate belligerents of Europe, as the only great commercial neutral, and by the export of agricultural products, seemed to justify Jefferson's policy, and he was reelected in 1804-5, with George Clinton, of New York, as Vice-President. Burr's shattered fortunes were wrecked by his arrest for an attempted expedition against Mexico (1807). The clouds began to gather around the administration as the twelve years, to which the commercial articles of Jay's Treaty of 1794 were limited, drew to a close. British naval officers and courts began to show a more unfriendly disposition towards American vessels, as other carriers, open to capture, disappeared from the seas. In particular, the practice of carrying produce from belligerents' colonies, with which trade was then not allowed in time of peace, to the United States, there breaking bulk, and thus transforming a belligerent into a neutral commerce, was complained of, and British prize courts began to hold it illegal. Nevertheless, Monroe succeeded (1806) in arranging a new treaty, much like Jay's; but Jefferson rejected it, without laying it before the Senate, since it did not renounce the rights of search and impressment. The proceedings of British naval officers became more offensive, culminating in the attack of the "Leopard" on the "Chesa-

peake" (1807), which almost resulted in war. For such a war the administration was utterly unprepared. Its party had supported it in its policy of creating a force of gunboats, which proved useless in practice; but it rejected the President's second proposal, to confine coast defence to the use of cannon on travelling carriages, to be dragged from point to point by the militia. Instead of it the dominant party passed the "Embargo" Act, forbidding clearances to foreign ports, and limiting the coasting-trade to the United States. It was believed that the European belligerents, cut off from American supplies for their armies, would cease their attacks upon American commerce.¹

It should be remembered that New England was not then a manufacturing territory; that its interests, outside of agriculture, were exclusively commercial; and that its commerce was paralyzed² by a blow from its own government, in which it felt that it was politically outlawed. It is no wonder, then, that the whole year 1808 was filled with such a turmoil as the political history of the United States had not hitherto witnessed, a turmoil which was well calculated to throw a new light upon the notion of a "voluntary union." The language of the dominant party of New England became more angry as the months went by; the spirit and words of the Kentucky Resolutions were revived and adapted to the new circumstances: it was evident that the five New England States were unanimous as to an "infraction" of the Constitution, and it was not at all certain that they would not proceed to exercise the right to judge of "the mode and measure of redress." Early in 1809, John Quincy Adams, who had become a supporter of the administration, informed it that arrangements were being perfected for a transfer of New England to Canada. The administration, in a panic, hurried through Congress the "Non-Intercourse" Act, allowing foreign commerce with other nations than England and France. No preparations, however, were made to protect this permitted foreign commerce; the act was merely a permission to American citizens to run such risks as they would. With this modification, as a possible *modus vivendi* with New England, Jefferson gladly abandoned the reins of government to Madison, who had been elected his successor (1808-9), with George Clinton as Vice-President.

The advance of settlement westward was already having its effects on national politics. Hitherto the building of light-houses, the improvement of harbors, and whatever benefits accrue from the expenditure of taxation, had gone to the seaboard States. A new population was growing up away

¹ How far this belief was justified by events is uncertain. Wellington, on the Peninsula, was annoyed by failure to receive American supplies for his troops, and the case may well have been the same with others. On the other hand, a natural result was to throw the carrying trade with other countries than the United States more entirely into British vessels, under convoy. For

the attacks upon American commerce, the Orders in Council, the Berlin and Milan decrees, etc., see *post*, Chapter VI.

² For example, New Haven's commerce never recovered; the embargo system, and the war which followed, transformed the place from a commercial into a manufacturing city.

from the seaboard, and it claimed a division of benefits, in the form of roads. An appropriation for the making of a road to begin at Cumberland, Maryland, and run indefinitely westward, in 1806, was backed by Gallatin's *Report on Roads and Canals*. The Republican theory of a strict construction of the Constitution could not admit the power of Congress to make appropriations for such a purpose. Nevertheless, appropriations for the Cumberland Road were continued at intervals until 1838, when the road itself was superseded by the superior advantages of railroads; the system of national appropriations for roads and canals swelled to a large volume from 1820 until about 1830; and the general notion of a claim of the States away from the seaboard to a share in the expenditure of taxation has strongly influenced legislation down to the present.

A diplomatic trick of Napoleon's transferred the whole weight of the rising American anger to Great Britain. The Non-Intercourse Act provided that the President was to suspend the act as to either of the belligerents which should so modify its edicts as to cease to oppress American commerce. Napoleon, while actually extending his system by the Rambouillet Decree (1810), had the effrontery to inform the American government that his whole system of decrees had been suspended. The new administration, grasping at this indication of the success of the Non-Intercourse Act, suspended the act as to France; but this left the act in force against Great Britain, and intensified the ill-feeling between the two countries. This was especially the case in the United States. When the new Congress met in November, 1811, the administration majority was overwhelming,¹ and it came together with a strong disposition for war. Clay, the representative of the new policy of war against Great Britain through Canada, had served twice in the Senate for short terms: he now appeared as a Representative from Kentucky, and was promptly chosen Speaker. Among the other new members were John C. Calhoun and Langdon Cheves of South Carolina, and Felix Grundy of Tennessee; and these, with William H. Crawford of Georgia, and Varnum, in the Senate, became the recognized leaders of the party in its new policy. They can hardly be called leaders of an administration party, for they coerced the peace-loving President out of his embargo policy into agreement with them. Madison was given to understand that his renomination by the Congressional caucus in the following year depended on his adhesion to the new order of things. De Witt Clinton of New York was evidently ready to accept the nomination from any party, and the President yielded. The winter was a busy one, so far as legislation was concerned. Carey cites a great number of Acts, as evidence of the careful preparation made for the approaching struggle. Eleven of these referred to increases of the army, the formation of a volunteer force, and the organization of the militia. In addition to the ordinary appropriations for the navy, a generous provision was made for equipping

¹ *Niles's Register*, i. 233, states the Republican vote in the Senate as 28 to 6, and in the House as 105 to 37.

three frigates "for actual service," at an expense "not exceeding three hundred thousand dollars." It seems to have been believed that appropriations for a navy were worse than useless; that, on the outbreak of hostilities, all the vessels would be "Copenhagenized" at once by the invincible British navy. Finally, the single act of financial preparation for war was one authorizing the President to borrow "a sum not exceeding eleven millions of dollars." With this exhaustive preparation, war was declared, June 18, 1812. The Orders in Council were revoked by Great Britain five days afterward.¹

Madison was reelected in 1812-13, with Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts as Vice-President. The Federalists supported De Witt Clinton and Jared Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania. If their evident hope of securing the twenty-five electoral votes of Pennsylvania had been realized, their candidates would have been seated by a clear majority of electors; but Pennsylvania remained overwhelmingly Republican, and Madison and Gerry were elected.² Before the successful candidates were seated, events had shown that the Republican policy of attacking Canada was a failure, and that the despised navy was to reap most of the glory of the war.³ Generous appropriations were therefore made for the increase of the navy. Financial mismanagement thwarted this, like other good intentions. The dominant party, afraid to tax, undertook to manage the war mainly on loans. Much of the available capital was in New England, and the loans did not meet with great favor there. Gallatin, hopeless of the treasury under such a system, sailed for Europe early in 1813, in order to obtain peace through the mediation of Russia. For nine months his party kept his name at the head of the treasury; but, without him, the finances went from bad to worse, and from worse to worst. Early in 1815, \$20,000 of a government loan was offered at auction in Boston; but \$5,000 was taken, and that at a discount of 40%.⁴ The banks generally suspended specie payment. The charter of the Bank of the United States had expired in 1811; and the Republicans, choosing this dangerous moment for a change of policy, had refused to recharter it. The country was thus left with a depreciated paper currency, consisting of the notes of banks which had suspended specie payment, and were under no governmental supervision whatever, while they offered no real security for the credit which they asked for their notes.⁵ The report

¹ The "revocation," however (which will be found in full in *Niles's Register*, i. 392-93), was careful to state that nothing in it was to preclude the Prince Regent from reestablishing the Orders in Council, in their full effect, whenever he should think proper.

² Madison's vote was 128 to 89, and Gerry's 131 to 86. Two of the Massachusetts and one of the New Hampshire electors voted for Clinton and Gerry.

³ For the events of the war, see *post*, Chapter VI.

⁴ *Olive Branch*, 317, citing *N. Y. Evening Post* for Feb. 27, 1815.

⁵ What "banking" meant in those days, and until the New York system of 1838 was introduced, may be imagined from one instance given by Sumner (*History of American Currency*, 62), the Farmers' Exchange Bank of Gloucester, R. I., founded in 1804, with a nominal capital of \$1,000,000, and a real capital of \$3,000. One of the directors bought out the other eleven, paying them out of the bank's funds, loaned \$760,000 to himself, and the bank failed with assets of \$86.46 in specie.

of Dallas, the new Secretary of the Treasury, to the House Committee of Ways and Means,¹ in December, 1814, acknowledges "a deficient revenue, a suspended circulating medium, and a depressed credit," circumstances surely embarrassing enough to any treasury, and especially to that of a nation at war. He had already advised the creation of a second Bank of the United States, and the opposition to the measure was naturally weak. It was finally passed in April, 1816, the bank having a capital of \$35,000,000, three fifths in government stocks, and being chartered for twenty years.

The attitude of the New England States was even more embarrassing than the financial straits of the country. Their legislatures had passed resolutions denouncing the war. The Constitution authorized Congress to "provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." When the President, under the authority of Congress, called upon the New England governors for their quotas of militia to garrison forts, instead of regular troops drawn off for the invasion of Canada, he was met with requests to state the law which was to be executed, the insurrection which was to be suppressed, or the invasion which was to be repelled, and the legislatures supported the governors. As one result, the New England States were left very much to their own defence; and the advance of the enemy along the coast of Maine seemed to call for common action. In December, 1814, delegates from Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and from parts of Vermont and New Hampshire, met at Hartford, and discussed the state of the country in secret session for about three weeks. Hardly anything could have been more embarrassing to the Republicans of the old school. If the Hartford Convention should advise their principals to exercise their sovereign powers, withdraw from the Union, and set up a new flag with the five stars of the New England republic upon it, was President Madison to introduce a new reading of the Virginia Resolutions, and "interpose" with the power of the Federal government to coerce New England into an involuntary union with the other States? The question never became practical. The convention's recommendations were confined to certain constitutional amendments, with a perhaps significant suggestion of a second convention; and the almost coincident settlement of terms of peace enabled the dominant party to ignore the recommendations. The principal result of the convention was the political ruin of its members, who were never forgiven for their participation in it. But the Republicans of the new school showed an evident readiness to cut the Gordian knot, if necessary, and to maintain the Union, at no matter what cost to former theory. Much of this spirit was shown merely by an obstinate refusal to engage in any further discussion of State sovereignty. But there was a significant agreement with Grundy's doctrine that the Federalist opposition amounted to "moral treason"; even Calhoun, in the House,² quoted it approvingly. State sover-

¹ It may be consulted most easily in *Niles's Register*, vii. 265.

² January 15, 1814.

eighty and democracy within the States had been the two leading tenets of the dominant party. The rising national democracy showed now for the first time that disposition to regard an opposition based on State sovereignty as rebellion, which came to its full fruition in 1861-65. It was thus the State sovereignty party which brought into our system the germ of a real national unity.¹

Peace was made by the Treaty of Ghent in December, 1814. It was probably inevitable that protection, in some form, should take a new place in American politics with the close of the war. The whole system, beginning with the embargo in 1807 and running through the war and the blockade, by giving the strongest form of actual protection, had suddenly and violently transformed the United States from a purely agricultural into a largely manufacturing country. No nation will willingly retrace such a step in development as this, whether it has been taken naturally or under artificial stimulus. When, therefore, the surplus of British manufacturers was shipped to the United States and sold at auction at low prices in 1815, the appeals of American manufacturers for legislative assistance met with a sympathetic hearing. "It was the duty of the country," said Calhoun,² "as a means of defence, to encourage the domestic industry of the country: more especially that part of it which provides the necessary materials for clothing and defence . . . the means of maintaining our army and navy cheaply clad. . . . A certain encouragement should be extended, at least, to our woollen and cotton manufactures." An *ad valorem* duty of twenty-five per cent. on woollens and cottons was imposed until 1819, then extended to 1826, and raised still higher by the tariffs of 1824 and 1828, the introduction of the "minimum" feature increasing the actual amount of protection by raising the legal or taxable valuation of imported goods. Protective duties were also imposed on iron imports, and were increased in 1818, 1824, and 1828; and, as these duties were regularly specific (so much per hundredweight), every improvement in production and consequent decrease of price made the absolute amount of protection still heavier.³ In all this, however, there is visible a very different spirit from that which had animated the original Federalist programme. Protection was no longer meant to secure the perpetuity of the Union by forming protected classes. The present dominant party felt by instinct that the Union was already secure; and its measures were rather the result of its determination to provide for national defence. They were only a phase of a revolution which for the moment swept even Calhoun from his feet.

The Federal party really came to an end with the peace. Discredited, sullen, out of harmony with the new order of things, it felt itself to be, as

¹ From this time, also, may be dated the willingness of the Republicans to accept the subtitle of the Democratic party, which had once been a Federalist term of contempt.

² In the House, Jan. 31, 1816.

³ On this subject of the tariff, down to 1840, see Professor F. W. Taussig's *Protection to Young Industries*. All the figures are easily accessible in Young's *Customs-Tariff Legislation in the United States*.

Gouverneur Morris expressed it, "in the awkward situation of a man who continues sober after the company are drunk." It hardly kept up the semblance of a party organization. Before 1825, those of its members who took any part in politics had become Republicans by joining some one of the many contending Republican factions; and the New England States, except Rhode Island, had accepted the new regime. At first, the old Republicans seemed likely to succeed the Federalists as the conservative party in opposition to the Republicans of the new school, who were led by Clay, and adopted protection and internal improvements at national expense as the most appropriate objects of the national democracy. Old influences were strong enough to secure the nomination and election of Monroe as President in 1816-17, with D. D. Tompkins, the "war governor" of New York, as Vice-President, and their re-election, with hardly any opposition in 1820-21.¹ But Monroe fell very much under the influence of Clay and Adams; their "American system" of high tariffs and internal improvements at national expense continually found more favor in Congress during the eight years of his service as President; and the old Republicans, having no living force of development at work in their party, and no rising leaders, could only follow Crawford. Thus, while this "era of good feeling" was marked by an absence of legitimate party contest, and a series of personal scandals and intrigues of the pettiest sort, the current of success was running in favor of the new Republicans. Crawford's following, mainly Southern, losing their leader by paralysis,² turned to the rising fortunes of Andrew Jackson, until Calhoun's secession finally provided them with a more appropriate leader. The event which drove them temporarily to Jackson, and thus for a time threw the natural evolution of the coming parties into confusion, was the sudden irruption of slavery as an element in American politics.

Negro slavery had existed in all the States, except Vermont, at first by custom, then by State statutes recognizing the custom. It was now dead or dying in the States north of "Mason and Dixon's line" (the southern boundary of Pennsylvania). In the States north of the Ohio River it had been forbidden by the ordinance of 1787; and the efforts to obtain a suspension of the prohibition in the early years of the century had been a failure in Congress. Thus the new States to the south of the Ohio had come in with the custom of slavery in recognized existence, that is, as slave States; while those to the north of the Ohio had come in with the custom of slavery forbidden by organic law. When the great territory of Louisiana was purchased, the custom of slavery existed in it also, and had been recognized by Spanish and French law. Congress, doing nothing to

¹ Monroe's electoral votes were 183 to 34 for Rufus King in 1817, and 231 to 1 for John Quincy Adams in 1821. Tompkins's were 183 to 34 scattering in 1817, and 218 to 14 scattering in 1821. There were 4 vacancies in 1817, and 3 in 1821.

² Crawford was stricken by paralysis in August, 1823, but his condition was kept as much concealed as possible until after the election of 1824, and a stamp was contrived by which he affixed his "signature," when required, to official documents.

prohibit the custom, tacitly permitted it in the new territory's two centres of population, one around New Orleans, the other around St. Louis. When the first of these was admitted as the State of Louisiana, in 1812, no objection to its slave system seems to have been made. When the other, in 1818 and 1819, applied for admission as the State of Missouri, with a constitution authorizing slavery, it came into a different atmosphere.¹ The national events of the past twenty years, and the growing antipathy to slavery, had worked a double development of democracy in the North; while the different policy as to slavery in the North and in the South was forming that line of sectional division which was to grow broader and deeper for the next forty years, until it ended in open collision.

Slavery in the South as in the North seems to have been a patriarchal institution, until the invention of Whitney's cotton-gin in 1793 brought out the natural monopoly of the South in the production of cotton. Coming, as this did, just after the remarkable series of inventions in the English cotton manufacture, it added the capstone to them, and bound the English factory system and the Southern slave system together. The two acted and reacted upon one another. As the English manufacture grew larger, the exports of cotton grew more numerous, and the interests bound up in the slave system more important. Slavery had become a business; and business interests fought for it. Under such a system, manufactures, commerce, everything but a rude agriculture, was impossible in the slave States; social security demanded that the only working-class should be kept ignorant, and that was equivalent to a prohibition of the higher forms of industry, and a cessation of all progress. Arrested development, in other words, was the case of the South, while the natural development was going on with cumulative speed in the North and West.² During all this half-century, then, the two sections were drifting further apart. Their interests, their political purposes, their ways of looking at every proposed piece of national legislation, were different. The real task of each Federal administration was to govern what were coming to be two separate countries, and to do it by laws which should suit both of them. The task, continually becoming more difficult, could only be partially performed by a series of compromises instead of laws. The word "compromise" is always restricted in our political history to a few leading events. But in reality almost every Federal law of this half-century was a compromise, and it was always becoming more difficult to contrive them. The strength of the non-political bonds which really tie the Union together is best shown by its ability to endure, under such circumstances, until 1861.

¹ The new States thus far admitted were Vermont (1791), Kentucky (1792), Tennessee (1796), Ohio (1802-3), Louisiana (1812), Indiana (1816), Mississippi (1817), Illinois (1818), Alabama (1819), Maine (1820), and Missouri (1821); this ends the list of new States until 1836.

² The last chapter of Von Holst's third volume is an exhaustive comparison between the results of the free and the slave systems, as they stood in 1850. The sudden recuperation of the South since 1865, and its wonderful development under free labor, is even a more striking lesson in social science.

The immediate and decided Northern opposition to the admission of Missouri was not the beginning of this process; it was merely the first public indication that the process had already taken shape. The House admitted Missouri, with a prohibition of slavery, and the Senate then rejected the bill. The application was renewed in 1820 with the same result, the Senate this time amending the House bill by attaching a bill admitting Maine to a Missouri bill permitting slavery. The Missouri Compromise of 1820, contrived by Clay, finally avoided the difficulty by admitting Maine separately, permitting slavery in Missouri, and forever forbidding slavery in the rest of the Louisiana purchase north of the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$, the main southern boundary of Missouri. Another compromise in the following year admitted Missouri, on condition of a modification of the State constitution, which had forbidden free colored persons to settle in the State.

The new elements in politics impatiently awaited the expiration of Monroe's second term, when the enforced truce would expire. The Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, was in the usual line of promotion. His service under Monroe had proved his ability. The declaration in Monroe's annual message of 1823, that any attempt by European powers to reduce the former Spanish colonies of America to obedience would be regarded as evidence of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States, which demonstrated the impossibility of any assistance from the Holy Alliance to Spain in her hopeless effort to subdue her revolted colonies, has always gone by the name of the "Monroe Doctrine"; but it is very certain that Adams had had a large share in suggesting and preparing it. Clay, Speaker of the House, was another formidable candidate for the presidency. Endowed with eloquence and with a wonderful tact in making friends, in attacking enemies, and in contriving compromises, he was the most prominent champion of protection, internal improvements, and a vigorous foreign policy. He was acceptable to the following of Adams, and after the latter's failure in 1828-29, became the sole leader of his party. Crawford, the Secretary of the Treasury, was the candidate of the old Republicans, who attempted to give him prestige in the fashion hitherto recognized, by a nomination from a Congressional caucus. Now that all men claimed to be Republicans, it was felt that a continuance of caucus dictation to the electors was in reality a transfer of the election of President and Vice-President to Congress. The call for a caucus was obeyed only by Crawford men, and their nomination really injured the chances of their candidate. Calhoun, the Secretary of War, was at first a candidate for President; but all parties agreed to support him for the second office, to which he was elected with little opposition. All these candidates had made a profession of politics, had served their time honorably, and knew and respected one another. The free lance, who entered the struggle under a nomination from his State legislature, was Andrew Jackson, once the victor of New Orleans, now a private citizen of Tennessee.

When the returns came in from the elections of 1824, it appeared that no one had a majority of the electoral votes.¹ With much the same feelings as a Federalist must have had at the result of the New York election in 1800, the other candidates found that the largest number of votes had gone to Jackson; but this was not enough to elect him; the House of Representatives, voting by States, was to choose from the highest three candidates, Jackson, Adams, and Crawford. Clay's supporters naturally voted for Adams, and he was elected. This result made Jackson's political fortune. His supporters looked upon the other candidates very much as volunteer troops are apt to regard regular officers. They attacked the old system of choice of electors by the legislature, in those States in which it still survived: and in 1828 only one State, South Carolina, retained it. The appointment of Clay as Adams's Secretary of State, natural as it was, gave new force to the feeling that a popular revolt against officialism was necessary.² This feeling was of course guided and made stronger by rising and ambitious men, who desired the places of the former leaders; but the whole process seems to have been, in the main, like that of 1800-1, a sudden revelation of the fact that the people, in their natural development, were no longer in harmony with those who had hitherto represented them in politics. The results were, first, the rise of a multitude of new men, who came into public life in the Jackson procession; second, the relegation to private life of those who were not, like Clay and Webster, strong enough to accommodate themselves to the new order of things; and, lastly, a far stronger popular cast in the coming broad construction party than had ever been possible in its predecessor, the Federal party.

The old name of Republican was retained for a time by all parties, the factions calling themselves "Jackson men" or "Adams men." The latter showed at once a strong predilection for the word "national," and soon began to call themselves National Republicans, retaining this title until 1834, when, as opponents of the "personal rule" of Jackson, they adopted that of the Whig party.³ The Jackson party, on the other hand, from the beginning of Adams's term, began to make an exclusive use of the old alternative title of Democrat, retaining as an official title that of the Democratic-Republican party.⁴ The Congressional struggles between the two new parties during Adams's term were insignificant. Both parties were manœuvring for position; and the efforts of the Democrats to arouse popular enthusiasm for the "injured" candidate of 1824 were the more

¹ Jackson had 99 votes, Adams 84, Crawford 41, and Clay 37. For the Vice-Presidency, Calhoun had 182 votes, to 78 scattering.

² For very different reasons, Randolph denounced the appointment as an alliance of "Blifil and Black George, the Puritan and the black-leg." Like others of the amenities of politics of that time, this led to a duel.

³ *Niles's Register*, xlvii. 9.

⁴ The old title of Republican passed out of ordinary use, though it was occasionally heard, and never quite lost its favor in agricultural regions, until it was revived and rehabilitated in 1854-55 by the new Republican party. See Wilson's *Slave Power*, ii. 410.

successful. In 1828–1829, Jackson and Calhoun were elected over Adams and Richard Rush, of Pennsylvania.¹

Jackson's administration moved on quietly for its first year. But the quiet was merely a reorganization of political warfare on a new base. The new President's constitutional power of removing office-holders was turned into an instrument of political proscription; the first "clean sweep" was made in the civil service of the United States. Some of the economic consequences were a series of startling defalcations, caused by the business incompetence of the newly appointed officials, and such inefficiency in the post-office department as received direct condemnation from the Democratic House within five years.² The political consequences were more lasting. The new system put an end to nomination by legislative and congressional caucus. There was a sudden development of the system of delegate conventions, through which democratic power, incited, guided, and often represented by office-holders or aspirants for appointment, was to make nominations.³ County, district, and State conventions became general, and in 1831–32 national conventions to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency completed the machinery of the modern American party. The new system was really a nationalization of the methods of the "Albany Regency," whose members,⁴ having clear notions of party principle, entire devotion to them, and no desire for personal profit, made it their rule never to desert a party friend or forgive disobedience or breach of party discipline, and to enforce discipline by merciless removal from office. All this met Jackson's cordial approval, and it became the basis of political conflict for the future.

The second Bank of the United States, having narrowly escaped shipwreck in its early years, had become a reasonably successful institution. The new party had come in under able leaders, — such men as Van Buren, Livingston, Woodbury, Hugh L. White, Marcy, Buchanan, Cass, Ingham, Taney, Silas Wright, and Amos Kendall. To these men, strict constructionists by instinct and training, the bank could not but be offensive, and they certainly inspired the President with no love for it. His first message,

¹ Jackson's electoral vote was 178 to 83. Calhoun's vote was less by 7, that number of Georgia electors voting for William Smith of South Carolina. The election left Clay the real leader of his party. Adams returned to the House of Representatives in 1831, and served there until his death in 1848.

² The story of the introduction of the new system is vividly told in Parton's *Life of Jackson*, iii. 206–55.

³ The system had already been begun in New York and Pennsylvania. The dividing line between the old and new systems in New York may be seen in Hammond's *Political History of New York*, ii. 156–58, where the opponents of the Albany Regency, out-voted in the legislative

caucus for governor in 1824, called a State convention at Utica. The idea seems to have been taken from the Democratic State convention of the previous year in Pennsylvania (Niles's *Register*, xxiv. 20). The germ of the system is in the action of the Clinton party in New York in 1817, in admitting delegates for districts represented in the legislature by Federalists (Hammond, i. 437). The Tammany men, or "Bucktails," had suggested a State convention in 1813 (*Ibid.* 343). For county and district conventions, see *Ibid.* 473.

⁴ Some of them, at various times, were John A. Dix, Marcy, Van Buren, Crosswell, A. C. Flagg, and Dean Richmond.

in 1829, referred to the possibility of a renewal of the charter in 1836 in unfriendly terms ; and the language was made more emphatic in 1830 and 1831. By this time, the bank, forced into a struggle for existence, had begun to cast about for an ally, and had found one in the National Republicans, who were eager to make support of the bank operate as an attack upon the administration. The time of Congress was occupied by the struggle until the bill for a recharter, passed by both houses, was vetoed by the President, July 10, 1832, and failed to pass over the veto. The introduction of the bill at this time seems to have been intended to provide an "issue" for the approaching Presidential election,¹ and in this object, at least, it was successful.

The President had not been hostile to protection or internal improvements before his election ; but in this respect, also, the influence of the body of leaders who had come into prominence with him showed itself. Veto after veto killed bills intended to promote these objects,² until his opponents came to consider the veto power the worst part of the Constitution. A quarrel with Calhoun took away from the President the support of the strong Southern element which Calhoun best represented. The rise of a new political party, the Anti-Masons,³ controlling most of western New York and Pennsylvania, and certain not to support Jackson, made the electoral votes of those two great States exceedingly doubtful. Altogether, the number and strength of elements which the President had contrived or been compelled to array against him made the election of 1832-33 a serious crisis in his political fortunes. As if to throw down the gauntlet to all his opponents at once, he secured from his party's national convention, for the Vice-Presidency, the nomination of the "little magician," Van Buren, who was considered the evil spirit of the new order of things by those who did not approve of it. The Whigs nominated Clay and John Sergeant of Pennsylvania ; and the Anti-Masons William Wirt of Maryland, and Amos Ellmaker of Pennsylvania. In spite of a somewhat closer popular vote, the electoral majority for the Democratic candidates was overwhelming,⁴ and Jackson felt with satisfaction that the voice of the people had approved his course toward both his friends and his enemies.

Congress no sooner met in December, 1832, than the President renewed his struggle with the bank, which he had come to consider as a menace to

¹ See, for example, Clay's *Private Correspondence*, 316, 322, 340-41.

² Nevertheless, Jackson signed the protective tariff of 1832, and a number of bills for internal improvements, and his course was not marked by rigid consistency.

³ This party originated in the murder of William Morgan, of Batavia, N. Y., in 1826, and the asserted responsibility of the Masonic order for it. See *Life of Thurlow Weed*, 210. The party was opposed to both Clay and Jackson, who were Freemasons ; but, acting generally with the

Whigs, its influence within that party aided largely in forcing the nomination of Harrison in 1840. Weed, Seward, and Fillmore came into public life through the anti-Masonic movement.

⁴ The Democratic electoral votes were 219, the 30 votes of Pennsylvania, however, being cast for William Wilkins, of that State, for Vice-President. The Whig votes were 49, and the anti-Masonic, 7. South Carolina's 11 votes were cast for John Floyd of Virginia, and Henry Lee of Massachusetts.

the country. In his message he expressed strong doubts of the bank's solvency, recommending a sale of the government's interest in it: and a fall in the value of the bank's stock showed the effect. The refusal of both houses to agree with him only convinced Jackson of the power of the bank for corruption, and he prepared an attack on a new line. The public moneys were deposited in the bank and its branches, some twenty-five in number, and were transferred from place to place on order from the Secretary of the Treasury. It might very well happen that public money would be needed at some point where there was no branch bank; and the 16th section of the charter act, after directing the deposit of the revenues in the bank or its branches, added "unless the Secretary of the Treasury shall at any time otherwise order and direct," with a proviso that the Secretary should give the House of Representatives his reasons for thus ordering. The power had been used again and again for its proper purpose of depositing public money temporarily in the banks of smaller or frontier towns. Jackson conceived, or had suggested to him, a way in which it might be used to deal a stunning blow at the bank, by a general and permanent order from the Secretary to deposit *all* the revenue in other places than the bank and its branches. The usual leaders of the party, including the Secretary of the Treasury, objected strongly, but the President persisted, and appointed a new Secretary. This officer also refused to give the order, and he was dismissed, September 23, 1833, and R. B. Taney was appointed in his place. He gave the necessary order for what was called the "Removal of the Deposits," which was more properly a suspension or cessation. Few political actions have called forth more intense or long-continued party passion than this. For nearly ten years it was the stock subject of caricature, pamphlet, set speech, and party warfare. It may have been hasty or ill-advised, but within three months it became evident that it had given the President the enormous advantage of the first move. He had crippled the bank; he had in the new House a majority just sufficient to prevent impeachment or a countermand of the Secretary's order; and the slight Whig majority in the Senate could do nothing effectual to get the bank out of its predicament. From this time the game was in the President's hand. The Senate passed a resolution of censure against him; but this merely opened a new theatre of conflict until the Senate had a Democratic majority, in 1837, when the resolution was "expunged" from the record. The tide was always growing stronger in favor of the President; the votes against a recharter were becoming more numerous in both houses; and the bank abandoned the struggle, and obtained a charter from the State of Pennsylvania.

All these conflicts had been as to the direction of the national life; the first severe struggle against internal disease had been going on at the same time. As the development of the slave-system had made the South more inevitably agricultural, it became more evident that the benefits of the new protective system were going exclusively to the North; and Southern oppo-

sition to the new tariffs became more pronounced. The highly protective tariff of 1828 brought the opposition to fever heat. Southern legislatures protested against it, and the language of public meetings grew more angry as the year passed by.¹ Vice-President elect Calhoun appeared as the spokesman of State sovereignty, and drafted the South Carolina "Exposition" of that doctrine, passed by the legislature in December, 1828. Then the feeling smouldered until February, 1830, when, in a debate in the Senate on public lands,² Hayne of South Carolina, in reply to Webster, put into shape the doctrine of "nullification," as Calhoun had elaborated it. If the State was sovereign, the Constitution and the Federal power existed within its jurisdiction by its continuing will; and the State was the only judge as to what powers over its citizens it had entrusted to the Federal government. If the State should declare that an act of Congress was a usurpation of powers not granted, its citizens were not bound to obey the act. This was nullification, for which the Kentucky Resolutions at least were claimed as direct precedent and authority.³ An attempt by the Federal government to enforce the act against the State's will involved, of course, the consequence of secession, which, however, Calhoun always deprecated.

Since 1826, Georgia, impatient at the delay of the Cherokees to leave the State, and in defiance of Federal treaties, the declarations of President Adams, and the orders of the Supreme Court, had expelled the Indians and seized their lands. This example of practical nullification was suggestive; and, when the more scientifically protective tariff of 1832 was passed, South Carolina declared it "null, void, and no law, nor binding upon South Carolina, her officers and citizens," and arranged to support the ordinance of nullification by force. This action ought to have been embarrassing to Jackson, as to other Democrats who had rested on State sovereignty; but precedents were as pack-thread to the President. He issued his "Nullification Proclamation"⁴ to the people of South Carolina, warning them of his intention to enforce the Tariff Act, even though "the military forces of the State of South Carolina should be actually embodied and called out." Every one knew how Jackson would probably "enforce the laws" under such circumstances; and though he collected the duties at Charleston by naval and military force, and obtained from Congress the passage of a "Force Bill," giving him additional powers, the nullification ordinance was *not* put into effect on the specified date, February 1, 1833. Instead, a meeting of "leading nullifiers," the day before, agreed to avoid all collision with the Federal government, thus yielding the point in dispute.⁵ In the mean

¹ The feeling may be studied in Niles's *Register*, xxxv., Index, under the title "Southern Excitement."

² Senator Foot's resolution on public lands gave a name to the debate; but the resolution, as Webster said, was almost the only matter which was not discussed in the debate.

³ Jefferson was dead; but Madison was living, and his protests against any use of either

the Virginia or the Kentucky resolutions as authority for nullification were vehement.

⁴ Prepared by Livingston, Secretary of State, and dated Dec. 11, 1832. The nullification ordinance was adopted Nov. 19th.

⁵ This was really a suspension of an ordinance of a "sovereign State convention" by an official body: nullification nullified.

time the compromise tariff of 1833 was contrived by Clay, passed by both houses, and became law March 2, 1833. It scaled down all duties of more than twenty per cent. by one tenth of the surplus annually for ten years, so that twenty per cent. should be the standard duty in 1842. This was claimed as a triumph for nullification, and the ordinance was solemnly repealed. But Calhoun's programme had failed : it never was tried again, even when the re-entry of protection in the tariff of 1842 gave provocation for it. The time had passed when any single State could withstand the national democracy ; for such a task the energies of a strong combination of States were now needed.

The administration was successful in its management of foreign affairs. The British colonial trade was reopened (1830) ; the Maine boundary was partially settled (1831) ; indemnity was obtained from France for commercial spoliations in the opening years of the century (1831) ; a similar treaty was made with Naples (1832), and less important ones with Denmark (1830), and Spain (1834) ; and commercial treaties were negotiated with Austria, Brazil, Turkey, and other countries. In internal affairs the introduction of the locomotive engine, and the building of railways, turned some of the popular attention from politics to business.¹ But the embarrassing question of 1820 had re-entered politics in a new form, and this time to remain.

The strong original desire for abolition of slavery had died out at the South with the increase of the business interests involved in slavery. The only remnant of it was the Colonization Society, intended to aid the emigration of free negroes to Liberia or other places abroad. A few persons continued to denounce slavery itself. Benjamin Lundy travelled over the country from 1815 until his death in 1839, preaching and publishing journals and pamphlets against slavery ; but the chief result of his work was the conversion of William Lloyd Garrison, who in 1829 became the real founder of American Abolitionism, substituting immediate for gradual abolition, and finally urging even a separation of the sections, to free the North from complicity with slavery. He began the publication of the *Liberator* at Boston in 1831. In 1832 he formed the New England Anti-Slavery Society and attacked the Colonization Society as an agent of the slave system for the removal of troublesome freedmen. His followers had so far increased in number in 1833 that the American Anti-Slavery Society was formed at Philadelphia. By this time the mob-spirit had awakened and spoken. The meetings of the Abolitionists, as enemies of the Union, were broken up by violence ; and it was not long before murder and arson became a feature of the crusade against them. As usual the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church, and the Abolitionists gauged their growth of influence by the increase of violence. The country owes more to them than it fully realizes. If the national democracy, which had grown in strength until it was now able to hold even a "sovereign State" in unwilling obedience,

¹ Arkansas and Michigan had been admitted as States in 1836 and 1837.

never degenerated into a national tyranny over the individual, much of the gratitude therefor is due to the man who dared to call the Constitution "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell,"—and lived.

Lack of space forbids any attempt to detail the wrath roused at the South and at the North by the new movement, the attempts to exclude Abolition documents from the mails, to extradite Abolition speakers and writers, to "boycott" members of the Anti-Slavery Society, and to shut out Abolition petitions from Congress. Every effort to smother the agitation only made the attempted victim struggle more strenuously and make more trouble. Within five years the Abolitionists at the North had become numerous enough, in many places, to be an object of growing solicitude to politicians. Some of the Abolitionists were intoxicated by the sweets of such rapid importance; others were affronted by the recognized leadership of Garrison; others were alienated or frightened by his hearty support of woman's rights and perfectionism, by the uncompromising individualism with which he denounced church¹ and Constitution with equal freedom, and by his doctrine that voting or any participation in politics under a Constitution which permitted the existence of human slavery was an offence against God and man. In 1840, after internal dissensions of several years, the original Abolition Society split. Those who had begun political action the year before as the "Liberty Party," including Birney, Gerrit Smith, Goodell, Elizur Wright, Earle, the Tappans, and others, formed the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Garrison was left with those who had always supported him warmly, including the woman element. In addition to these, however, Garrison had found a tower of strength in Wendell Phillips, the only American who has ever rivalled Webster as an orator, even surpassing his great rival in fiery force and intense conviction. The original organization never grew largely in numbers. Its function is easily perceptible; it acted as the storehouse of the energy which was transmitted to its former associate, the new Liberty party, and thence, in diminished degree, to the more purely political organizations, the Free-Soilers, the Anti-Slavery Whigs, and the Republican party of 1855.

Jackson closed his second term in complete, confessed, and almost unbroken triumph.² All his enemies were in the dust: no one who had suffered on his behalf had failed of reward. Van Buren had become Vice-President in 1833, and was elected President in 1836-37.³ Taney had succeeded John Marshall as Chief Justice. The other supporters of the President were Senators, Representatives, in the diplomatic service,

¹ These denunciations were levelled at the church organizations for their attitude on the subject of slavery. Garrison's religious feeling was deep and fundamental, and, in many points, rather of the old Hebraic type.

² Clay, writing home that he was soon to leave Washington for Kentucky, adds (Feb. 10, 1837), "Would to God it were for the last time," (*Private Correspondence*, 411.)

³ His electoral votes were 170 to 124: 73 for Harrison, 26 for Hugh L. White of Tennessee, 14 for Webster, and 11 for Mangum of North Carolina. R. M. Johnson was elected Vice-President by the Senate, having received 147 votes to 147: 77 for Francis Granger of New York, 47 for John Tyler of Virginia, and 23 for William Smith of Alabama.

in the post-office, everywhere. The rise of the railway system and the increase of migration had increased the sales of public lands enormously. The growth of the revenue extinguished the debt in 1836, and it was decided, at Calhoun's suggestion, to "loan" the surplus revenue to the States.¹ The government revenues were deposited in banks selected by the Treasury — "pet banks," as they were often called. Neither these nor their unselected rivals were under any sort of supervision by the States which had chartered them or by the Federal government; and no bank-notes had any certainty of value. In 1836 the Treasury issued the "Specie Circular," ordering land agents to take only gold and silver in payment for lands.² The consequent demand for specie, and the return of paper from the West for payment, brought on the "panic of 1837" in the following spring. The business failures and public distress had had no previous parallel; the government revenues were locked up in suspended banks; and Van Buren called a special session of Congress in September. The policy which he recommended to Congress was to allow business affairs to take their natural course; to provide for the temporary needs of the government; and to "divorce bank and State" by the adoption of the "Sub-Treasury" or "Independent-Treasury" system. Failing again and again to secure a majority in Congress, even when his own party was in a majority, Van Buren persisted, and the Sub-Treasury Act finally became a law, July 4, 1840.³

Van Buren had thus been successful in that which was the one great subject of political struggle in his administration. But the panic of 1837, a smaller event of the same nature in 1839, and the usual disposition of voters to hold the administration responsible for all general evils, encouraged the Whigs to a new form of attack in 1840. Adopting no public declaration of principles, they nominated William H. Harrison, of Ohio, for President, and John Tyler, of Virginia, for Vice-President.⁴ The first of the modern "campaigns" followed. Long processions, monster mass-

¹ The loan, amounting to about \$37,000,000, was brought to an end by the panic of the following year. It was the "strict constructionists' " evasion of a difficulty. Clay's proposal, renewed again and again without success, was for an absolute distribution of the proceeds of the public lands among the States.

² Sumner, in his *Life of Jackson*, compares Jackson's management of the finances to a monkey's "regulation" of a watch: he simply "smashed things" and left his successor to repair damages. It was certainly reckless for the administration to discredit all the banks of the country when the national revenues were deposited in some of their number. Nevertheless, it ought to be noted that the Specie Circular had the merit of bringing bad financial management to a crisis.

³ Repealed in 1841 by the Whigs, the Act was

re-passed in 1846 by the Democrats, and is still law. Its principle was to throw the responsibility for the care of public moneys on receiving and disbursing officers, keeping them under sufficient bonds. The Act was framed by Silas Wright. When the National Banking system was introduced by Secretary Chase, the new banks were made legal depositories of public moneys: in so far, the principle of the original Act has been altered.

⁴ Tyler was an extreme nullifier, too strict a constructionist to endure Jackson, and a Whig only in his opposition to that President. Calhoun had shown a strong disposition to return to the Democratic organization after the retirement of Jackson, and Tyler's nomination was intended to retain the nullification element in the Whig party.

meetings, log-cabins and hard-cider (as an answer to Democratic ridicule of Harrison's frontier life), and uproarious chorus-singing became a feature of the Whig contest. For the first time, Demos was called to the help of a broad construction party, and the experiment was completely successful. The Democrats had adopted a strict construction platform, opposing protection, internal improvements, a national bank, and interference with slavery in the States, and had renominated Van Buren and Johnson. The result was the election of Harrison and Tyler, and a Whig majority in both houses of the new Congress.¹ The successful candidates were inaugurated in March, 1841, and the first step of the new President was to call a special session of Congress for May 31, the intention being, of course, to overturn the political structure which the three preceding administrations had erected. Within a month Harrison was dead, and Tyler was President in his stead.²

Clay had been very sore over Harrison's nomination ; for Tyler he had small respect ; and he came into the special session with a determination to reduce the new President to the ranks. The Sub-Treasury Act was repealed. A charter for the "Fiscal Bank of the United States" was then passed, and the President vetoed it, stating his objections to special clauses of it. A new bill was framed, with Tyler's approval, and passed. Its opponents contrived to fill the President's mind with jealousies and suspicions ; he seems to have imagined all sorts of snares ; and he vetoed the very bill which he had approved in private. The Whig majority was not large enough to override the veto ; they were stale-mated through their own President ; and all they could do was to denounce his treachery. The tariff of 1833 was to expire the next year, and the Whigs passed a bill to continue its duties, dividing surplus revenue among the States. This again was vetoed. Finally, the tariff of 1842, containing the principle of protection, but with lower duties,³ was passed and became law. In the last half of Tyler's term the Democrats had a majority in both Houses, and their hopes were high for the coming election of 1844. They were met by a new issue. Texas, which had been practically independent of Mexico since 1836, covered territory which had been claimed by the United States as a part of the Louisiana purchase, though the claim had been abandoned in 1819 in part-payment for Florida. Efforts had been making beneath the surface for its reannexation to the United States, but they had little prospect of success until 1843-44. By that time a small section of Southern politicians had decided that the interests of slavery

¹ The electoral votes were 234 to 60. Of the Democratic votes for Vice-President, 11 were cast for L. W. Tazewell of Virginia, and 1 for James K. Polk of Tennessee.

² The new administration had repudiated the idea of a "clean sweep" among the office-holders, but the pressure of the "hungry crowd," as Crittenden called it, was too strong, and the Jackson mode of procedure was henceforth a

precedent for all parties. See Von Holst's *Constitutional History* (trans.), ii. 406, and authorities there cited.

³ The percentage of duties rose in 1844 to 35.1% on dutiable imports and 26.9% on aggregate. Compare the 48.8% on dutiable and 40% on aggregate in 1830, under the tariff of 1828, and the 47.21% on dutiable, and 31.42% on aggregate in 1885, the highest point since 1871.

required an extension of territory. Where so great a power as the slave system is open to attack on moral or economic grounds, it cannot hold all its members in check; some of them will, from time to time, bring up more radical and advanced proposals; nor can it afford to desert its radicals. So long as the attacks on slavery should be kept up, the inevitable political destiny of the body of slave-holders was thus aggressive; and the attacks had now gone far enough to show the nature of the process. When Tyler, in 1844, called Calhoun into the Cabinet, the Texas annexation scheme acquired a new dignity. No one could say how general was the Southern favor for the scheme; and this very vagueness perhaps made Democratic politicians more timid in the matter, for Van Buren was committed against the present annexation of Texas. Further, Van Buren represented the strictness of the party opposition to protection, and the experience of 1840 was fresh in every one's memory. Polk, one of Van Buren's rivals for the nomination, had written a letter¹ for general reading, in which, while upholding the principle of free-trade, he had admitted his strong liking for a "reasonable incidental protection." The majority of the delegates to the Democratic convention, therefore, went prepared to vote for Van Buren, as a cloak of political virtue, while the requirement of a two-thirds vote for a nomination should make his success impossible. After a session of three days, Polk was nominated, the nomination for Vice-President being given to Silas Wright,² Van Buren's close friend. The convention also demanded the re-occupation of Oregon³ and the re-annexation of Texas. The Whigs nominated Clay and Theodore Frelinghuysen, of New York, both being opposed to annexation. Clay, however, attempted to make his opposition to the scheme less pronounced, and thus arrayed against him the Liberty party, which voted for candidates of its own, Birney and Thomas Morris of Ohio. Their votes in New York, withdrawn from Clay, gave the electoral votes of that great State to Polk and elected him.⁴ Congress, at its meeting in December, 1844, taking the result as a popular approval of annexation, passed a joint resolution for that purpose,⁵ which was approved by the President. The assent of the Texas congress, ratified July 4, 1845, by convention, made Texas part of the soil of the United States; and it was admitted as a State in December.⁶

The foreign slave-trade had been made illegal at the earliest moment

¹ The so-called "Kane letter."

² Wright declined, and George M. Dallas, of Pennsylvania, was substituted for him.

³ There was a vague popular belief that the American claim in the Oregon country went as far north as the southern limit of the Russian claim, 54° 40'; and that it ought to be maintained "with or without war with England." Hence the popular cry, "Fifty-four-forty, or fight."

⁴ The electoral votes were 170 to 105. New York's 36 votes, given to Clay, would have elected him.

⁵ The resolution would have been defeated in the Senate but for the addition of a provision authorizing annexation by treaty, and a general understanding that the execution of this clause was to be left to the incoming President. As it was, it passed by a vote of only 27 to 25. Tyler hurried to offer the original resolution to Texas for its assent. See Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, ii. 632.

⁶ Texas was the last slave State admitted. Florida had been admitted in March, 1845. Iowa and Wisconsin followed in 1846 and 1848.

allowed by the Constitution — 1808. The trade from one American port to another had produced diplomatic difficulties. If the vessel were forced by stress of weather into an English port, the slaves were set free, to the discontent of the owner. The suppression of the African slave-trade brought up again the old question of the right of search. The Webster-Ashburton treaty of 1842 provided for a joint squadron on the African coast, fixed the Canadian boundary up to the Rocky Mountains, and introduced extradition of criminals.¹ This was supplemented in 1846, under Polk, by a treaty settling the boundary west of the Rocky Mountains as it now stands.²

Texas had claimed the Rio Grande as a western boundary, but had never maintained the claim west of the River Nueces. Early in 1846 the administration brought on the Mexican war by ordering Taylor, then commanding in Texas, to pass the Nueces. When armed conflict followed, the President sent a message to Congress, declaring that Mexicans had at last shed the blood of Americans on American soil,³ and advising a declaration of war. Seizing the opportunity to put the Whigs on the wrong side, the Democrats made the declaration of war,⁴ passed May 13, 1846, an assertion that the war had been begun "by the act of the Republic of Mexico." This manœuvre failed. The Whigs, asserting that the war existed by the act of the President, voted under protest for all bills meant to support the army which the President had sent into danger. The Democrats soon had other matters to attend to. Almost the first swoop of the war gave the United States possession of all the territory north of the present northern boundary of Mexico; and in August the President applied to Congress for a grant of money with which to buy Mexico's rights in the conquered territory and end the war. A bill was brought in appropriating \$2,000,000 for this purpose. David Wilmot of Pennsylvania, a Democratic member of the House, offered as an amendment a proviso, drawn from the ordinance of 1787, forbidding slavery in any territory thus to be purchased. It passed the House by an almost unanimous vote of the Northern Democrats, and

¹ Jay's treaty of 1794 had made partial provision for extradition.

² This was so complete an abandonment of the Democratic "fifty-four-forty" programme that Polk, at Benton's suggestion, adopted the extraordinary course of stating the terms of the treaty to the Senate in advance, and leaving to that body the responsibility of "advising" the acceptance of it. The Whig senators, to their great honor, relieved the Democratic President of his embarrassment by voting to advise an acceptance. See Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, ii. 674.

³ Lincoln, in Congress in 1847, represented the Whig feeling as to this proposition by offering what was called his "spot resolution," asking for information from the President on eight points relating to the location of "the spot on

which the blood of our citizens was shed, as in his messages declared." See *Century Magazine*, xxxiii. 529.

⁴ For the events of the war see Chapter VI. Von Holst, in his third volume, chapters vi-viii, elaborates the theory that the Polk administration carried the quarrel with Great Britain about Oregon just far enough to seduce Mexico into the belief that she was to have Great Britain as an ally if she resisted Taylor's advance; and that, when Mexico had gone too far to retrace her steps, England's terms were accepted in full, the treaty of 1846 was hurried through, and the whole storm of war was turned upon Mexico. One objection to all this is, that it required a Macchiavellian subtlety for which we can find no parallel in the Polk administration.

went to the Senate just at the end of the session. Here a Whig senator, a supporter of the proviso, used up all the time in arguing in favor of it,¹ and the session expired without action. When the next session opened, most of the Democrats had seen new light. Although the Wilmot Proviso was offered as an amendment to every territorial bill, the Democratic vote against it became constantly larger. The war ended, and the territory was acquired by treaty, without any settlement of the slavery question.

The end of the war, and the few years after, are just such a period of party disintegration as that which followed the war of 1812. But there was no natural evolution of new parties, no "era of good feeling": the new policy of rotation in office, acted upon by sectional division, prevented that. Political managers, whose control of their respective groups of offices depended on the Southern vote, had to trim their sails carefully to avoid shipwreck on one side or the other, and they could have no good feeling for any one who opened new and embarrassing questions. There had always been a strong anti-slavery feeling within the Democratic party, especially in the agricultural districts, whereas the orthodox Whig policy was to ignore slavery altogether. Further, the notion of State supremacy has had its effect in giving Democratic State organizations a certain feeling of independence; and some of the Northern State organizations showed a disposition to go into alliance with the Abolitionists, as the New York Barnburners did in 1848. It is true that an evasion of the difficulty by an adoption of the notion of "popular sovereignty" or "squatter sovereignty," of leaving the choice of slavery or prohibition of slavery to the people of the interested territory, carried the Democratic party through the great struggle of 1850, which wrecked the Whig party, and four years beyond it. But the future of the party was gone when its thorough-going Abolitionists, the men whose Jeffersonian principles were not limited by the color of the individual's skin, left it in 1848 to form the Free-Soil party. The dominant party had re-enacted the Sub-Treasury Act in 1846, thus barring a national bank; it had passed the tariff of 1846, from which protection was excluded; it had now illustrated all the phases of its fundamental principle; but the principle itself left it in 1848, not to return until slavery, the disturbing force, should disappear. The case of the Whigs was worse. The dry rot had always been at work on the party organization. Composed at first of a congeries of jarring elements, it had never yet dared to formulate a platform, except a single resolution in 1844. Its success in electing Taylor in 1848² confirmed it in the fatal belief that it needed no particular party principle in regard to slavery, provided it could nominate a popular man. Thus, of the two great parties, one had no principles at all

¹ See Greeley's *American Conflict*, i. 189.

² Taylor and Fillmore had 163 electoral votes; Cass and Butler, 127. The 36 electoral votes of New York were decisive in this election also. The Free-Soil vote in that State, for

Van Buren and Charles F. Adams of Massachusetts, though it was largely a Barnburner revolt against the national Democratic organization, cost Cass the votes of the State and the election.

on the subject of slavery, and the only principle of the other was a temporary evasion. The "great struggle of 1850" was an affair of offices and sectional advantage, not of political principle. With the end of the war in 1848, real political history is suspended, the question of slavery in the territories being in the air, until the Kansas-Nebraska Act brings an issue between two real political principles: the Republican doctrine of Congressional prohibition of slavery in the territories on the one side; on the other, the doctrine wrought out by the logical mind of Calhoun, of Congressional protection of slavery in the territories.¹

Alexander Johnston

CRITICAL ESSAY ON THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE official publications of the government under the Constitution, which record its political progress and development, are the following:—

Thomas B. Waite's *State Papers and public documents of the United States* [from 1789], exhibiting a complete view of our foreign relations.²

The compilation of what is known as Peter Force's *State Papers* (edited by W. Lowrie, M. St. C. Clarke, and others) have been ordered by Congress at different times since 1831, in two series of 21 and 17 volumes each, making 38 volumes in all.³

There was copyrighted in 1834 what purports to be vol. i. of a *History of Congress; exhibiting a classification of the proceedings, March 4, 1789, to March 3, 1791* (Philad., 1843). It is not known that more was published.

The *Annals of Congress* of Joseph Gales and W. W. Seaton were published at Washington between 1834 and 1856, and include the debates and proceedings of Congress from 1789 to 1824, with the more important documents and laws, making forty-two volumes. Gales was a very competent reporter. The title was then changed to a *Register of Debates*

¹ The popular vote has no constitutional influence on Presidential elections, but is given merely as an approximation to the voting strength of parties. It can be no more than an approximation, for in some States the lowest vote is reported, in others the vote for the highest elector on the list, in others the average. The figures of Spofford's *American Almanac* are used. Until about 1824, electors were so largely chosen by the legislatures that no reliable record of the popular vote is available.

1824: Jackson, 155,872; Adams, 105,521; Clay, 46,587; Crawford, 44,282.

1828: Jackson, 647,231; Adams, 509,097.

1832: Jackson, 687,502; Clay, 530,189.

1836: Van Buren, 761,549; all the opposition, 736,656.

1840: Harrison, 1,275,017; Van Buren, 1,128,702; Birney, 7,059.

1844: Polk, 1,337,243; Clay, 1,299,068; Birney, 62,300.

1848: Taylor, 1,360,101; Cass, 1,220,544; Van Buren, 291,263.

² The series was begun by order of Congress in 1816, and consists of twelve volumes (Boston, 1817-1819), extending to 1818. The third is the last edition. Cf. *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 3062.

³ They have satisfactory indexes, and are divided thus:—

Foreign relations, 1789-1828, in six volumes.

Indian affairs, 1789-1827, in seven volumes.

Finances, 1789-1828, in five volumes.

Commerce and navigation, 1789-1823, in two volumes.

Military affairs, 1789-1838, in seven volumes.

Naval affairs, 1789-1836, in four volumes.

Post-office, 1789-1833, in one volume.

Public lands, 1789-1837, in eight volumes.

Claims, 1789-1823, in one volume.

Miscellaneous, 1789-1823, in two volumes.

in Congress, which extended to twenty-nine volumes. The speeches of Congressmen were revised by themselves. It carried the record from 1824 to 1837.

After 1833, the accredited report of Congress is *The Congressional Globe, containing the debates and proceedings* (Washington, 1834-1873), which began with the twenty-third Congress and included the forty-second, making 110 volumes in all, with indexes by sessions. It was conducted by Francis P. Blair and J. C. Rives, and later by Rives alone, and by others. The speeches are revised by the speakers, and the laws are reported in an appendix of each session. It is well known that speeches not delivered were often included in its reports, and Hudson (*Journalism in the United States*) affirms that its records were not always trustworthy, the soberer after-thought of speakers obscuring or transforming what was actually said.¹

The ordinary recourse for the debates of Congress is Thomas H. Benton's *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress, 1789-1850, from Gales and Seaton's Annals of Congress; from their Register of Debates; and from the official reported Debates by John C. Rives* (N. Y., 1857-1863), in 16 volumes, with an index in each volume.² This publication may be well supplemented by another, involving much more his own personality, his *Thirty Years' View, or a History of the working of the American Government, 1820-1850* (N. Y., 1854-56), in two volumes, chiefly taken from the Congress debates, the private papers of Jackson, and speeches of Benton, with his actual view of men and affairs.³

The Senate sat with closed doors till February 20, 1794.⁴ Although its *Legislative Journal* was printed from 1789, and for the period (1789-1815) was reprinted in 1820-21, in five volumes, and its *Executive Journal* (1789-1829) was printed in three volumes, we had no record of its earliest debates, before the notes made by one of its members, William Maclay, of Pennsylvania, recently appeared as *Sketches of debate in the first senate of the United States* [April 24, 1789, to March 3, 1791], edited by George W. Harris (Harrisburg, 1880).⁵

The *Journal of the House of Representatives, 1789-1815*, was reprinted (1826) in nine volumes, with an index in each. This may be supplemented for the earlier part of the time by Thomas Lloyd's *Congressional Register, or Proceedings and Debates of the first House of Representatives* (N. Y., 1789-1791), in four volumes.⁶ The *Journal of the House of Representatives* is in print from 1789.

Congress soon began to add other publications, called *Senate Documents; Executive Documents*, usually called *State Papers; Reports of Committees of the House; Extra Journals* in trials of impeachment; and *Bills*. After the thirtieth Congress (1847-1849) these additional publications increased.⁷

¹ Cf. Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, i. ch. 43, on the *Globe* newspaper establishment. The *Globe* was succeeded in 1873 by the *Congressional Record*, printed at the government printing-office. Cf. R. W. Kerr's *History of the Government Printing-Office, with a brief record of the public printing, 1789-1881* (Lancaster, 1881).

² The debates at the time (1856) Benton undertook his work made a hundred volumes, and the essential trains of thought and action, as showing the development and motions of government, were buried in a mass of other temporary and extraneous matters. This was his warrant for a compilation which should omit routine business and private bills and avoid repetitions. He adds some notes and comments.

³ There are other reminiscent books:—
C. W. March, *Reminiscences of Congress* (1813-1834), N. Y., 1850.
H. G. Wheeler, *Hist. of Congress, biographical*

and *political* (1839-1847), N. Y., 1848, in two vols.

⁴ Cf. *Life of Geo. Read*, 532. For the reasons which impelled the opening of the doors, see contemporary letter in *Am. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1887, p. 371. For its later secret sessions, see D. B. Eaton's *Secret Sessions of the Senate* (N. Y., 1886), who deems the custom disastrous.

⁵ This record is of a continuous character, while that which we derive from the writings of Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Wolcott is fragmentary. A debate of the Senate, Dec. 30, 1791, on the sending of ministers abroad, is preserved among Washington's papers (Sparks, x. 479).

⁶ It is the best account we have, and is adopted by Gales and Seaton. Van Buren (*Polit. Parties*, 191) calls the reports "tolerably full and obviously fair," and regrets that Benton did not adopt them.

⁷ The *Boston Public Library, Bates Hall Catal.*

The *Laws of the United States*, as issued by sessions, began at Philadelphia in 1796, and was continued at Washington, making 35 vols. down to 1850.¹

The principal collection of the *Laws of the United States* is an early one, compiled by J. B. Colvin, and authorized by Congress in 1814. The plan of the compilation was one suggested by Richard Rush, and adopted by Monroe, then Secretary of State.²

What is known as the United States *Statutes at Large* was published in Boston (1845, etc.), under the editing of R. Peters to vol. viii., and of G. Minot and G. P. Sanger, later, being authorized by Congress in 1845, and subsequently authenticated as competent evidence in all courts.³

In studying the course of political parties in the United States,⁴ the readiest bibliographical aid is W. E. Foster's *References to the History of Presidential Administrations, 1789-1885* (N. Y., 1885); though many of the political biographies are ample in their foot-notes, and some of the general histories, which emphasize the political side.⁵

The best concise mapping of the whole course of American politics under the Federal government is Alexander Johnston's *History of American Politics*, which was originally

p. 796, gives a convenient synopsis of all these extra documents, as does the *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 3065, etc.

Indexes of the documents of the first eighteen Congresses were printed in 1823-24; and others, continuing the same, were added in 1832, 1840, and 1870. A *General index to the Journals of Congress (1st-10th, 1789 to 1809), with references to debates, documents and statutes*, by Albert Ordway, was printed in 1880. The documents in the *State Papers* prior to 1823 are well indexed. An index to the Congressional documents after 1823 will be found in the Boston Public Library's *Bates Hall Index*, p. 815. There is a *Synoptical index to the laws and treaties, 1789-1851* (Boston, 1860).

¹ There were other contemporary editions of the early acts, as one at Boston, 1795, for the first and second Congress.

² Vol. i. — the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, treaties, proclamations, etc. Vols. ii., iii., and iv. — the laws from 1789 to 1815. Vol. v. — lists of acts and resolutions, and various indexes. Vols. vi. and vii. brought the laws and treaties down to 1827, with an excellent index, by Samuel Burch, for the whole period, 1789-1827. It is sometimes found in separate binding. Vols. viii. to xi. continue the collection to 1848.

³ The collection begins with the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution, and then follow the public acts from 1789 to 1845, — these making volumes i. to v. Vol. vi. has private statutes at large, 1789-1845. Vol. vii. has Indian treaties, 1778-1845. Vol. viii. has treaties with foreign powers, 1778-1845, and a general index to the eight volumes. The series was continued beyond this, putting the public and private acts, treaties, and proclamations together in successive volumes. There

are several lesser collections. Richard Folwell's *Laws of the United States*, containing also treaties, covers 1789-1797, in 3 vols.

Judge Story edited in 3 vols. the *Public and General Statutes of the United States, 1789-1827*, with marginal references and index, and an appendix, with a fourth volume (1828-1836), edited by G. Sharswood (Philad., 1837).

The different compends are: —

Digest of the general Laws of the U. S. [1789-1856], with references to acts repealed and notes of decisions of the Supreme Court, by J. Dunlop (Philad., 1856).

Analytical Digest of the laws of the U. S., 1789-1869, by F. C. Brightly (Philad., 1859-1869), in 2 vols.

A *Synoptical index to the Laws and Statutes of the U. S., 1789-1851*, prepared by A. Dickens (Boston, 1852).

A volume of *Official opinions of the Attorneys General of the U. S.* was printed in Washington in 1852.

⁴ On the necessity of parties, with particular reference to our early history under the Constitution, see John Adams's *Works*, x. 23, 48, 50; Sparks's *Washington*, x. 283. On the general proposition, see Smyth's *Lectures on History*, Bohn's ed., ii. 502; Lalor's *Cyclo. Polit. Science*, iii. 95; Crane and Moses's *Politics* (N. Y., 1884).

⁵ Like Von Holst and Schouler, Hildreth masses his references at the end of his sixth volume. There is a good list of the party literature from 1789 down, in the *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, pp. 3148, etc. The distinctively political periodicals did not begin till a late day, like the *American Whig Review* (1844, etc.), and the *Democratic Review* (1841, etc.), but their articles sometimes are retrospective. Talcott Williams wrote the article on "Party government in the U. S." in Lalor's *Cyclopædia*, iii. 112.

issued in 1879, and reached a revised and enlarged edition in 1882. It follows the course by administrations.¹

The most conspicuous surveys of the subject, by virtue of the positions of the writers, are John Quincy Adams's *Jubilee Discourse before the N. Y. Hist. Society, April 30, 1839*, on the origin and progress of parties; and the posthumous *Inquiry into the origin and course of political parties in the United States, by the late ex-president Martin Van Buren, edited by his sons* (N. Y., 1867). The remarkably independent career of Adams lends interest to his views, and as an exponent of Democracy the *Inquiry* of Van Buren gives us the vindictive though somewhat mollified estimates of the Jacksonian Democracy.² The latter book is not well constructed, and there is a recurrence of thought verging at times upon garrulity.

¹ Mr. Johnston also furnished the articles on the political history of the United States in John J. Lalor's *Cyclopædia of Political Science* (Chicago, 1881, 3 vols.), and the principal ones are supplemented by useful references to documents, discussions, and narratives appertaining. There are some specific monographs worth noting:—

M. W. Cluskey's *Political Text-book* (Washington, 1857, and later editions), a mass of documentary material, topically arranged. E. G. Tileston's *Hand-book of the Administrations of the U. S.* (Boston, 1871).

M. C. Spaulding's *Hand-book of Statistics of the U. S. (1789—), a record of Administrations and Events* (N. Y., 1874).

Edward Stanwood's *History of Presidential Elections* (Boston, 1884), with the campaign platforms. Cf. E. W. Gilliam, "Presidential Elections historically considered," in the *Mag. of American Hist.* xiv. 189; the "Early Presidents,"

in *Ibid.*, Feb., 1884; and "Unsuccessful Candidates for the Presidency," with portraits of A. Burr, J. C. Calhoun, L. Cass, H. Clay, DeWitt Clinton, Geo. Clinton, W. H. Crawford, E. Gerry, R. King, W. Scott, W. Wirt, in *Ibid.*, Nov., 1884.

The Presidential counts: a complete official record of the proceedings of Congress at the counting of the electoral votes in all the elections of president and vice-president of the United States: together with all congressional debates incident thereto, or to proposed legislation upon that subject. With an analytical introduction (New York, 1877).

The votes for the Presidents will be found in the *American Almanac*, 1860, p. 198; Lalor's *Cyclopædia*, ii. 53, iii. 1001, and elsewhere. The series of Presidents, so far as they come within the scope of the present chapter, is:—

| NAMES. | Born. | Inaugurated. | Con. in office. | Died. | Native of. |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| George Washington | Feb. 22, 1732 | Apr. 30, 1789 | 8 years . . | Dec. 14, 1799 | Virginia. |
| John Adams | Oct. 30, 1735 | Mar. 4, 1797 | 4 " . . . | July 4, 1826 | Mass. |
| Thomas Jefferson | Apr. 2, 1743 | " 4, 1801 | 8 " . . . | July 4, 1826 | Virginia. |
| James Madison | Mar. 16, 1751 | " 4, 1809 | 8 " . . . | June 28, 1836 | " |
| James Monroe | Apr. 2, 1759 | " 4, 1817 | 8 " . . . | July 4, 1831 | " |
| John Quincy Adams | July 11, 1767 | " 4, 1825 | 4 " . . . | Feb. 23, 1848 | Mass. |
| Andrew Jackson | Mar. 15, 1767 | " 4, 1829 | 8 " . . . | June 8, 1845 | S. Carolina. |
| Martin Van Buren | Dec. 5, 1782 | " 4, 1837 | 4 " . . . | Dec. 27, 1862 | New York. |
| William H. Harrison | Feb. 9, 1773 | " 4, 1841 | 1 month . . | April 4, 1841 | Virginia. |
| John Tyler | Mar. 20, 1790 | Apr. 5, 1841 | 3 yrs 11 mo's | Jan. 17, 1862 | " |
| James K. Polk | Nov. 2, 1795 | Mar. 4, 1845 | 4 years . . | June 15, 1849 | N. Carolina. |
| Zachary Taylor | Nov. 24, 1790 | " 4, 1849 | 1 year 4 mo's | July 9, 1850 | Virginia. |

A few special subjects:—On the veto power, see Lalor, iii. 1064; Lucy M. Salmon's *Hist. of the appointing power of the president*, no. 5 of the papers of the Amer. Hist. Association, 1886. Cf. "Appointments and Removals," in Lalor, iii. 586. The Caucus System, in Lalor, by Frederick W. Whitridge, and published separately in 1883 (*Economic Tracts*, no. 8); and by G. W. Lawton, *The American Caucus System, its origin, purpose, and utility* (1884), in *Questions of the day*. Lalor (ii. 1039) also has a paper on "Nominating Conventions." On the creation of Departmental Offices, see George N. Lamphere's *United States Government, its organization and*

practical workings (Philad., 1880); Towle's *Hist. and Analysis of the Constitution*, p. 377; and Lalor's *Cyclopædia*. Cf. Lossing on the Executive Departments and their Seals, in *Harper's Mag.*, xxxviii. 319. J. F. Jameson's *Introd. to the study of the constitutional and political history of the States* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, 1886) is in some measure an appeal for the study of local political opinion, as affecting the masses and the progress of parties. *Poole's Index* gives many references on "government of the U. S.," p. 1349.

² Cf. p. 74 upon Hamilton. Also C. C. Hazewell's review in *No. Amer. Rev.*, cv. p. 267. The

The principal of the more extended histories of later origin is Dr. J. D. Hammond's *History of the political parties in the State of New York, 1789-1840*. To the 4th enlarged edition (Buffalo, 1850, in two vols.)¹ General Root has added notes. The author is a Democrat, but not a partisan, and the book is generally commended.²

To these may be added two well-known books of reference: Edwin Williams's *Statesman's Manual*, or more properly cited as *The addresses and messages of the Presidents, 1789-1849, with memoir, etc.* (N. Y., 1847-49, in 3 vols.; new and enlarged ed. in 4 vols., N. Y., 1854), with each President's papers followed by a review of his administration and policy;³ and T. V. Cooper and H. T. Fenton's *American Politics* (Philad., 1882),⁴ in which book i. gives a history of parties, and book ii. has the party platforms, 1800-1880.

The lives of leading statesmen,⁵ as well as the general histories, necessarily trace the

estimate of Alexander Hamilton led the son of that Federalist leader, James A. Hamilton, to counteract its unfavorable tone in his *Reminiscences* (N. Y., 1869), which contains also an examination of Jefferson's charges against Hamilton. Matthew Carey published his *Olive Branch* (Boston, 1815; Philad., 1818, and later) after the Federalists had begun to lose ground, in which he endeavored to show that there were faults on both sides, but he hardly pleased either extreme, though the book was sufficiently popular to pass through numerous editions. Carey acknowledged himself an Anti-Federalist, though not necessarily an approver of all his party might do. His mediatory efforts consisted mainly in assaulting what he did not like in both parties, and not always temperately. He defends the Alien and Sedition laws, and abuses Jefferson for his mistakes. He thinks the New England Federalists plotted treason, and arrogated for themselves a commercial importance which they did not have. (Cf. Duyckinck, i. 641.)

¹ Hammond's *Life and Times of Silas Wright* (1848) is sometimes called a third volume.

² C. K. Adams's *Manual*, p. 554. There are several other helpful books:

Orrin Skinner's *Issues of American Politics* (Philad., 1873). Arthur Holmes's *Parties and their principles, a manual of historical and political intelligence* (N. Y., 1859). The book unfortunately has no references or authorities.

Walter R. Houghton's *Hist. of Amer. Politics (non-partizan) embracing a history of the federal government and of political parties in the Colonies and United States from 1607 to 1882* (Indianapolis, 1883).

Of less importance are:—L. J. Jennings's *Eighty years of Republican Government in the U. S.* (London, 1868; cf. P. W. Clayden in *Fortnightly Rev.*, ix. 117). A. W. Young's *American Statesman: Political history of the U. S., enlarged by G. T. Ferris* (N. Y., 1877). "It might with some propriety be called," says C. K. Adams (*Manual*, 578), "a history of public opinion on political questions." Joseph Brucker's *Chief political parties in the United States, their history and teaching* (Milwaukee, 1880). Lewis O.

Thompson's *Presidents and their Administrations* (Indianapolis, 1873). William C. Roberts's *Leading Orators of twenty-five Campaigns, with a concise history of political parties* (N. Y., 1884).

There is a paper on "The Origin and Character of the Old Parties" in the *No. Amer. Rev.*, xxxix. 208. J. M. Cutts, in his *Constitutional and party questions* (1866), has a section on the origin, history, and state of parties.

W. G. Sumner summarizes the history of politics 1776-1876 in the *N. Am. Rev.*, Jan., 1876. W. C. Fowler gives an outline history of parties in their territorial relations in his *Sectional Controversy* (N. Y., 1868). Cf. Horace White on the relations of government to State sovereignty in the *Fortnightly Review*, Oct., 1876. S. M. Allen's *Old and New Republican parties, 1789-1880* (Boston, 1880).

³ Cf. Jeremiah Chaplin's *Chips from the White House; or selections from the speeches, etc., of the Presidents* (Boston, 1881). *Addresses and Messages of the Presidents, Washington [to] Van Buren* (N. Y., 1837).

⁴ *Contents*:—History of the political parties. — Political platforms. — Great speeches on great issues. — Parliamentary practice. — Existing political laws. — Federal blue-book. — Tabulated history of politics.

⁵ Greg (*United States*, i. 459) charges the "Amer. Statesmen Series" with expressing the views of a party "which conquered in the civil war as developed by conflict and exaggerated by victory, and written for a generation which has converted a confederacy into a consolidated sovereignty." Cf. on the other hand, on this same series, Goldwin Smith in the *Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1888.

The earlier, much more condensed sketches of leading statesmen in J. G. Baldwin's *Party Leaders* (N. Y., 1855) offers comparisons of party champions in the sketches of Jefferson, Hamilton, Jackson, Clay, and Randolph. We may trace the rivalry of leadership in the early administrations with due allowances in such representative books as Randall's *Jefferson* and J. C. Hamilton's latest *Life of Hamilton*, letting one correct the other.

history of parties, but reference may be particularly made on the origin and development of the two great parties to Schouler's *United States* (i. 47); Roberts's *New York*, ii. ch. 27; and for the comments of a wary observer, O. A. Brownson's *Works*, xvi. 350. Carl Schurz in his *Henry Clay* (i. 316) traces sharply the sequence from Federalism and Republicanism through the Democratic Republican adherents of Jackson and the National Republican followers of Clay, till they became respectively the later Democratic and Whig parties.¹

Madison has some exculpatory remarks on the changes of the policy of the Republican party, which brought them to the ground held by the Federalists (*Letters*, iii. 317, 321, 325), which may be taken as indicative of the explanations given by both parties for similar tergiversations.

Von Holst's *Constitutional History of the United States* is in some respects the most suggestive book we have on the progress and shiftings of parties. It is written so as to presuppose in the reader some knowledge of events, and he soon learns to make allowances for the disheartening quality of his comment.²

Of all the personal experiences of prominent actors in political events which have come before the public, the most important is the *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, which makes a current diary from 1795 to 1848, embraced in twelve large volumes, covering his career as diplomatist, Secretary of State, President, and member of the House of Representatives. One gets weary of his rasping criticism of his contemporaries, and wonders if he felt all he said of condemnation to be true.³

It was the mission of Washington, in the early days of our constitutional history, to hold the passions of the young parties in check;⁴ and while there can be no doubt of his sympathy with the more conservative of the Federal leaders, he was not by policy openly adverse in all ways to the principles of their opponents. As the commanding character of all, he deserves our attention, first, to discover what best unveils him, and to make it plain how different men understood him then and since. There were almost innumerable sketches of his career, temporary in their character, before we began to have any that have left an impress of some sort. The earliest of these last is one of little value, but it has set the popular standard with the masses of readers. This is the narrative by Mason L. Weems, an Episcopal clergyman, who, while officiating at a church neighboring to Mount

¹ R. McK. Ormsby's *Hist. of the Whig Party*, 2d ed. (Boston, 1860), traces its immediate origin in the unimpassioned time of Monroe's administration. Cf. on the origin of the Whig and Democratic parties in *Amer. Whig Review*, ix. 6; and Johnston's article in *Lalor*, iii. 1101, under "Whig Party." Lodge (*Webster*, 297) places its definite formation in Jackson's time.

² Unfortunately the English translation is not faultless. An older book, Alden Bradford's *History of the Federal Government for fifty years, 1788-1839* (Boston, 1840), is chiefly now of importance for the personal acquaintance of the author (b. 1765; d. 1843) with the progress of political belief during that period.

³ John T. Morse, in his *John Quincy Adams*, "travels along its broad route to the end," and he doubts if any one ever before left to posterity a "portrait of himself more full, correct, vivid, and picturesque."

There is only space here to refer to a few other personal records, like those of Nathan Sargent's *Public Men and Events*, sometimes known as the


reminiscences of "Oliver Oldschool"; the *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, by L. G. Tyler; the *Autobiography and Memoir of W. H. Seward* (1801-1846); the *Autobiography and Memoir of Thurlow Weed*; and G. T. Curtis's lives of *Buchanan and Webster*, both based on personal papers, — not to name others.

On the phases of political life in Kentucky and the Southwest, we find some personal flavor in Lucius P. Little's *Ben. Hardin, his Times and Contemporaries* (Louisville, 1887); the *Autobiography of David Crockett* (Philad., 1834, — cf. *Pool's Index*); the *Memoir of Sargeant S. Prentiss*, by George L. Prentiss (N. Y., 1855), in two vols., and a life of him by Shields. The lives of Jackson and Clay necessarily touch this region and period.

⁴ Cf. Randall's *Jefferson*, ii. 518. The testimony of Wm. Smyth (*Lectures on Modern History*, ii. last chap.) deserves all the more confidence that it was written in 1811, when the relations of England and America were strained to excess.

Vernon, had known Washington. His *Life of George Washington* was published a few months after Washington's death, and is the source of most of the popular estimation of the superhuman goodness of the man, which it has kept alive by repeated editions, dressed out with all the arts in which Weems, who became a book-agent, was an adept.¹

It was in John Marshall's *Life of George Washington, compiled under the inspection of Bushrod Washington*,² that the most authentic material respecting Washington's life, namely, his own papers, received the impress of a true historic spirit. Its execution was



JOHN MARSHALL.*

not altogether deliberate, however, and there were improvements introduced in a revision. Jefferson at the time, indeed, judged there was a purpose in its hastened publication, which was to affect the pending presidential election.³ The book has, indeed, notwithstanding a perspicuous method, suffered in popular estimation from a somewhat dull style; and Smyth⁴ points out that its more conspicuous merit is in the pictures it gives of the distresses which at times gathered about Washington.

The *Life of Washington*, by David Ramsay, was largely an attempt to give more popular interest, in a less extended narrative, to the story as told by Marshall.⁵

An account is given in another place of the labors of Jared Sparks as editor of Washington's Papers. They resulted in what has been the historical student's ultimate resort, *The Writings of George Washington, being his Correspondence, addresses, messages, and other papers, official and private, selected and published from the original manuscripts, with a life of the author, notes, and illustrations, by Jared Sparks*. Boston, 1834-1837.⁶

¹ It gave Parton occasion to publish his "Real and Traditional Washington" in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, iii. 465, to which Dr. De Costa made a rejoinder in *Ibid.* v. 81. (Cf. references in Allibone, iii. 2633.)

² Published in Philad. and London, in five quarto vols., in 1804-1807; and at the same time in octavo. The introduction, on colonial history, was published separately in 1824, and in the revised ed. of the *Life* (Philad., 1832) it was omitted. It was abridged in a school ed. in 1838.

³ Magruder (*John Marshall*, ch. 12) says that Jefferson wished Joel Barlow to take Marshall's material, and such other as he and Madison could offer, and write a history of the United States since the war, to be a corrective of Marshall.

⁴ *Lectures*, Bohn's ed., ii. 461, 475.

⁵ It was first published at New York in 1807, and has passed through many editions (cf. Sabin, xvi. 67,695, etc.), and has been once or twice revised. Of a more ethical character was the study of Washington made by the Rev. Aaron Bancroft, then a minister settled at Worcester, Mass., and the father of George Bancroft. He published in the first place one of the very many printed eulogies of Washington which marked the year following his death. This led to the *Essay on the Life of Washington* (Worcester, 1807), and the later *Life of Washington* (Boston, 1826, and later dates).

⁶ The plates were used for other issues, dated 1842, etc., and are now the property of Harvard College. An attempt to issue the book in England failed; but in 1839, and again in 1842, some

* After a print in the *Analectic Magazine*, July, 1817, engraved by E. Kearny from a painting by J. Wood.

The most important of the later accounts of Washington is the *Life* by Washington Irving, a graceful rendering of accessible knowledge, with little independent research of importance.¹

selections from it were printed in London, without the sanction of Sparks, under the title of *Personal memoirs and diaries of George Washington . . . by Jared Sparks*, in two volumes.

The first volume of the original work, which contained the life, was separately issued in 1839, and during Sparks's life seventeen editions had been printed. Sparks abridged the life, in two volumes (Boston, 1840, etc., and Auburn, N. Y., 1851). The complete text of the life was also published in 1855 at Dessau, Germany, in a collection of standard American authors.

Guizot condensed the original twelve volumes into six (Paris, 1839-1840), under the title of *Vie, correspondance, et écrits de Washington, publiés d'après l'édition Américaine, et précédés d'une introduction sur l'influence et le caractère de Washington dans la révolution des États-Unis de l'Amérique*. Sparks's life is followed in the *Vie*, and such parts of the letters are given as were deemed necessary. The *Vie* was also published separately in 1839, and an English translation appeared in 1851. It has been the subject of some surprise that Sparks's name was never mentioned in the title, and this omission, it is claimed, caused successive editions of the French translation to be credited to Guizot alone (*Sparks Catal.*, no. 2,789). Sparks notes that the atlas of plates and maps which accompanied Guizot's publication were taken from Sparks's publication without acknowledgment (*Ibid.*, preliminary, p. 2).

In 1851 there appeared *Fondation de la république des États-Unis d'Amérique. Vie de Washington, traduite de l'Anglais de M. Jared Sparks par M. Ch. . . . et précédée d'une introduction par M. Guizot*, in two volumes.

A German version in two vols., issued at Leipzig in 1839, was called *Leben und Briefwechsel Georg Washingtons, nach dem Englischen des Jared Sparks im Auszuge bearbeitet, herausgegeben von F. von Raumer*.

A work supplemental to the twelve volumes was projected by Sparks, to be called *Illustrations of the principal events in the life of Washington, edited by Jared Sparks*, each part to have four engravings; but some failure in the details prevented the publication of more than a single part (Allibone, p. 2193).

A few years after the publication of the twelve volumes there was prepared in Boston, under the editing of Charles W. Upham, a *Life of Washington in the form of an autobiography; the narrative being to a great extent conducted by himself in extracts and selections from his own writings* (Boston, 1840, two volumes). The book was, in fact, mainly a collection of extracts

from Washington's writings, as edited by Sparks, strung together so as to make a continuous narrative of his life. The Circuit Court of the United States held it to be an infringement of Sparks's copyright, and the book was never published, though a very few copies are known to be in existence (Boston Pub. Library; Harvard College library). The plates were sent to England, and various editions from them were disposed of there. The *Sparks Catalogue*, no. 2,790, notes one, entitled *The life of General Washington, written by himself, comprising his memoirs and correspondence as prepared by him for publication, including several original letters now first printed. Edited by C. W. Upham* (London, 1852, in two volumes). Cf. G. E. Ellis's memoir of Upham in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xv. 198.

¹ An illustrated copy in the Menzies sale, no. 1,041, brought \$4,080. The details of his private life are especially studied in Richard Rush's *Domestic Life of Washington* (Philad., 1857), and in G. W. P. Custis's *Recollections of Washington* (1860). There are some anecdotes in John Barnard's *Retrospections of America*, p. 85. There is a chapter on his religious character in Meade's *Old Churches of Virginia*.

The more popular lives of less extent are those by James K. Paulding in *Harper's Family Library*; *The Life and Times of Gen. Washington*, by Cyrus R. Edmonds (Washington, 1835); Mrs. Kirkland's *Memoirs of Washington* (N. Y. 1857); and Schroeder's *Life and Times of Washington*, an illustrated volume. The latest are John Habberton's *George Washington* (N. Y., 1884), and Edward E. Hale's *Life of George Washington*, studied anew, as he claims, to present the human side of his character (N. Y., 1887).

From the time of the eulogy of Gen. Henry Lee, which gave currency to the phrase "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," leading American orators like Fisher Ames, Webster, Winthrop, and Everett have made his character and career the subject of addresses. That of Mr. Everett is the best known from the many repetitions which he gave of it to help the fund for the redemption of Mount Vernon, and he has told the story of his successful efforts in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* (June, 1858). Mr. Everett also elucidated Washington's career in his *Mount Vernon Papers*, and wrote the article on him in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, which was later printed separately as a *Life of Washington* (N. Y., 1860). Among essayists, Theodore Parker in his *Historic Americans*, and E. P. Whipple in his *Washington and the principles of the Revolution*, are perhaps the best

The antagonisms and contrasts of Jefferson and Hamilton as representing the Republican and Federalist views¹ have given color to all the literature rehearsing the history of their times, and of the later outgrowths; and as their characters embody more distinctively than any others the spirit of the two opposing divisions of the American people at the beginning of the constitutional period, the consideration of the literary aids to the understanding of their respective agencies can best engage us first before going farther.

The only estimate of these opposing founders of the Republic, in a historical spirit, made near their time, was by Marshall in his *Life of Washington* (1804-1807). Marshall was a strong Federalist, and his views were promptly questioned.² What are known as his *Anas* was Jefferson's record, while he was Washington's Secretary of State, of the opinions which he had given the President on the questions about which they were more or less at variance. In the revision which he made at a later day (1818), for their

known. The reader needs to be warned against a fraudulent *Memorials of Washington*, by one Walter (N. Y., 1887). The French lives, since Guizot, of the most importance are those by Cornelis de Witt (reviewed by J. J. Ampère in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, x. 630), and Joseph Fabre's *Washington libérateur de l'Amérique, suivi de La révolution américaine et Washington; documents et éclaircissements* (Paris, 1882).

The best display of the multifarious characterizations of Washington will be found in W. S. Baker's *Character portraits of Washington as delineated by historians, orators, and divines; selected and arranged in chronological order, with biographical notes and references* (Philadelphia, 1887), which will serve as a key to the works drawn upon. John Adams (*Works*, ix. 541) has a striking estimate of Washington's relation to his countrymen; Lecky's estimate (vol. iii. 468) is one of the best.

Among the later American general historians, we have conspicuous drawings of his character in Bancroft (final revision, vi. 177); in Schouler (i. 121-126); and a not altogether grateful one, strained in some respects, by McMaster.

The most popular estimate of Washington as a soldier is in Joel T. Headley's *Washington and his generals* (1842, and various later eds.). Col. Carrington has examined his conduct as a strategist in *No. Amer. Rev.*, Oct., 1881. There are papers on his various headquarters in Custis's *Recollections* (ch. 9); on his military family in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.* (1881), vii. 81; and on his life-guard in *Hist. Mag.*, May, 1858, in G. W. P. Custis's *Recollections of Washington* (ch. 7), and Lossing's *Field-Book*, ii. 120. For the feeling for and against him during the war, see Sargent's *Stansbury and Odell*, p. 176.

Respecting the English ancestry, the paper of Col. Joseph L. Chester (*N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, xxi. 25, Jan., 1867) disposes of the earlier belief in Washington's connection with the Washingtons buried at Brington, Northamptonshire.

Fac-similes of the memorial stones of the last English ancestors of George Washington in the parish church of Brington, Northamptonshire,

England; permanently placed in the State house of Massachusetts (Boston, 1862), which contains Gov. Andrew's Message to the House of Representatives, with letters from Jared Sparks and Charles Sumner, etc.

Cf. papers in *Harper's Mag.*, March, 1879; *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, 1882, p. 765, and 1885, p. 587; *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, 2d ser., ii. 231; and for the Virginia family, Meade's *Churches of Virginia*, ii. 166; and the reader needs hardly to be warned against the folly of Albert Welles's *Pedigree and History of the Washington Family from Odin, B. C. 70 to Gen. Geo. Washington* (N. Y., 1879).

For the proceedings in Congress on his death, see Sparks's *Washington*, i. 563; Irving's *Washington*, v. App. 3. Cf. also Hildreth, v. 337; McMaster, ii. 452; *Washingtoniana* (Baltimore, 1800; reprinted, New York, 1866); Francis Johnston and Wm. Hamilton's *Washingtoniana* (Lancaster, Pa., 1802); F. B. Hough's *Washingtoniana, a memorial of the death of Washington, with a list of tracts and volumes printed on the occasion, and a Catalogue of medals* (Roxbury, Mass., 1865, in 2 vols.); Sullivan's *Public Men*, 168.

His will was printed at the time, and is given by Sparks. He bequeathed five swords (*Mag. Amer. Hist.*, March, 1887, p. 257). One was presented to Congress with a staff of Franklin (*House Doc. no. 144; 27th Cong. 3d session*).

Materials for the bibliography of *Washingtoniana* exist in the *Brinley Catal.*, nos. 4, 189-4, 276; the *J. J. Cooke Catal.*, iii. nos. 2, 563-2, 683; *Boon Catal.*, pp. 430-452. Cf. also *Poole's Index*, p. 1387.

¹ Cf., for instance, Von Holst, *Eng. transl.*, i. ch. 3; Schouler, i. 171, 174, 203, 209; Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 40 and 47. Sumner, in his *Life of Jackson*, recapitulates the history of the different points of antagonism: the Federal judiciary; the Southern Indian question; the land system; internal improvements; the tariff; nullification; and the U. S. Bank. Cf. also Sparks's *Washington*, x. 315; Hildreth, iv. 297, 359, 393; Rives's *Madison*, iii.

² Cf. Jefferson's *Works*, iv. 443.

ultimate publication, he aimed, as he said, to leave out all personal reflections,¹ and accounted for his desire to preserve the notes at all because they bear testimony "against the only history of that period [Marshall's] which pretends to have been compiled from authentic and unpublished documents."²

The earliest publication of Jefferson's works was in the *Memoir, Correspondence and Miscellanies of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by T. F. Randolph.³ The attacks on what was called Jefferson's infidelity mainly rested upon a passage in his *Notes on Virginia*,⁴ and they were used for political effect, principally in New England. The main exposition of this sort against Jefferson was made by John M. Mason, and his accusations⁵ are reprinted in an edition of his writings by his son, — *The Writings of the late John M. Mason, D. D.* (N. Y., 1832, 1849. Cf. Allibone, p. 1237).⁶ Another cause of complaint was found by the sensitive son of General Henry Lee in some words of Jefferson, now made public by Randolph, respecting an intimation that Jefferson had suspected Washington of British leaning; and the younger Henry Lee published at New York, in 1832, some *Observations on the Writings of Thomas Jefferson, with particular reference to the attack they contain on the memory of the late General Henry Lee*.⁷ It was a studied attempt to prove the unbridled hostility of Jefferson to many of the great men of the Federal side, like Washington, Marshall, Hamilton, Knox, Jay, and R. H. Lee.⁸

An early result of this publication of Jefferson's writings had been the little compendious *Life of Jefferson*, by B. L. Rayner (N. Y., 1832);⁹ but ample justice was not done to Jefferson's memory till, with the aid of new papers not included in Randolph's edition, and with Madison's sympathy and assistance,¹⁰ Professor George Tucker produced his *Life of Thomas Jefferson, with parts of his Correspondence never before published, and notices of his opinions on questions of Civil Government, National Policy and Constitutional Law* (Philad., 1837, in 2 vols.; also London, 1837).¹¹ The book was in fact a

¹ The *Anas* are in Jefferson's *Writings*, ix., and after excisions we still read there (p. 96): "Hamilton was not only for a monarchy, but for a monarchy bottomed on corruption." Randall, i. ch. 15, attempts to explain this phrase. Cf. Morse's *Jefferson*, 109, on the unfortunate preservation of the *Anas*.

² The biographers of Jefferson all have to protest gently or vigorously against the tone of that biography of Washington. Cf. Tucker and Randall (ii. 35) particularly on Marshall's historical method; and on his influence on the action of parties, Van Buren's *Polit. Parties*, ch. 6; and on the enmity of Jefferson to Marshall, the *Amer. Quarterly*, vii. 123.

³ Charlottesville, Va., 1829, in four volumes, and in 1829 and 1830, at Boston, New York, and London; the London edition having the title changed to the *Memoirs, Correspondence, and private papers*, etc. Cf. Madison's *Letters, etc.*, iii. 532, 538, 618, 629; Tompkins's *Bibl. Jeff.*, p. 113; Sabin, *Dict.*, ix. 35,891-2.

⁴ See O'Callaghan on the bibliog. of this book in Allibone; Sabin's *Dict.*, ix. 35,894, etc. The first private ed. bears date [Paris], 1782; the first published ed., Philad., 1788. The latest and best bibliography of the *Notes on Va.* is in H. B. Tompkins's *Bibliotheca Jeffersoniana*, pp. 65, etc.

⁵ *Voice of Warning to Christians* (N. Y., 1800).

⁶ Randall (ii. 568; iii. App. 8) replies to this attack, and gives a chapter (iii. ch. 14) on Jef-

fer'son's belief in Christianity. Cf. *Test of the religious principles of Thomas Jefferson, extracted from his writings* (Easton and Philad., 1800; Sabin, *Dict.*, ix. 35,936, etc.); C. C. Moore's *Observations upon certain passages in Mr. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, which appear to have a tendency to subvert religion, and establish a false philosophy* [Anon.], (New York, 1804); Gay's *Pop. Hist. U. S.*, iv. 164; McMaster's *U. S.*, ii. 501; and titles in Tompkins's *Bibl. Jeffersoniana*.

⁷ It passed to a second ed., with an introduction and notes by C. C. Lee, at Philadelphia, in 1839.


⁸ Cf. Randall's *Jefferson*, iii. 660.

⁹ There had been various contemporary lives of a partisan character, the most considerable of which, "printed for the purchasers," was an anonymous *Memoirs of Thomas Jefferson* (N. Y., 1809) in two volumes, which was aimed at the French influence, and was so libellous that it was suppressed. There is a copy in Harvard College library. We find other extreme Federalist views of Jefferson in Dennie's *Portfolio*, and Thomas G. Fessenden's Hudibrastic poem, *Democracy unveiled*. Cf. Schouler's *United States*, ii. 87. For some contemporary tracts on Jefferson, see Sabin, *Dictionary*, ix. 35,920, etc. H. B. Tompkins's *Bibliotheca Jeffersoniana, a list of books written by or relating to Thomas Jefferson* (N. Y., 1887), is now the chief record.

¹⁰ Madison's *Letters, etc.*, iv. 70.

¹¹ Reviewed by Lord Brougham in the *Edin-*

professed vindication of the Republican party, which was felt to be necessary with a public which had been made cognizant, in Randolph's edition, of so much that Jefferson had written in the private confidence of friendship, and which had been made the occasion of animadversion by his old political antagonists.



THOMAS JEFFERSON.*


Another distinctively Federalist arraignment of Jefferson was in William Sullivan's *Familiar Letters on the Public Characters of the Revolution, 1783-1815* (Boston, 1834; 2d ed., 1834, with App. omitted), whose title was changed in the new edition to *Public*

burgh Review, vol. lxvi. Cf. Brougham's *States-* and Macaulay's opinion in the Appendix of *men of the Reign of George the Third, 2d series*, Trevelyan's *Macaulay*.

* After the engraving by Neagle, following Otis's picture, as given in Delaplaine's *Repository*. Cf. T. P. H. Lyman's *Life of Jefferson* (Philad., 1826). A bust by Ceracchi was burned in the Capitol in 1851.

*Men of the Revolution*¹ (Philad., 1847; cf. particularly on Jefferson's character and writings, p. 178).

Theodore Dwight published at Boston, in 1839, his *Character of Thomas Jefferson, as exhibited in his own writings*. It was mainly given to setting forth the proofs, as he thought he found them in Jefferson's own words, of the allegations against Jefferson, which were the grounds of the Federal opposition to him; and as summing up his opponents' allegations, the book is worth looking at. Dwight points out Jefferson's opposition to the Constitution and disregard for it when it stood in his way; his dangerous attachment



PRESIDENT JEFFERSON.*

to Revolutionary France; his misuse of patronage; his hate of an independent judiciary; his vagaries as regard the co-ordinate powers of government; his belief that obligations by act of legislature could not be transmitted to successors;² his secret enmity to Washington;³ his visionary schemes; his charging the Federalists with a monarchical aim,

¹ This edition has a biography of the author, by his son, J. T. S. Sullivan. Cf. Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 313. Randall gives the correspondence of Jefferson and Madison, in his *Life of Jefferson*, iii. 589.

² On the question of the legislative power of one generation to bind another in contracts, his letter on Washington's character seems to place him in the category of his discriminating

* After a print in the *European Mag.* (1802), vol. xli., as "painted by Stuart in America." This differs from the ordinary full-face Stuart likeness as given in Gillet's *Democracy*; the *Statesman's Manual* (engraved by Balch); Irving's *Washington* (vol. v.); as engraved by Buttre in *Jefferson's Writings* (1853), and in Randall's *Jefferson*. See notice of likenesses of Jefferson in the present *History*, Vol. VI. p. 258. The portrait there given is also in Randall's *Life*, and in S. N. Randolph's *Domestic Life of Jefferson*.

simply to create a party cry;¹ his opposing the Alien and Sedition laws, simply to propitiate foreigners; and his habits of defamation and intrigue.

The main authoritative edition of Jefferson's works came after the government had bought his papers, when they were printed as *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, being his Autobiography, Correspondence, Reports, messages, addresses, and other writings, official and private, published by order of Congress, from the original manuscripts, Ed. by H. A. Washington* (Washington, 1853-1854; and Philad., 1864; N. Y., 1884: in nine volumes). The notes, which are scant, are explanatory and historical, and there is an index in each volume, and a general one for all.²

A more elaborate record and declaration was yet to come. All that Tucker had had, and much more, was given to Henry S. Randall when the family of Jefferson recognized him as their authoritative spokesman.³ His *Life of Thomas Jefferson* was published in three large volumes at New York in 1858, and again at Philadelphia in 1863. To some, as to Schouler, it is "admirable"; to those who sympathize less with the spirit of the author it is not free from partiality and too constant palliation. While the student must recognize its valuable contributions to the elucidation of the character of an interesting and conspicuous historical person, he can hardly but find the picture, through iteration, taking too much space,⁴ and does not gain a high opinion of the writer's judicial quality by finding him almost always on the defensive as regards his subject, and equally aggressive towards other characters, though sometimes with caution; as, for instance, respecting Washington and Marshall, in his delineation of Jefferson's opponents.⁵ The book gave a more extensive view of Jefferson in his private life than any of its predecessors.⁶

admirers. Cf. Randall, iii. 641. The famous Mazzei letter is mainly depended upon to prove the hostility of Jefferson to Washington. Cf. Randall, ii. 361; iii. 608; Hildreth, iv. 617; v. 53; Schouler, i. 360; Sullivan's *Public Men*, 171. Jefferson's letter to Van Buren, June 29, 1825, denying that he referred to Washington, is in his *Works*, vii. 362. Cf. Tompkins's *Bibl. Jeff.*, p. 157.

¹ Cf., on the two sides for this charge, Randall (i. 560-573) and J. C. Hamilton; also Hildreth, iv. 331; Wells's *Sam. Adams*, iii. 314; Sullivan's *Public Men*, 196.

² The volumes are thus divided: i., autobiography; letters, 1773-1783; and letters in Europe, 1784-1790; and these last are continued through ii. and part of iii., till the letters, 1790-1826, begin, which are extended into vol. vii., and that volume is completed with his papers as Secretary of State. Vol. viii. has his inaugural addresses and messages, his replies to addresses, his Indian addresses, his notes on Virginia, and a few sketches of distinguished men. Vol. ix. holds the parliamentary manual, the *Anas*, and some miscellaneous papers. It is said that the plates of the work have been destroyed. (Cf. C. K. Adams's *Manual*, p. 591.)

³ He claims that one third of his material came from Jefferson's approving and surviving descendants, and we find in his pages an occasional addition "by a member of Mr. Jefferson's family."

⁴ C. K. Adams's *Manual*, p. 584.

⁵ Cf. reviews by A. P. Peabody in *No. Amer. Rev.*, October, 1858, vol. ci.; and by William

Dorsheimer in *Atlantic Monthly*, ii., October, 1858.

⁶ The special monograph on the family life of Jefferson is *The domestic life of Thomas Jefferson, compiled from family letters and reminiscences by his great-granddaughter, Sarah N. Randolph* (N. Y., 1872), which embodies much that is scattered through Randall's book, and embraces some part of his family and private papers, which had been surrendered not long before by the United States government.

There is an essay on Jefferson's private character, by Thomas Bulfinch, in the *North Amer. Rev.*, July, 1860, which was replied to by E. O. Dunning in the *New Englander*, 1861 (xix. 648). In 1862, H. W. Pierson published *The private life of Thomas Jefferson*, in which all that is new was obtained from the reminiscences and papers of an old overseer at Monticello. On this estate and its associations, see *Hist. Mag.*, Dec., 1861, p. 367; Lossing in *Harper's Mag.*, vii. 145; G. W. Bagby in *Lippincott's Mag.*, iv. 205; J. G. Nicolay in *The Century*, xxxiv. 643. Accounts of a visit of Daniel Webster and Geo. Ticknor to Monticello in 1824 are in Webster's *Private Correspond.*, i.; G. T. Curtis's *Webster*, i. 223, 226, and App.; *Memoirs of Ticknor*, i. 35, 348. A sketch of his daughter, Mrs. Randolph, and her relations to Jefferson, is in the *Worthy Women of our first Century*. What is called Jefferson's Financial Diary, Jan., 1791, to Dec., 1803, or a view of his daily life from the side of its expenses, is given by John Bigelow in *Harper's Mag.*, March, 1885, p. 534, from a MS. in S. J. Tilden's library.

The latest of the lives of Jefferson are those by James Parton and John T. Morse, Jr. Parton sifted his material through the *Atlantic Monthly* (vols. xxix. and xxx.), and intended to make a small book for "the mass of readers." The growth of the subject under his hand ended in a stout octavo of compact type. Parton cannot commend the Jeffersonian ideas without expressing aversion to those opposed, and Adams and Hamilton were to him ideas incarnate, deserving of such aversion. His *Life of Thomas Jefferson* (Boston, 1874, and later) is lively, easy reading, and generally unconvincing to the impartial student. John T. Morse's *Thomas Jefferson* (Boston, 1883) is by an admirer of Hamilton, but more to be trusted. It is an excellent and engaging book, and written with an earnest purpose to be even-handed.

At the time of the coincident deaths of Jefferson and Adams in 1826,¹ there was a large number of joint eulogies of the two. The occasion softened asperities, and most of them need to be read in cognizance of that fact.²

Alexander Hamilton³ has found champions in his two sons. James A. Hamilton, in his *Reminiscences* (N. Y., 1869), has, in the earlier part, defended him against what he calls the misrepresentations of Van Buren;⁴ and John C. Hamilton began his filial service in his *Life of Alexander Hamilton* (N. Y., 1834, only one volume printed; and 1840-1841, in two volumes), using his father's papers, and driven to the task, as he says, "to check the promulgation of a hurried, imperfect narrative."⁵ It stopped with the adoption of the Constitution.

A few years later, J. C. Hamilton edited for the government the Hamilton papers, as noted a little further on; and using these, as well as the Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe papers, he produced in New York and Philadelphia, in 1857-61, what he called "a combined biography and history," under the title of *History of the Republic of the United States, as traced in the writings of Alexander Hamilton and in those of his contemporaries*, in seven volumes.⁶ This work was sharply attacked for its criticisms of Jefferson, the Adamses, Madison,⁷ and Joseph Reed, and gave much offence by his inordinate claims for Hamilton's having been the author of a large number of Washington's letters, which he wrote as secretary. He says that he found over a thousand of such letters in Hamilton's handwriting. In the preface to his second volume he attempted a defence of his claims for them to have been Hamilton's proper work.⁸ The book is, nevertheless,

¹ Schouler, iii. 387; Madison's *Letters*, iii. 525; Benton's *Thirty Years*, i. ch. 31.

² Cf. *Eulogies pronounced in the several States* (Hartford, 1826); and reference may be particularly made to those of William Wirt, Daniel Webster, and Edward Everett. Cf. Tompkins's *Bibl. Jeffersoniana*. There are some other characteristic delineations of Jefferson's nature: by J. Q. Adams in *Old and New*, Feb., 1873; by C. F. Adams in *John Adams's Works*, i. 616; in Hildreth's *United States*, vi. 141; in Theodore Parker's *Historic Americans*; A. H. Everett's *Defence of the character and principles of Jefferson* (Boston, 1836); Samuel Fowler's "Political Opinions of Jefferson," in the *No. Amer. Rev.*, Oct., 1865; "Adams and Jefferson as founders of parties," in the *National Quart. Rev.*, March, 1875; his "Opinions on Slavery," by A. D. White in the *Atlantic Monthly*, ix. 29 (see Randolph, iii. App.); C. de Witt's *Étude*, 1862, from the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (July, 1859), and a version in English by R. S. H. Church, 1862; Ste. Beuve's *Premiers Lundis*, vol. ii.; Taine's *Nouveaux Essais*; J. E. Cooke in *New Amer.*

Cyclopædia; and references in Poole, Allibone, and Duyckinck.

There is a good exemplification of the Federalist views of Jeffersonism, received by inheritance and long clung to, in S. G. Goodrich's *Recoll. of a Lifetime*, i. 109, 118.

³ The fullest bibliography is the *Bibliotheca Hamiltoniana. A list of books written by or relating to Alexander Hamilton, by Paul Leicester Ford* (N. Y., 1886, — 500 copies).

⁴ He also defends him in *Martin Van Buren's Calumnies repudiated* (N. Y., 1870).

⁵ The author says that nearly all the copies were burned in the binder's hands.

⁶ There was a third edition in 1868; and in 1879 it was reissued at Boston as *The Life of Alexander Hamilton, a History, etc.*

⁷ Rives's *Madison* is a frequent object of his attack, and Rives (i. 437), in turn, points out the other's prejudices and perversions. Von Holst (Eng. transl., i. 172) charges J. C. H. with suppressions.

⁸ Parton (*Jefferson*) calls the book "a lumbering pamphlet in seven volumes octavo, designed

the essential storehouse for the student of Hamilton. He can, if steady of head, make allowances for the over-partial zeal, and can avoid the snares of the writer's perversions, and desert him in his not altogether guileless meanderings.¹

The earliest gathering of Hamilton's writings is John Wells's edition of the *Works; comprising his most important official reports; an improved edition of The federalist, and Pacificus, on the proclamation of neutrality* (N. Y., 1810; some copies, 1816: in three volumes). Only one volume was published of Francis L. Hawks's *Official and other papers of Hamilton* (N. Y., 1842), and they are wholly of the Revolutionary period.

The first extensive collection was that under the title, *Works, comprising his correspondence, and his political and official writings, exclusive of The federalist, civil and military. Published from the original manuscripts deposited in the Department of state, by order of the joint library committee of congress. Edited by John C. Hamilton* (N. Y., 1850-1851, in seven volumes).² The latest edition is that edited by Henry Cabot Lodge, *Works* (N. Y., 1885, etc., 500 copies, in 8 volumes).³

The bitter and unblushing character of the political antagonisms of the day are no better exemplified than in the charge against Hamilton of speculating in government securi-

ties to show that George Washington was Punch, and Alexander Hamilton the man behind the green curtain, pulling the wires and making him talk." Cf. Randall's *Jefferson* (ii. 208) on similar use made by Washington of Jefferson.

¹ The lesser lives may need a few words of characterization. James Renwick's is a popular recital in *Harper's Family Library* (1840 and later). S. M. Smucker's *Life and Times of Hamilton* (Boston, 1857) is too compressed for the student. Christopher James Rietmüller's *Life and Times of H.* (London, 1864) is a foreigner's view, not wholly intelligent, of Hamilton's influence in shaping the destinies of the republic. J. Williams's *Life of H.* (N. Y., 1865) served as an introduction to the Hamilton Club series. Ford, *Bibl. Ham.*, no. 108, thinks a Boston book, 1804, which this life pretends to follow, does not exist. Ford (p. 99) also says that Francis S. Hoffman assumed the name of the Hamilton Club to print old attacks on Hamilton. The *Life* by John T. Morse, Jr. (Boston, 1876; and later eds. in two vols.), is the best substitute for the voluminous work of the son. He confesses admiration of his subject, but expresses his temperate purpose, when he fears, in the preface, that he has neither pleased the ardent admirer nor the strenuous enemy. The *Alexander Hamilton* of Henry Cabot Lodge, in the "American Statesmen Series" (Boston, 1882, and later eds.), is probably the most read of all the lives. Lodge had shown his study of the subject in a paper in the *No. Amer. Rev.*, cxxiii. 113. Cf. his *Studies in History*, p. 132.

The abundant testimonies and criticisms can be gathered from Allibone (i. 773) and *Pool's Index* (p. 567). For warm French admiration, see Laboulaye's *États-Unis*, iii. ch. 9; and Schouler's estimate (particularly ii. 63) is not an unfair, as it is a varied one in praise and dispraise. At the time of his death there were eulogies from some of the most distinguished of his

countrymen in the Federalist party, whose encomiums may be taken as expressions of contemporary admiration, which it is of interest to consider, if the soberer judgment of posterity may more or less qualify it, — such as came from Harrison Gray Otis, Gouverneur Morris, and Fisher Ames. Otis's was printed at Boston in 1804; Morris's is in F. Moore's *American Eloquence*; Ames's was reprinted (Boston, 1804) from the *Boston Repertory*. (Cf. Ames's *Works*, ii. 256.) There are some reminiscences in G. W. P. Custis's *Recollections*.

William Coleman published a *Collection of facts and documents relative to the death of General Hamilton* (N. Y., 1804), a volume which includes orations, sermons, and eulogies. The fatal duel with Burr, beside making part of the *Lives* of both Hamilton and Burr, was of such political significance that all the general histories rehearse the facts. Cf. also Sullivan's *Public Men*, p. 260; *Autobiog. of Chas. Biddle*, 302, 402; *Mag. of Amer. History*, March, 1884; Sabine's *Notes on Duelling*; B. C. Truman's *Field of Honor* (N. Y., 1884), etc.; and the titles in Ford's *Bibl. Hamil.*, pp. 69, etc.

² Ford, no. 124.

³ It differs from the edition of 1851 in discarding letters addressed to Hamilton, others "valueless for history," and the Washington letters included in J. C. Hamilton's edition, because drafts were found in Alexander Hamilton's handwriting; and in admitting the *Federalist*, the Reynolds pamphlet, and letters printed since 1851, and others unpublished in the State Department collection; also the first volume of the *Continentalist* (incomplete in the 1851 ed.), the speeches in the Federal Convention of 1787 as reported by Madison and Tate, and address to the electors in 1789. The papers are grouped by subjects, and chronological under subjects. There are in the *Sparks MSS.* (xlix. 23) a series of Hamilton's letters, 1787-1795. Sparks has indorsed on

ties,¹ when Secretary of the Treasury, which was made in a virulent book by one James Thomson Callender, an outcast Englishman,² who is said to have received assistance from Jefferson in formulating the charge.³ It occurred in chapters 5 and 6 of Callender's *Hist. of the U. S. for 1796* (Philad., 1797). Hamilton did not hesitate, in his defence and explanation, to acknowledge a crime of another sort, as helping to account for appearances against his official honor. This, which is known as the "Reynolds pamphlet," and which his enemies helped him to circulate by reprinting it (1800), is called *Observations on certain documents, contained in The History, etc., in which the charge is fully refuted, written by himself* (Philad., 1797).⁴

The life of the Federal party expended itself very nearly, as a national organization, during the administrations of Washington and Adams, and here is the field to study it in its first principles. The trials to which it was subjected were singularly mixed by the equipoise of Washington, and because of the dissensions in his cabinet, which grew importunate as soon as the opposing views of Federalists and Anti-Federalists became openly sustained.⁵

Matters became more complicated when, with John Adams President, an ultra Anti-Federalist like Jefferson presided in the Senate, and stood in the line of succession in case of the President's death. We trace the certain and uncertain outcomes of Federalist views, of course, in the histories of parties, to which reference has been made ;⁶ but the general histories, like Hildreth, Schouler, and Von Holst, must not be forgotten, if no reference to them is made in later notes to this chapter,⁷ and it must not be overlooked that it is in the lives of the leading Federalists and Anti-Federalists that their party views and passions are most vividly presented.⁸

It may well be doubted if the party of the Federalists had collapsed with so little credit, if it had not tried to do more than its legitimate work. With securing the Constitution and giving the key to its interpretation, the party had justified its existence. Some foolish measures in the end rendered its overthrow inevitable, and, it must be confessed, there were some able men bound to effect their downfall, and were persistent in it.

them: "The letters were copied from the originals in the Treasury Department in Washington, 1830. The office has since been burned, and the originals destroyed."

¹ The Congressional resolutions of Feb., 1793, are said to have been drawn by Madison (Gay's *Madison*, 197).

² Having been apprehended for his *Political Progress of Britain*, Edinb. and Lond., 1792. *Brinley Catal.*, no. 4,786.

³ Sullivan's *Pub. Men*, 156; Morse's *Jefferson*, 225.

⁴ The pamphlet was reprinted by the Hamilton Club in 1865, and is included in Lodge's ed. of *Hamilton's Works*. Callender replied in *Sketches of the Hist. of America* (Philad., 1798) with more virulence than ever. Cf., on this scandal, McMaster, ii.; Schouler, i. 302; Parton's *Jefferson*, 534.

⁵ Cf., on these dissensions, *Works of John Adams*, i. 451; Randall's *Jefferson*, i. ch. 15; Schouler, i. 109; Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 42; Morse's *Hamilton*, ii. ch. 1.

Hamilton, irritated at Freneau's attacks, which he knew to be in the interests of Jefferson, retaliated in Fenno's *Gazette* as "An American," which was but a thin disguise. As the war

waged, Washington remonstrated, when Jefferson replied briefly, but Jefferson returned a long letter outlining his views.

C. F. Adams (*Works of J. Adams*, vol. i.) points out the repeated necessity for John Adams, while Vice-President, to throw a casting vote, which decided constitutional principles. Cf. John Adams's letters on the affairs of this time, addressed to James Lloyd, in *Works*, vol. x.

⁶ Cf. Lalor's *Cyclopaedia*, ii. 165-172.

⁷ Dr. Wharton, in his *State Trials of the U. S. during the Administrations of Washington and Adams*, has an introd. on the political history of this period. Gay (*Madison*, ch. 12) portrays the characteristics of the Federal and Republican leaders in the first Congresses. There is an interesting letter of Ames (*Works*, i. 103) on the conflict of temper, North and South, in 1791. Judge Iredell's *Address to the Citizens of the U. S.*, in the *Federal Gazette* (reprinted in McRee's *Iredell*), goes over calmly the differences of the two parties. For some of the features of the Western counter-parties, see Albach's *Annals of the West*, p. 683. Cf. Wm. H. Seward's characterization of the Federalists and Republicans in his *Autobiography*, p. 59.

⁸ See notes A and B to this Essay.

The Anti-Federalist movement found a great obstacle removed in the retirement and death of Washington; and its policy was best mapped, perhaps, by Jefferson, when, retiring from Washington's cabinet, he drew up his *Report on commercial relations*.¹

Unfortunately we have not, as a monograph, any good exposition of the history of the Republican party as led by Jefferson.² The unfinished *History of Democracy*, by Nahum Capen, barely touches the subject, and one must be content with such insufficient records as Ransom H. Gillet's *Democracy in the U. S.* (N. Y., 1868), and B. F. Hall's *Republican Party, 1796-1832* (N. Y., 1856).³ We can find a statement of the origin of the party in Austin's *Gerry* (ii. 121), written with the traditions still unbroken. The later writers of biography have necessarily occasion to note the beginnings.⁴

¹ *Works*, Washington's ed., vol. vii.

² Capen issued only three parts of a *History of Democracy in the United States* (Boston, 1852); and of his more elaborate but rather confused conglomerate, *The History of Democracy, from the earliest to the latest periods* (Hartford, 1874), only the first volume was printed. Cf. Jonathan Norcross's *Hist. of Democracy* (N. Y., 1883),—an adverse view.

³ Cf. a sketch and references in Lalor, 768, 788.

⁴ Cf., for instance, the history of the movements leading to the rise of the party in Irving's *Washington*, vol. v., written "with more truth than sympathy," as Parton says, who, in his *Life of Jackson* (ch. 17), has his own way of telling

the story under the head of "Filthy Democrats." Henry Adams says, in his *John Randolph*, p. 253, speaking of a later period (1815): "Jefferson's party was still in power, but not a thread was left of the principles with which he had started on his career in 1801." Duane's *Collection of select pamphlets* (Philad., 1814) is not an edifying exhibition of Democratic argument at this time. Cf. Schouler (iii. 45) on the rehabilitation of the Democracy in the subsequent administration of Monroe.

For the early movements allied to the Tammany Hall section of the Democrats, and for some explanation of the confusion later connected with that name, see Lalor, iii. 850.

NOTES.

A. THE LIVES AND WRITINGS OF THE LEADING FEDERALISTS.—Those of Washington and Hamilton have been given in the preceding essay. The list will be completed down to the final extinction of the party at the close of the war of 1812-1815. A view of the necessity of John Adams succeeding to the chair of Washington is set forth (vol. i. 491) in C. F. Adams's *Works of John Adams, with a life, notes, and illustrations, by his grandson, Charles Francis Adams* (Boston, 1856, etc., in ten volumes). This is the full and essential biography of the first Vice-President. It is as free from one-sidedness, perhaps, as could be expected, and Trescot speaks of its "singular and honorable impartiality," though Von Holst (Eng. transl. i. 140) advises caution in respect to its estimate

of Hamilton. The works include his diary, autobiography so far as it was written, and his correspondence, as well as public papers,¹ but the material employed was but a fraction of the papers left by him. The life, which was begun by John Quincy Adams and completed by Charles Francis Adams, has been published separately. There was a brief *Memoir of John Adams* (Washington, 1827) published by his nephew shortly after Adams's death; but the best compressed biography is in the "Amer. Statesmen Series," *John Adams*, by John T. Morse, Jr. (Boston, 1885).²

A memoir by John T. Kirkland was prefixed to the *Works of Fisher Ames* (Boston, 1809), which produced some animadversions on his political views. These, appearing first anonymously as

¹ On Adams as a writer, see Greene, *Hist. View Am. Rev.*, 381; cf. Allibone and Duyckinck, and D. A. Goddard in *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 141.

² There were numerous eulogies at the time of his death, combined with those of Jefferson (Hartford, 1826) or separately published (*Brinley Catal.*, iii. 4764; *N. E. Hist. and Gen. Reg.*, xi. 97-100). Cf. Theodore Parker's *Historic Americans*; Quincy's *Figures of the Past*; and references in *Pool's Index* and Cushing's *Index, No. Amer. Rev.* For the Adams genealogy, see *N. E. Hist. and Gen. Reg.*, Jan., 1853.

American Principles, were soon known to be the work of J. Q. Adams; and they were replied to with little sparing of rebuke, by John Lowell in some *Remarks* (Boston, 1809). Some opinions by John Adams are printed in *Scribner's Mag.*, xi. 577.¹ The son, Seth Ames, re-edited the *Works* in 2 vols. in 1854; in the first volume is a collection of very readable letters recovered from the descendants of Ames's correspondents. Ames kept no letter-book. The letters given by Gibbs

are not reprinted in this collection. The second volume is a reprint of the edition of 1809. George Cabot, in 1809, is said to have designed the publication of Ames's private letters; but the plan was put off (*Life of Jeremiah Smith*, 225, — in which some pleasant glimpses of Ames are found). A supplement volume of *Speeches in Congress, 1789-1796*, was edited by Pelham W. Ames (Boston, 1871).² The *Life of Timothy Pickering* was begun by



FISHER AMES.*

¹ On Ames as a speaker, see Parsons's *Theophilus Parsons*, p. 115, and the comparison of Ames and Madison in *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1887, p. 374, as they appeared in Congress in 1794.

² Cf. Loring's *Boston Orators*, p. 291; Magoon's *Orators of the Rev.*; George Lunt's *Three Eras of N. E.*, etc.; *Poole's Index*, p. 34.


* After J. Boyd's engraving of the painting by Stuart, as given in Delaplaine's *Repository* (1815). There is an engraving of this same picture by Leney, in the *Analectic Mag.*, April, 1814; one by Kelley in the *Boston Monthly Mag.*, Jan., 1826; and Edwin's in Ames's *Works*, i. (1854). An excellent woodcut is in Higginson's *Larger Hist. U. S.*, p. 301. The original is owned by Mrs. John E. Lodge. Copies are in Independence Hall, and in Memorial Hall, Cambridge. Cf. Mason's *Stuart*, 127.

his son, Octavius, and finished by C. W. Upham. (Cf. Hildreth, vi. 718; Sabin, vol. xv.) H. C. Lodge (*Atl. Monthly*, June, 1878, and *Studies in History*, p. 182) complains of this biography as softening the asperities, personal and political, of Pickering's character so much as to do reader and subject injustice. Lodge's view is commended by Schouler (i. 304; cf. p. 467).

The *Life of John Jay* (N. Y., 1833), by William

George Gibbs's *Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and John Adams*, Edited from the papers of Oliver Wolcott (N. Y., 1846), in 2 vols.

Trescot, in his *Diplom. of the Adm. of Washington and Adams* (p. 66), while admitting the great value of Gibbs's material, deplors that the book is "written with all the violent animosity of perverted party feeling in making



JOHN JAY AS CHIEF JUSTICE.*

Jay, Whitelock's *Life and Times of Jay*, and the memoir in Van Santvoord's, and in Flanders's *Chief Justices*.

The *Life and Correspondence of Henry Knox*, by F. S. Drake (Boston, 1872).

jealousies, gossip, and scandal of the day the ground of historical induction."

Sparks's *Life of Gouverneur Morris* introduces us to a Federalist who kept up a busy correspondence with the leading members of his

* After the engraving in Delaplaine's *Repository* (Philad., 1815) by Leney, following Stuart's picture. See *ante*, p. 91, for note on portraits.

party, at first from Europe, when he was living in Paris, and after 1799 in his own country. An opponent's view is in Randall's *Jefferson* (i. 515). Roosevelt's *Morris* is more readable.

Luther Martin, of Maryland, became so boldly persistent as a Federalist that Jefferson called him "the Federal bull-dog." Story called him "a compound of strange qualities." There is a short life of him in the *Publications* of the Maryland Hist. Society.

The *Memoir of Theophilus Parsons*, by his son (Boston, 1859), who calls the father "always and thoroughly a Federalist."

Henry Cabot Lodge's *Life of George Cabot* (Boston, 1877), who was in Congress as a senator 1791-1796; but his career is more particularly illustrative of the hard-dying New England Federalism. (Cf. *Nation*, July, 1877.) We have others of this type in Samuel Dexter and Josiah Quincy, but Dexter went over to the support of "Madison's War."¹

There is not so extended a life of Chief Justice Marshall as there should be; but he has put his opinions before us in the early formative days of the government in his *Life of Washington*. His judicial career has been most emphasized, and to his decisions we trace some of the most important early-established constitutional questions as illustrating the Federalist theories.² The only monographic biography is Allan B. Magruder's *John Marshall* (Boston, 1885) in the "Amer. Statesmen Series," in which the author had some aid from family papers.³

Of Oliver Ellsworth there is no good record, though he is of course included in the works of Flanders and Van Santvoord.⁴ He was one of Washington's firmest supporters in politics, and entered upon the chief-justiceship near the close of Washington's administration. (Cf. *Poole's Index*, p. 404.)

In the *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, one of the associate justices of the Supreme Court of the U. S., by Griffith J. McRee (N. Y., 1857, and 1883-85), in 2 volumes, we find in the second volume a correspondence of interest in

disclosing the Federal side of the interpretation of the Constitution, and also various charges to juries (1790-1798), in which judicial opinions are set forth with more warmth and partisanship than we would countenance in these days.

The *Life of Jeremiah Smith* (Boston, 1845), by John H. Morison, is a record of a member of the second and succeeding Congresses from New Hampshire, who did not comprehend Hamilton's funding system and hated France, so that he swung between the two parties; but he was steadfast in his adherence to Washington, and ultimately believed Federalism to be too good for the age.

During the war of 1812, the leading Federalists in Congress were Christopher Gore and Rufus King, and of neither have we any adequate memoir. There is a brief sketch of Gore in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections*, xxxiii. 191, by Mr. Ripley. Of King there is nothing better than the sketches in general biographies like the *National Portrait Gallery* (vol. iii.)⁵

During the war, New England was represented in the Senate by a decided Federalist, whose career is told by George S. Hillard in the *Memoir and Correspondence of Jeremiah Mason*, privately printed (Cambridge, 1873). Cf. Curtis's *Webster*, i. 87.

There is no considerable memoir of Caleb Strong. H. C. Lodge printed the most extensive one, which we have in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* (i. 290; also in his *Studies*, 224). Strong was in the first Senate.

The chief repository, however, respecting the New Englanders is the *Documents relating to New England Federalism*, Ed. by Henry Adams (Boston, 1877). It contains papers which passed between the Mass. Federalists and J. Q. Adams, ending with his "Reply to the Appeal of the Massachusetts Federalists," which had never been printed before, though it had served a purpose for Lodge in his *Cabot*, and for the *Life of Wm. Plumer*. The *Reply* was written under the disappointments of Adams when driven from the presidency, and with a natural bitterness;

¹ Cf. L. M. Sargent's brief *Reminiscences of Samuel Dexter* (Boston, 1857), and an essay by Judge Story in his *Miscell. Writings*. Edmund Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy* (Boston, 1867), and J. R. Lowell's "A Great Public Character" in his *Study Windows*, show us an unflinching Federalist. In the *Memoir of the life of John Quincy Adams*, by Josiah Quincy (Boston, 1858), the author says he has derived his matter "from personal acquaintance, from Adams's public works, and from authentic unpublished materials;" but the book has a special interest as from the pen of an actor in the events he describes during the reign and decline of the Federalists.

² Cf., for instance, the eulogies of Judge Story (*Miscellaneous Writings*, p. 639) and of Horace Binney, and the addresses of Chief Justice Waite and W. H. Rawle in *Exercises at the ceremony of unveiling the statue of John Marshall, in Washington, May 10, 1884* (Washington, 1884), and the memoirs in Flanders, and in Van Santvoord's *Lives of the Chief Justices*.

³ Cf. Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, i. ch. 149; F. W. Gilmer's *Sketches and Essays of Public Characters*; R. Hughes in the *Reformed Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 1887; and references in *Poole's Index*, p. 804.

⁴ His son-in-law, Joseph Wood, contemplated the writing of a biography in 1836, but his purpose failed (*Madison's Letters*, etc., iv. 427).

⁵ Cf. Benton's *Thirty Years' View* (i. ch. 23); *Maine Hist. and Gen. Recorder*, vol. i.

and the editor finds it prudent to omit some passages respecting H. G. Otis. John T. Morse, in his *John Q. Adams*, contends for the justice of Adams's ground (p. 219). The Appendix is mostly from the Pickering Papers in the Mass. Hist. Soc., — "the most considerable collection of Federalist papers yet thrown open to students."¹

Much of the writing on the Federalist side was done by the political actors;² but they

were reinforced by two journalists of different quality. The scope of Noah Webster as a political writer is shown by H. E. Scudder in his *Noah Webster* (Boston, 1882), and his N. Y. *Minerva* had more the confidence of the respectable part of the Federal party than John Fenno's *Gazette*.³ The position of William Cobbett was a peculiar one, and we associate both hard-fisted vigor and scurrility with the name of "Peter Porcupine."⁴

¹ John T. Morse, Jr., characterizes some of the leaders of the Federalists in Boston at this time in a chapter on "The Bench and Bar of Boston," in *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iv.; cf. also Sullivan's *Public Men*, 374, etc. There is a good instance of the jubilant spirit of the New England Federalists in 1809 in a letter of John Eliot to Josiah Quincy (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xvii. 19), and in the account of the celebration in Boston in 1813 because of Napoleon's Russian disasters (*Ibid.* xviii. 379), as printed in the *Columbian Centinel*, March 27, 1813.

Something of the more respectful antagonism of the two parties can be seen in some of the letters of John T. Kirkland (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xvii. 112), and the flavor of the time is preserved in the reminiscences of Harrison Gray Otis, William Sullivan, and Timothy Pickering, in Josiah Quincy's *Figures of the Past, from the leaves of old journals* (Boston, 1883). There is a picture of the experiences of a Republican among the Connecticut Federalists in W. M. Meigs's *Life of Josiah Meigs* (Philad., 1887).

At the time of the war of 1812, Dexter of Massachusetts, Plumer of New Hampshire, William Pinkney of Maryland, Rufus King of New York, J. A. Bayard of Delaware, and R. G. Harper of South Carolina went over to the support of the administration. At this time two thirds of the newspapers in New England were in opposition to the government.

² Some of the best of their writings will be found in Robert Goodloe Harper's *Select Works* (Baltimore, 1814); but his speeches and tracts usually appeared separately at the time of their composition. Morse says in his *Jefferson* (p. 343), "The Federalists have to this day been more successful than the Republicans in getting their side forcibly and plausibly before the reading public." But a distinguished Federalist gives us another picture. "The newspapers," wrote Fisher Ames in 1801, "are an overmatch for any government. They will first overawe, and then usurp it. The Jacobins owe their triumph to the unceasing use of this engine; not so much to skill in the use of it, as by repetition" (*Works*, i. 294).

John Lowell, of Boston (b. 1769; d. 1840), was never in office; but he was one of the Federalists' strongest pamphleteers. His *New England Patriot, being a candid comparison of the principles and conduct of the Washington and Jefferson Administrations* (Boston, 1810), sets forth powerfully the contrast in respect to hostility to Britain and subserviency to France, hostility to commerce, depleting of the Treasury, and violations of the Constitution.

³ Schouler, i. 369; Hudson's *Journalism*, 191. Cf. index to *Belknap Papers*, vol. ii.

⁴ *Peter Porcupine's Works, exhibiting a faithful Picture of the United States of America, their Governments, Laws, Politics, Resources, Presidents, Governors, Legislators, Customs, Manners, Morals, Religion, Virtues, Vices, etc., and a complete Series of Historical Documents and Remarks, from the end of the War, in 1783 to 1801* (London, 1801), in twelve volumes, is not so wearisome reading as the extent might indicate, for his characterizations are racy, and we get principles and men set before us vividly. He settled in Philadelphia in 1796, and of course a portion of his survey is his observation of events not within his experience; but he looked sharply at the past as well as sharply at the present. An impetuous zeal carried him often beyond the bounds of prudence, sometimes beyond decency, and his *Peter Porcupine's Gazette* occasionally hurt the Federalist party as much as its enemies. It was issued in Philadelphia from March 4, 1797, to Jan., 1800, and it was from this and his pamphlets that the *Works* were made up. Schouler (i. 367), referring to the *Gazette*, speaks of it as "ostensibly the mouthpiece of the ultra-Federalists, but in reality to propagate British opinions of a deeper dye." Benj. Russell, in the *Columbian Centinel*, thus defined Cobbett's work: "The Federalists found the Jacobins had the *Aurora*, *Argus*, and *Chronicle*, and they perceived that these vermin were not to be operated on by reason or decency. It was therefore thought necessary to hunt down these skunks and foxes, and the 'fretful porcupine' was selected for this business" (Buckingham's *Reminiscences*, ii. 81). Cobbett's free pen brought him easily into libel suits, and for an attack on Dr. Rush he was fined \$5,000, which, with expenses, cost him \$8,000. He took his revenge in his *Rush Light* (five nos.; cf. *Brinley Catal.*, iii. no. 4,815), which he printed in New York in 1800, just before leaving for England, and there were those who said that he was pensioned from England to advocate monarchical ideas in America! (Cf. Hildreth, v. 164, etc., for other libel suits.)

Porcupine was a good mark for the Republican arrows, and McMaster (ii. 253) enumerates some of their shafts. Cobbett's own venom was emitted upon Priestley, particularly in his *Observations on the Emigration of Dr. Priestley* (Philad., 1794), and upon everybody who was thought to favor a French policy. Cf. titles in

B. THE LIVES AND WRITINGS OF THE LEADING ANTI-FEDERALISTS, OR REPUBLICANS. — Of Jefferson there has been given a sufficient account in the preceding Essay.

Next to Jefferson, we must consider Madison as possessing the greatest influence in combating the Federalists. Lodge (*Studies in History*, 157) says that "Madison cannot fairly be numbered with either party"; but when we find him facing where he had earlier shown his back, we may consider he had fairly taken his side among the Anti-Federalists in the time of the second Congress. Fisher Ames (*Works*, i. 49) pictures Madison as "Frenchified" in his principles, and bookish rather than practical in his political theories. "One of his speeches," he adds, "was taken out of Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. The principles of that book are excellent, but the application of them in America requires caution."

There are two collections of the writings of Madison, gathered out of the papers which Congress at two different times has bought, and they have been published by their order: —

The papers of James Madison, being his correspondence and reports of debates during the Congress of the Confederation, and his reports of debates in the Federal Convention. Published under the superintendence of Henry D. Gilpin (Washington, 1840; N. Y., 1841; Mobile, 1852), in three volumes. This is usually cited as *The Madison Papers*,¹ and, beside the reports mentioned in the title, they include some correspondence of the same period, 1782–1787. *The Letters and other writings of James Madison* (Philadelphia, 1865; N. Y., 1884), in four volumes, includes material falling between the limits of Madison's active life, 1769–1836; and the book, only in the case of a few letters, duplicates the matter of the earlier publication, while reprints of certain of Madison's political tracts are included. The committee of publication also acknowledge the courtesy of Mr. James C. McGuire in helping them to copies of certain papers in his possession. Mr. McGuire published at

Washington, in 1859, *Selections from the private correspondence of James Madison, 1813–1836*.

John Quincy Adams published an *Eulogy on the life and character of Madison*, at Boston, in 1836; and later his *Lives of James Madison and James Monroe, with historical notices of their Administrations* (Boston, 1850; Philad., 1854).

The weightiest book on Madison, however, is the *Life and Times of James Madison*, by Wm. C. Rives (Boston, 1859–1868), in three volumes, only two of which, however, the author lived to publish. The third, bringing the narrative no farther than the close of Washington's administration (1797), was issued by his son, editing the father's manuscript. From Madison's prominence, during Washington's terms, as an exponent of Republicanism in the House of Representatives, the record of his life is of the first importance. The younger Rives claims Washington to have been with Madison, in principle, Republicans of the conservative school. The elder Rives, in his preface, says that he has worked from the Madison papers, and from other papers placed in his hands by private courtesy, and presents his book as belonging "more, perhaps, to the department of history than of biography, though partaking of the character of both." One must, however, go to his foot-notes to learn with any precision what his authorities have been.² Mr. Rives made no pretensions to authorship, and his book warrants his reservation. It is not attractive reading, and Sydney H. Gay has called it "stately, not to say stilted;" but its worth will be apparent to the student. There was need of a condensed memoir of Madison, which should also include his later and not so brilliant years, and this we have in S. H. Gay's *James Madison* of the "American Statesmen Series" (Boston, 1884). Gay's view of Madison is not an admiring one, and is moulded largely by the weaknesses of his presidential career. Gay (p. 172) says: "As his career is followed, the presence of the statesman grows gradually dimmer in the shadow of the successful politician."³

Brinley Catal., iii. p. 41. Priestley answered him in his *Letters to the inhabitants of Northumberland*, 2d ed., with additions, Philad., 1801. Some of Cobbett's chief American writings constitute the first volume of J. M. and J. P. Cobbett's edition of *Selections from Cobbett's Political Works, being an Abridgment of the 100 volumes of the Writings of Porcupine and the Polit. Register, with notes historical and explanatory* (London, 1835–48), in six volumes. Cf. Edward Smith's *William Cobbett, a Biography* (London, 1878), and the paper upon it, in H. C. Lodge's *Studies in History*, p. 110; the references on Cobbett in *Brooklyn Library Catal.*, i. 133; *Poole's Index*, p. 270; and the bibliog. in *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 611.

¹ Sabin, no. 43,716.

² There is an excellent review of his book in the *Quarterly Review*, April, 1878.

³ Wirt's defence of Madison's political career up to 1808 is in Kennedy's *Life of Wirt* (i. 220); and for a Federal view, see Sullivan's *Public Men*, p. 315. Accounts of Madison in his domestic aspects will be found in Paul Jennings's *Colored man's Reminiscences of James Madison* (Brooklyn, 1865); Meade's *Old Churches, etc., of Va.*, ii. 96; a paper by E. W. Johnston in *Homes of Amer. Statesmen*, and on his home in *Lippincott's Mag.*, ix. 473. Webster and Ticknor visited him in 1824 (Curtis's *Webster*, i. 223). There are references in *Poole's Index*, p. 786. Of Dolly Madison, the wife and long the widow, we find accounts in *Dennie's Portfolio*, xix. 91; Mrs. Ellet's *Queens of Amer. Society*; L. C. Holloway's *Ladies of the White House*; and particularly in *Memoirs and Letters of Dolly Madison, ed. by her grand-niece* (Boston, 1887).

It was Madison who set Philip Freneau upon his editorial career, as a champion of the Republican side (Gay's *Madison*, 176, etc.), and the *National Gazette*, under Freneau, led the opposition to Fenno's paper, which was patronized by Hamilton.¹

Parton says: "It is Aaron Burr who taught the Democratic party how to conquer." The first attempt to write an account of Burr, except for political purposes, was the little *Life of Aaron Burr*, by Samuel L. Knapp (N. Y., 1835), published the year before his death, and of not much value except as reflecting current opinion. Burr was singularly deficient among the party leaders of his day in published writings.² We have, however, two considerable lives of Burr. Matthew L. Davis was his friend, to whom he entrusted his papers, with the expectation that Davis would prepare an account, which was done in the *Memoirs of Aaron Burr, with a miscellaneous selection from his correspondence* (N. Y., 1837 and 1856), in two vols.³ He throws little light, is hardly responsive to the confidence of his friend, and tells us of Burr's insuperable prejudices against Washington. John Adams (*Works*, x. 124) says that when he suggested the appointment of Burr as a brigadier, at the time of the threatened French war, Washington said: "By all that I have known and heard, Col. Burr is a brave and able officer; but the question is whether he has not equal talents at intrigue." James Parton claimed that it was not possible, from Davis, from his European journals, or from the evidence of his trial, to tell what sort of a man Burr was. So he sought such survivors of Burr's acquaintance as he could find, and gathered reports from them; not to follow them, as he says, but to elucidate with them the material

in the records already named. With this purpose he wrote his *Life and Times of Aaron Burr* (N. Y., 1857); and while acknowledging Burr's lack of conscience, he made the most of such amiable qualities as he had, to paint him not quite so black as the popular notion. His book drew out some indignant reviews (mostly in religious periodicals; cf. list in Poole, p. 179), and, with the indignation, a little new material, which Parton made some use of in a new edition, in 1864, by adding an appendix.⁴

In Albert Gallatin the Democratic party had, perhaps, their ablest administrator. Lodge says of him in his *Studies*, p. 263: "The life of Gallatin from 1801 to 1815 is the cabinet history of the administrations of Jefferson and Adams." It cannot be said of him, as of Burr, that his pen was idle. What he wrote was never made wholly apparent till Henry Adams edited *The Writings of Albert Gallatin* (Philad., 1879), in three volumes, and gave in the last of them a list of all his writings and where they could be found.⁵ To Mr. Adams's labors the student is also indebted for a well-considered *Life of Albert Gallatin* (Philad., 1879), in which the author's even judgment is evinced. He has given us a book of the first importance in the study of Jefferson.⁶

The bibliography of James Monroe has been done for the student in an appendix to Gilman's *Monroe*, prepared by J. F. Jameson. Excepting the *Eulogy* by J. Q. Adams (Boston, 1831),⁷ and his subsequent *Lives of Celebrated Statesmen* (Madison, Lafayette, and Monroe), N. Y., 1846, and his *Lives of Madison and Monroe* (Buffalo, 1850; Philad., 1854; and other eds.), there was no memoir of importance till President D. C. Gilman's *James Monroe in his relations to the*

¹ Cf. Duyckinck, *Cyc. Amer. Lit.*, i. 327, etc.; Morse's *Jefferson*, 132. Fisher Ames wrote in 1793 (*Works*, i. 128) of the attacks of Freneau, that "their manifestos indicate a spirit of faction, which must soon come to a crisis."

² We have his *Private journals during his residence in Europe* [1808-1811], with selections from his *correspondence*, ed. by M. L. Davis (N. Y., 1838, 1856), in two vols.; and such correspondence as Davis also included in his later work.

³ Cf. Thurlow Weed's *Autobiography*, p. 415.

⁴ Parton drew Burr's character more concisely in his *Jackson. The Life of Aaron Burr*, by C. B. Todd, is simply a reprint of a portion of Todd's *Hist. of the Burr Family*. There are the beginnings of a Burr bibliography in Sabin, iii. p. 150, and in the *Menzies Catal.*, p. 56. Poole (p. 179) points out the periodical papers, to which may be added two papers by C. H. Peck in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Nov. and Dec., 1887. To fill out the references for further study, there is McMaster, on his early days (ii. 49); Garland's *Randolph* (i. ch. 32); Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, ch. 150; Atkinson's *Newark, N. J.*; a young student's impression, in Dr. William Hague's *Life Notes* (Boston, 1887).

⁵ Adams's book was a selection merely, embracing, in two of the volumes, letters largely unprinted and uncollected, together with letters addressed to Gallatin; and, in the third, his essays. He drew the material largely from the files of the State Department, and from the Jefferson and Madison papers.

⁶ The lesser books and papers are John Austin Stevens's *Albert Gallatin* (Boston, 1883), in the "American Statesmen Series;" and articles by H. C. Lodge in the *Eney. Britannica*, and *International Review*, Sept., 1879; and by J. T. Morse in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct., 1879. At the time of Gallatin's death, in 1849, there were some reminiscences of him by J. R. Bartlett, published in the *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1849, p. 281.

⁷ There is a *Notice* (Washington, 1832) of this eulogy by John Armstrong. Cf. character of Monroe in Schouler, iii. 203.


public service during half a century, 1776-1826 (Boston, 1883), in the "American Statesmen Series." There is no general edition of Monroe's writings.

Perhaps the most brilliant, and certainly the most erratic, of the Democrats in these days was John Randolph of Roanoke. His appearance in Congress dates from 1800 (Hildreth, v. 343). Plumer wrote not long after this: "Randolph has more talents than any one man of that party; but they are unwilling to own a leader who has the appearance of a beardless boy more than of a full-grown man" (*Life of Plumer*, 248). In 1806 Randolph broke with the administration on questions of policy and on the matter of a successor to Jefferson, Monroe instead of Madison being the nominee of Randolph's faction.¹ The main account of Randolph is Hugh A. Garland's *Life of John Randolph* (N. Y., 1850, etc.); but a sufficient account for most readers will be found in Henry Adams's *John Randolph* (Boston, 1882). The way in which Randolph sometimes found his match in impudence is seen in Henry L. Bowen's *Memoir of Tristram Burges* (Providence, 1835). It is a question if he did not at times break through the bounds of sanity.²

Henry Wheaton wrote *Some account of the life, writings, and speeches of Wm. Pinkney* (N. Y., 1826; cf. Madison's *Letters*, etc., iii. 338, 553), and abridged it in the *Life of William Pinkney* (Boston, 1836) for Sparks's *Amer. Biography* (vol. v.). A nephew, the Rev. Dr. William Pinkney, published at N. Y. (1853) *The Life of William Pinkney*, one of those overdone performances that make the

unsympathetic regret. Kennedy's rather sharply drawn sketch of Pinkney (*Wirt*, 355) disturbs the Rev. Dr. Pinkney, of course. There is an appreciative sketch by Judge Story in his *Miscellaneous writings*, and a memoir in Boyle's *Marylanders*.

These characters, already named, are the most considerable personal factors in the transition



JOHN RANDOLPH.*

of the Republican to the Democratic organization during the rise and decline of Federalism,³

¹ Cf. Lalor's *Cyclop.*, "Quids," iii. 483; Morse's *Jefferson*, 277; *Life of Plumer*, 341.

² Cf. Curtis's *Webster*, i. 147, and Bouldin's *Home Reminiscences of John Randolph* (Danville, Va., 1878), where this question of sanity is discussed (ch. 16) amid the recollections of neighbors and acquaintances, which form the staple of the book. The political literature of his time is full of references to his erratic humors. Josiah Quincy kept friendship with him, though the men were so different; and the *Memoir of Quincy*, by Edmund Quincy, contains his characterization (p. 94) and various letters. Cf. the younger Josiah Quincy's *Figures of the Past*, p. 209. There is a sketch by J. K. Paulding in his *Letters from the South* (1835), quoted in the *Literary Life of J. K. Paulding* (p. 237). Cf. Benton's *Thirty Years' View* (i. ch. 112); Par-ton's *Famous Americans*; F. W. Thomas's *John Randolph and other sketches, including Wm. Wirt* (Philadelphia, 1853); McMaster, ii. 457; A. P. Russell's *Characteristics* (Boston, 1884).

³ One may look also to *The life of Edw. Livingston* (in Congress 1794-1800), by Chas. H. Hunt; and to *The Life and Writings of Alexander James Dallas, by his son George M. Dallas*, by Philad., 1871). John P.

* From the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1839, vol. iv., following a painting by J. Wood. It is also engraved by T. B. Welch. Cf. the engravings in *Analectic Mag.*, Jan., 1815; two in Garland's *Randolph*, one of which is the familiar long and lank figure in profile, with cap drawn over the eyes. There is a similar figure on horseback in Smith's *Hist. and Lit. Curiosities*, 2d series. An early likeness is given in T. W. Higginson's *Larger History*, p. 397. The portrait "given by a citizen of Pennsylvania to Virginia" is engraved in Bouldin's *Home Reminiscences of Randolph* (1876). Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, January, 1884, p. 30.

except a class of New England men, who deserve a special grouping.

The later unquestioned leader of New England Anti-Federalism was Elbridge Gerry, and he began his influence upon national politics in the first Congress. His son-in-law, James T. Austin, published a *Life of Elbridge Gerry, with contemporary letters, to the close of the American Revolution* (Boston, 1828), and a continuation, *From the close of the American Rev.* (1829).¹

We find no better representation of the diverse views of the Federalists and Anti-Federalists, at the very beginning of the government, than in some letters which passed between Samuel Adams and John Adams in 1790, when the latter was Vice-President and the former Lieutenant-Governor of Massachusetts. They are easily accessible² in W. V. Wells's *Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams* (Boston, 1865), in three vols., the essential source for the study of Adams's career, though the volume *Samuel Adams* (Boston, 1885), by James K. Hosmer,³ in

the "Amer. Statesmen Series," is a compact and successful presentation, and with more discrimination than Wells has, as to Adams's dogged and outspoken sentiments, through his remarkable career,—sentiments not so temperately uttered, always, as to escape frequent animadversion. Locally, and as an agitator, he was perhaps more prominent than Gerry, and Wells may not be far from right in claiming for him the headship of the Republicans in Massachusetts.⁴

There needs to be but mention of two others prominent in the Republican ranks in Massachusetts,—James Sullivan and Benjamin Austin. Sullivan was a ready writer for his party,⁵ and some of his political papers have been reprinted in T. C. Amory's *Life of James Sullivan, with selections from his Writings* (Boston, 1857), in 2 vols. The somewhat violent writings of Benjamin Austin were collected in his *Constitutional Republicanism in opposition to fallacious Federalism* (Boston, 1803).⁶

Kennedy delivered a memorial *Discourse on William Wirt* (in Baltimore, 1834,—cf. Madison's *Letters*, etc., iv. 344), and later prepared an extended *Memoirs of the Life of William Wirt* (Philad., 1849), in 2 vols., which proved a successful book (new and revised ed., Philad., 1856, etc.). Cf. Benton's *Thirty Years' View* (i. ch. 113), and references in *Poole's Index* (p. 1416).

¹ Reviewed by Edward Everett in *No. Amer. Rev.*, xxviii. 37. There are lesser narratives in the various *Lives of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence*.

The name of Gerry became curiously connected with the political trick of so combining towns in a district as to secure victory, which is said to have its origin in an effort of Gerry's party in 1812 to carry the election in a certain part of Massachusetts. The territorial outline formed in this way so resembled some fabled monster that the name of "Gerrymander" was given to it. There are some conflicting stories about the originators of the drawing which was circulated at the time. Cf. Carey's *Olive Branch* (ed. 1818, ch. 70); Buckingham's *Reminiscences*; Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, 321; *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 212; *Losington's Cyclo. U. S. Hist.*, i. 574; *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, 1873, p. 421; *Amer. Law Review*, vi. 283; *Amer. Hist. Record*, Nov., 1872; Feb. and June, 1873; Lalor's *Cyclopadia*, i. 102, ii. 367; Parton's *Caricatures*, 316.

² Vol. iii. p. 207; also in C. F. Adams's *John Adams*, vol. vi. The original edition is *Four Letters, being an interesting correspondence between John Adams and Samuel Adams, on the important subject of government* (Boston, 1802). They are also included in *Propositions of Col. Hamilton, etc.*; also a *Summary of the political opinions of John Adams, proved by extracts from his writings on government, and a most interesting discussion of the fundamental points of difference between the two great political parties in the U. S., by the said John Adams, a Federalist, and Samuel Adams, a Republican, in four letters* (Pittsfield, 1802).

³ Hosmer had earlier presented a paper on "Samuel Adams, the man of the town meeting" in the *Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies*, 2d ser.

⁴ Wells's, iii. 318. It was while governor that Adams was attacked by the Rev. David Osgood, of Medford, a Hamiltonian, in a sermon which was widely circulated, and led James Sullivan to answer it in a pamphlet (Wells, iii. 344). See *ante*, Vol. VI., index, for references to traits of Samuel Adams. His character, with its boldness and stubbornness, could but be variously drawn. Cf. Hutchinson's *Mass. Bay*, iii. 294; John Adams's *Works*, x. 262, 364; Bancroft, v. 195; Mahon, vi. 121; D. A. Goddard in *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 140; Brooks Adams's *Emancipation of Massachusetts*, 345; Thomas Thacher's *Tribute of Respect at his death*, Oct., 1803 (Dedham, 1804). *Poole's Index* gives abundant references. The only doubt of his integrity arose from a deficiency in his accounts as a collector for the town of Boston before the Revolution broke out. It seems to have been a venial fault at the worst, but opinions differ. Cf. A. C. Goodell in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xx. 213; Mahon, vi., App. p. xxxvi.; Lecky, iii. 360, who exonerates him.

⁵ *Observations on the Government of the United States* (Boston, 1791). *The Altar of Baal thrown down, or the French Nation defended* (Boston, 1795), etc. Cf. *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 2883; Allibone, 2300; *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iv. 590; Hildreth, v. 666.


⁶ *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iv. 587. It was a son of Austin, a student in Harvard College, who assaulted T. O. Selfridge in the street in Boston, for affronts which Selfridge, as a Federalist leader, had put upon the boy's

C. EARLY SYMPTOMS OF DISUNION. — The most serious charges, involving constructive or deductive treason, during the long struggle of the Federalists and the Republicans, are grouped as respects the Anti-Federalists about the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798 and 1799, and as respects their opponents about the movements alleged to look towards secession among the Federalists of New England in 1803-4 and in 1814.¹

With the Republicans the provocation was in the Alien and Sedition laws of John Adams's

administration, and the movement was an attempt, by the passage of resolutions in Virginia and Kentucky signifying the unconstitutionality, and therefore the neutralized effect of those laws, to draw the sympathies of other States, and secure a sufficient seconding to intimidate the Federal administration. Jefferson seems to have made the first draft of those passed in the Kentucky legislature.²

Morse (*Jefferson*, 193) says that "Jefferson concocted a Republican antidote far worse than the Federal poison, and fell into the abyss of



GOVERNOR JAMES SULLIVAN.*

father, and was shot dead by Selfridge, — an event not lost upon the Republicans in the opportunity of largely increasing the bitterness of their charges. Selfridge had the advantage in his defence of the skill of Samuel Dexter, Harrison Gray Otis, and Christopher Gore, leading Federalists of great weight, and was acquitted. James Sullivan conducted the prosecution. There is a short-hand report of the *Trial* (Boston, 1807). Cf. Buckingham's *Reminiscences*, and *Personal Memoirs*; *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iv. 587; Hudson's *Journalism*; and the sketches of the savage character of the political feelings engendered by such scenes in Edward Warren's *Life of John Collins Warren, M. D.* (Boston, 1860), vol. i. ch. 6. On the comparative want of bitterness in later political controversies, as against those of the Federalist time, see Chas. T. Congdon's *Reminiscences of a Journalist* (Boston, 1880).

¹ See an outline history of secession views in the United States in Lator, iii. 695, with references, p. 702

² Randall's *Jefferson*, ii. 448, iii. 616, for the draft, and Jefferson's letter, Dec. 11, 1821, on his authorship in Collins's *Kentucky*, i. 401, 415; and in Jefferson's *Memoirs and Corresp.*, iv. 344.

* Follows a wax medallion in the American Antiquarian Society's hall at Worcester. A likeness by Stuart, engraved by H. W. Smith, is in Amory's *Life of James Sullivan* (Boston, 1859).

what has since been regarded as treason." (Cf. H. Adams's *Randolph*.)¹

A new view of the authorship of these resolutions is taken in *The Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, an Historical Study*, by Ethelbert D. Warfield (N. Y., 1887).² Mr. Warfield has mainly worked from the newspapers and correspondence of the day, and particularly from the papers of John Breckinridge, the mover of the resolutions in the assembly. Warfield contends that Breckinridge's authorship of the resolutions was not questioned before the publication of John Taylor's *Inquiries into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the U. S.* (Fredericksburg, 1814, p. 174), where they are credited to Jefferson.

It is quite certain, says Warfield, that Jefferson drew up certain resolutions and gave them to Breckinridge, for they were found among Jefferson's papers. (Cf. Jefferson's Works, iv. 258, 305; ix. 464.) Warfield (p. 152) gives them, and points out their difference from the resolutions as passed. They were made the basis of those drawn by Breckinridge.³

The resolutions passed in Virginia were "only a little less objectionable," says Morse (*Jefferson*, 193), and were drawn by Madison.⁴

Madison drew a report upon the answers of the States, and it was printed in the *Report on the Proceedings of the other States on the Virginia resolutions of 1798* (Richmond, 1819).⁵

Madison's views on these resolutions at the

time and later, and his protest against the inference that they embodied the later nullification doctrines of South Carolina, can be followed in *Madison's Letters, etc.*⁶

As regards the threatened movements in New England, there is a good summary of them in the life of one who did not hesitate at one time to call himself a disunionist, for he was an independent Federalist, who turned away from his associates when the war of 1812 called him to support the government. During Jefferson's administration he was a senator from New Hampshire, and he speaks of his Federalist associates in Congress as, "though few, a check upon the ruling party." *The Life of William Plumer, by Wm. Plumer, Jr., ed. by A. P. Peabody*, was published in Boston in 1856. There were some strenuous denials made of the prevalence of the secession views set forth in this book (pp. 277-282, 288, 292, 293, 299, 302, 308), and it is not unlikely that the yielding spirit of the administration at the time served to set back any set purpose of the extreme Federalists.⁷ Carey, in the preface of his *Olive Branch* (1814), referring to what he calls a conspiracy in New England to dissolve the Union, traces the beginnings of it in some papers signed "Pelham," which appeared in the *Connecticut Courant* in 1796. Cf. Lodge (*Studies*, 203-207) on these manifestations. In 1808, John Quincy Adams, who had broken with the Federalists on the embargo question, told Madison that there was a plan in

¹ The resolutions as actually passed are given in Shaler's *Kentucky* from the copy sent to Massachusetts, and on file in her archives; in Houghton's *Amer. Politics*, 150; and in Warfield's *Kentucky Resolutions of 1798* (p. 75), from another copy printed at the time.

² In some parts an expansion of papers by the same writer in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.* and *Mag. of Western History*.

³ Warfield first discussed the mooted question of authorship in the *Mag. of West. Hist.*, April, 1886, p. 375; and his views in their final shape may be found in ch. 6 of his *Kentucky Resolutions of 1798*.

In *The Nation* (N. Y., May 5, and June 2, 1887, pp. 382, 467) there is a communication, "New light on the Resolutions of 1798," by Miss S. N. Randolph, and a reply by Warfield. The question mainly in dispute was Jefferson's statement of a meeting of consultation to arrange for the opening attack on the government through resolutions, which it was first intended to bring forward in North Carolina. Papers on the subject by R. T. Durrett are in the *Southern Bivouac*, March, April, May, 1886.

The *Nation* (Dec. 29, 1887), in reviewing Warfield's monograph, thinks that he "minimizes the share of Jefferson and magnifies that of Breckinridge." Warfield (section 5) prints the answers of the several States, and adds that the first use of the word "nullification" is in some resolutions passed in the Kentucky House of Representatives, Nov. 14, 1799 (p. 126).

⁴ Given in *Madison's Letters, etc.*, iv. 506; in Cooper and Fenton's *Amer. Politics*, book ii.; in Houghton's *Amer. Politics*, 136; and the answers of the States will be found in Houghton and Cooper.

⁵ *Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly on the answers of the Sundry States to their Resolutions* (Philad., 1800), and in *Madison's Letters, etc.* (iv. 515).

⁶ Cf. vols. iv. 58, 61-66, 72, 80, 85, 87, 106, 107, 110, 117, 166, 195, 199, 204, 228, 269, 272, 289, 293, 334, 354, 395-425. (Cf. Warfield, 187; Cluskey's *Polit. Text-book*.) For other views of their meaning and effect, see Jefferson's Works, vii. 230; ix. 464; Elliot's *Debates*, iv. 544; Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, i. ch. 87 and 88; Hildreth, v. 273, 296; Gay's *Pop. Hist. U. S.*, iv. 130, and his *Madison* (p. 243); Greeley's *Amer. Conflict*, ch. 8; Von Holst, Eng. tr., i. ch. 4; Sumner's *Jackson*, 213; Schouler, i. 423; McMaster, ii. 419, 495; Lator, *Cycl. p.*, ii. 672, with other references. Cf. also *Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 and 1799, with Jefferson's original draft thereof; also Madison's Report* (Washington, 1832).

⁷ Cf. Schouler, ii. 60, 61; Lodge's *Cabot*; Adams's *N. E. Federalism*; and references in C. K. Adams's *Manual*, 623.

New England to nullify the embargo and defeat the laws, and perhaps secession and union with England would follow. At this time (1809-1812) there was an effort made by the British government, acting through Lord Liverpool and Sir James H. Craig, the governor-general of Canada, to tempt the disaffected New Englanders, as it had tempted the men of Vermont during the Revolution. One John Henry came with a sort of commission to find out the temper of leading persons in New England; but he seems to have met with no success. His exorbitant demands for money having been rejected by the English government for so little return, he sought to get some pecuniary gain by selling his papers to the administration. So he contrived to cajole Madison into giving him, out of the secret-service money, \$50,000 for such papers and letters as he had, which the President was led to believe might yield proofs against some of the more obnoxious Federalists. The proofs failed.¹ In 1828, Harrison Gray Otis and other Federalists demanded of Adams his proofs (Young's *Amer. Statesman*, ii. 15). The correspondence² and Adams's final reply, which was not printed till those concerned had been long dead, is given in Henry Adams's *Documents relating to New England Federalism*, elsewhere referred to.

The later movement, as expressed in the Hartford Convention, originated in the opposition to the war of 1812, as the earlier movement had grown out of the stress of the Embargo; both touched sharply the commercial interests of New England. The convention was first suggested by Harrison Gray Otis in 1808, in a letter to Josiah Quincy.³ From thence on through the period of the war indignation was not easily kept from

seeming like sedition, and there was sufficient incentive on the one hand, and doubtless much cause on the other, for acts that looked like, and were easily deemed to be, treasonable. In Jan., 1814, the Massachusetts legislature went dangerously far in an answer drawn by Harrison Gray Otis to the governor's speech.⁴ The record of the doings of the convention was soon published, under the title of *Proceedings of a convention of delegates, from Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; the counties of Cheshire and Grafton, in N. H.; and the county of Windham, in Vermont; convened, Dec. 15th, 1814*.⁵

It was hard to convince the friends of the administration that there was not something kept from sight in this record.⁶ The earliest authoritative statements by friends were the *Letters developing the character and views of the Hartford Convention* by [Harrison Gray Otis], first published in the "*National Intelligencer*," Jan., 1820 (Washington, 1820), written because he had discovered that "the clamors raised against the convention had made a profound impression upon many intelligent minds;" and the anonymous *Short Account of the Hartford Convention, taken from official documents: added an attested copy of the secret journal⁷ of that body* (Boston, 1823), which is known to have been written by Theodore Lyman (b. 1792; d. 1849). The next year, Harrison Gray Otis published a *Letter in defence of the Hartford Convention and the People of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1824), which was in effect a "campaign document" to defeat the election of Eustis as governor of Massachusetts.⁸

In Theodore Dwight's *History of the Hartford Convention, with a Review of the Policy of the*

¹ The account of the Henry transaction by Josiah Quincy, who was one of the persons in Boston that was polite to the concealed spy, is given in Edmund Quincy's *Life of Quincy*, p. 250. Cf. also Sullivan's *Public Men*, p. 329; Hildreth, vi. 284; Dwight's *Hartford Convention*, 195; *Niles's Register*, ii. 19; Von Holst, i. 221, with citations; and Lalor's *Cyclop.*, ii. 445. The letters, etc., are in Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 27.

² *Correspondence between J. Q. Adams and citizens of Massachusetts concerning the Charge of a design to dissolve the Union* (Boston, 1829, in 2 eds.).

³ Ed. Quincy's *Quincy*, 164; Schouler, ii. 191.

⁴ *Columbian Centinel*, Jan. 26, 1814, cited in Hillard's *Jeremiah Mason*, p. 89. On the disaffection and its consequences, see Hildreth, vi. 469; Gillet's *Democracy in the U. S.*, 29, 79; Schouler, ii. 347, 417; Randall's *Jefferson*, iii. 634; and the article "New England secessionists," in *New Englander*, March, 1878.

⁵ There were editions at Hartford, 1815; Newburyport, 1815; a second ed., "improved and corrected," at Boston, 1815; a third, "corrected and improved," Boston, 1815; and it is also in *Public Documents, containing Proceedings of the Hartford Convention; Report of the Commissioners while at Washington; Letters from Massachusetts members in Congress, and letters from the [governors] of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York* [Mass. Senate Doc.] (Boston, 1815).

⁶ Cf. Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 83; *Niles's Register*, 1813-1814; the Resolutions are also in Porter's *Outlines of the Constitutional Hist. of the U. S.*, and in Houghton's *Amer. Politics*, p. 185. See fac-simile of signatures of the members in Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 1015.

⁷ The original journal was deposited, in 1819, in the Massachusetts Department of State, with a deposition from George Cabot that it was a complete record of its doings. Gov. Eustis subsequently gave it to John Quincy Adams, and so it passed into the Adams Archives (Lodge's *Cabot*, 510).

⁸ Jeremiah Mason (*Memoir*, p. 270) wrote to Gore: "This is the second time Mr. Otis has been the unfortunate occasion of calling up the ghost of that unlucky convention. I hope it is now laid forever. This is probably the last struggle of Federalism."

United States Government which led to the War of 1812 (New York, 1833), we have the final full exposition made by its secretary and its friends, including the journal, and this is the chief record of its documentary history.¹ The friends of the convention came to believe that its object was "to give a safe direction to the indignation of the community, and thus to avert the threatening danger of secession."² The best of the modern accounts is that in the *Life and Letters of George Cabot*, by Henry Cabot Lodge (Boston, 1877), in which he has brought to bear such letters of Cabot, who was the president of the convention, and such other material as he could find in the papers of Caleb Strong and of Timothy Pickering,—the last being the most violent of the extreme Federalists,—since Cabot himself destroyed nearly all of his papers in his last days.³ We have accounts, more or less full, of some who were closely allied with the spirit of the convention, like the defence by Noah Webster in his *Essays* (1843), and the testimony of Otis and of Roger M. Sherman as quoted in the *Recollections of a Lifetime* (vol. ii. pp. 1-59), by S. G. Goodrich, who was a looker-on in Hartford at the time, and, though a young man, he was favored with opportunities for observing some

of the leading members of the convention. Sullivan, in his *Public Men* (p. 356, etc.), gives two letters to the subject. We find it more or less expounded in the lives of contemporaries, like Pickering, Plumer (p. 421), and Quincy (p. 357), and the later writers have borrowed from all these.⁴

The earliest successful defiance of the United States was the action of Georgia in disregarding the treaty of the United States with the Cherokees. The legal documents of the case are gathered in Richard Peter's *Cherokee Nation vs. The State of Georgia*.⁵

The later nullification movement of South Carolina was more portentous. The views of the nullifiers are best arrayed in Calhoun's *Address to the people of South Carolina* (1831). The people in convention published *Report, ordinance, and addresses of the Convention of the people of South Carolina* [on the subject of the several acts of Congress, imposing duties for the protection of domestic manufactures, with the ordinance to nullify the same] (Columbia, 1832).⁶ Jackson's proclamation (Dec., 1832)⁷ was probably written by Edward Livingston.⁸ It was indignantly received at the South,⁹ and incited

¹ Von Holst (Eng. transl., i. 200) says that the only worth of "that verbose and badly written book" is these documents.

² William H. Channing's *Memoir of Wm. Ellery Channing, with extracts from his correspondence and manuscripts* (Boston, 1848, etc.), in three vols., and the *Centenary Memorial Edition* (Boston, 1880), p. 280.

³ George Ticknor, *Memoirs*, i. 13, tells of the fiery antagonism of John Adams, who accused Cabot of a desire to be President of New England.

⁴ Cf. the index to Adams's *New England Federalism*, and *Poole's Index*, p. 572; Hildreth, vi. 533, 545-553; Schouler, ii. 424; Gay's *Pop. Hist. U. S.*, iv. 229; Barry's *Mass.*, iii. 411; Randall's *Jefferson*, iii. 411, etc.; Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, 202; Fowler's *Sectional Controversy*, p. 65; S. D. Bradford's *Works* (Boston, 1858), for a paper on the convention; and Lalor's *Cyclopaedia*, i. 624. There was a satire upon it published at Windsor, Vt., in 1815, called *The Hartford Convention in an uproar* (Stevens's *Hist. Coll.*, ii. 185). The convention was long a reproach to even the Whig party of a later day, and Webster had to repel the accusations of Hayne (*Works*, iii. 314; cf. Curtis's *Webster*, i. 134). For Webster's disavowal of his connection with the convention, see *Private Correspondence*, ii. 184; and for the libel suit which he instituted against Theo. Lyman for connecting him with earlier supposed disunion movements, see *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xix. Cf. *Identity* of the Hartford Convention Federalists with the modern Whig Harrison party* (Boston, 1847), and L. Josselyn's *Appeal to the people; proof of an alliance between the American Whigs and the British Tories* (Boston, 1840).

⁵ For the laws and treaties, see *Statutes at Large*, ii. 139; vii. 18, 39. William Wirt's opinion was published separately at Baltimore, 1830. Cf. Kennedy's *Wirt*, ii. ch. 15. The case is reported in Peters's *Reports*, v. 1; vi. 515; also see Curtis, ix. 178. Gov. Troup's message is in *Niles's Reg.*, xxix. 200; also see *Ibid.* vols. xlii, xliii. Cf. Joseph Hodgson's *Cradle of the Confederacy, or the times of Troup, Quitman, and Yancey,—a sketch of southwestern political history from the formation of the federal government to 1861* (Mobile, 1876); Lalor, i. 390; Sumner's *Jackson*, 181; Von Holst, i. 433; Benton's *Debates*; Greeley's *Amer. Conflict*, i. 102; Clay's *Speeches*, ii. 249; other speeches noted in Parton's *Jackson* (i. p. xxi.); A. H. Everett in *No. Am. Rev.*, xxxiii. 136; index of Poore's *Descrip. Catal.*, etc.

⁶ The nullification documents are also printed with Jackson's *Message* of Jan. 16, 1833. Cf. also Elliot's *Debates*, iv. 580; Benton's *Debates*, xii. 30 (and his *Thirty Years*, i. 297); *Niles's Reg.*, xliii. 219, 231; *Statesman's Manual*, ii.

⁷ *Niles's Reg.*, xliii. 231, 260, 339; *Annual Reg.*, viii.; Elliot's *Debates*, iv. 580-592; *Statesman's Manual*, ii. 890; Von Holst, i. 429, 478; Benton's *Thirty Years*, i. 303; Sumner's *Jackson*, 207; Parton, iii. 433.

⁸ Hunt's *Livingston*, p. 371.

⁹ *Niles's Reg.*, xliii. 231; Garland's *Randolph*, ii. 359; Calhoun's *Works*; Von Holst's *Calhoun*; Hodgson's *Cradle of the Confederacy*. The *Charleston Mercury* was the chief organ of Southern feeling (Hudson's *Journalism*, 403).

enthusiasm at the North.¹ The course of the debates in Congress is outlined in Von Holst (i. 459-476), and the speeches are given in Benton's *Debates* (vols. xi., xii.), and in *Niles's Reg.* (vols. xlv.-vi.)² There is a succinct sketch of the progress of nullification ideas in Sumner's *Jackson* (ch. 10, 13), and it may be followed in all the general histories and leading biographies.³

D. THE SLAVERY QUESTION AND ITS OPPOSING CHAMPIONS. — The subject of slavery and the slave-trade in America is one which needs a specific bibliography.⁴

The general surveys of the whole progress of the movement are these:—

William Goodell's *Slavery and Anti-Slavery, a history of the great struggle in both hemispheres* (N. Y., 3d ed., 1855), well judged and comprehensive (C. K. Adams's *Man. of Hist. Lit.*, 569).

Henry Wilson's *Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America* (Boston, 1872, etc., 3 vols.), the first volume covering the period prior to

1850,—the most extensive book on the subject, but without references to authorities, and sometimes warmly denunciatory of the conservative side.

Alexander Harris's *Review of the Political Conflict in America, from the Commencement of the anti-slavery agitation* (N. Y., 1876), a compact book.

Horace Greeley's *American Conflict* (Hartford, 1864, 1867, in 2 vols.),—a history of the civil war in its political aspects mainly, and of the movements of the slavery agitation from 1776, leading up to the war. An earlier book by the same writer, editor of the N. Y. Tribune, is a *History of the Struggle for Slavery Extension or Restriction in the U. S. (1776-1856), mainly compiled from the Journals of Congress and the other official records* (N. Y., 1856).

The rise and progress of the anti-slavery idea and development of the slave power with reference to its related forces is succinctly gone over in Draper's *Civil War* (i. ch. 16, 17).⁵

¹ Cf. W. H. Seward's *Autobiog.*, for instance.

² The debates are abridged in Elliot (iv. 494, 580). Cf. the published speeches of Peleg Sprague, Tristram Burges, etc. Those of Calhoun are the leading ones on the side of the nullifiers. Cf. his *Works* (on the Force Bill) ii. 197; (on State Rights), ii. 262, iii. 140; and (his later view in 1850) iv. 542; also vi. 59, 124; Von Holst's *History*, i. 465; his *Calhoun*, ch. 5; Benton's *Thirty Years*, ch. 84.

On the side of the Union we have the strongest expression in the speeches of Webster, like the three on Foot's Resolution (*Works*, iii. 248-355); that on the Constitution not a compact (iii. 448); and his final utterance in his seventh of March speech, 1850 (v. 324). On his position towards nullification, see Curtis's *Webster*, i. 351, 429, 456. It was the second of the speeches on Foot's Resolution which was the famous Reply to Hayne. Cf. Curtis's *Webster*, i. 357; Lodge's *Webster*, 172; Schouler, iii. 483; Sargent's *Pub. Men*, ii. 169. The original short-hand report of this speech, with Webster's subsequent MS. emendations, is preserved in the Boston Public Library. On Col. Hayne, see J. B. O'Neill's *Biog. Sketches of the Bench and Bar of So. Carolina* (Charleston, 1859), and Benton's *Thirty Years*, ii. ch. 51.

³ Benton's *Thirty Years* (i. ch. 46, 78, 79, 80); Roosevelt's *Benton* (ch. 5); Madison pronounced against it, *Letters*, iv. 95-105; J. A. Hamilton's *Reminiscences*; W. L. G. Smith's *Lewis Cass*, ch. 17; L. G. Tyler's *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, i. 441; S. J. Tilden's *Public Writings and Speeches*; Schouler, iii. 441, 489; Tucker's *History*; Greeley's *Amer. Conflict*; Wilson's *Slave Power*, overwrought; Von Holst, i. ch. 12; Gay's *History*, iv. 306; T. S. Goodwin's *Natural Hist. of Secession* (N. Y., 1864); Fowler's *Sectional Controversy*, 101; Draper's *Civil War*, i. ch. 21, etc.

There was no necessary connection between States-rights and nullification. Wirt called secession a revolution (Kennedy, ii. 347), and H. S. Legaré's *Writings* show how he opposed nullification. Cf., on States-rights, H. Adams's *Randolph*, 273; Schouler, iii. 381; Lator, ii. 1050; iii. 789; and President Welling's "States Rights theory" in *Papers Amer. Hist. Asso.*, ii. 72. The ultra Southern view is in Thomas Cooper's *Consolidation, an account of parties from 1787* (Columbia, S. C., 1830, 2d ed.). Hodgson's *Cradle of the Confederacy* emphasizes its New England origin. Cf. Tyler's *Tylers*, i. 285; and *Harper's Monthly*, xxiv. p. 807.

⁴ There are the beginnings of one in J. R. Bartlett's *Literature of the Civil War*, and in such classified *Catalogues* as that of the Boston Athenæum (pp. 2746-56). The chief other collections of books are those in Cornell University library, including those brought together by Samuel J. May; in the Boston Public Library, including the library of Theodore Parker; in Harvard College library, including the books of Charles Sumner, T. W. Higginson and others; and in the Public Library of Providence, from the collection of C. F. Harris. Mr. Daniel Parish of New York city has a large gathering. In newspaper files the libraries of Yale College and the Philadelphia Library Company are particularly strong.

⁵ The subject is also necessarily interwoven, by one of the colored race, in George W. Williams's *History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880* (New York, 1883), in such chapters as "Slavery a political and legal problem, 1775-1800," "Restriction and extension, 1800-1825," "Anti-slavery methods and efforts," etc.

Lator's *Cyclopædia* takes up the phases with the most useful references to sources, as in "Abolition" (i. 7), "Fugitive Slave Laws" (ii. 315), "Slavery in the U. S." (iii. 725).

Of the general histories, Von Holst is probably the most useful to the student, through the foot-notes of his chapters (vol. i. 7, 8, 9), tracing the development down and through the Missouri Compromise, and (ii. ch. 2)

The course of the congressional action is followed chronologically by picking out the entries in Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*, and topically by its index. Benton's *Debates* are a necessary resort in the periodical crises. Morse calls John Quincy Adams (*J. Q. A.*, 190) the first leader in the long crusade against slavery, and his *Memoirs* are of importance.¹ Benton (*Thirty Years*)

chronicles the agitation through a long period, 1816-1846, while he was in the Senate.² The three chief champions of distinct, but for the time conjoined, policies as the conflict was prolonged, were Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, till we reach the limit of the present *History*; and Greeley has studied their relations to the Compromises of 1850 in his *Busy Life*, ch. 30.³

later. Hildreth, Schouler, and Gay may help in broadening the view from different points of approach; and particularly on the side of Southern sympathy or justification, such books as James Buchanan's *Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion* (cf. Curtis's *Buchanan*) and George Lunt's *Origin of the Late War, traced from the beginning of the Constitution to the revolt of the Southern States* (N. Y., 1866). A Southern but not overstrained view is given in Tucker's *Hist. of the U. S.* Other views with a Southern sympathy are in L. G. Tyler's *Letters and Times of the Tylers* (i. 311) and in Hodgson's *Cradle of the Confederacy* (ch. 9).

¹ As the champion of the right of petition while a member of the House of Representatives, Adams became steadfastly prominent in all congressional encounters on the subject arising from the Southern opposition to petitions for the abolition of slavery. Cf. Morse's *J. Q. Adams* (pp. 249-280); Quincy's *J. Q. Adams* (p. 250); Wilson's *Slave Power* (i. 23, 25, 349, 427); Lalor's *Cyclo.* (iii. 167, 169). For Calhoun's opposition see Von Holst's *Calhoun* (ch. 6). Buchanan defended the right of petition (Curtis, i. ch. 13). Cf. R. C. Winthrop's *Addresses*, i.; and W. H. Smith's *Charles Hammond and his relations to Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams; or, Constitutional limitations and the contest for freedom of speech and the press. An address delivered before the Chicago historical society, May 20, 1884* (Chicago, 1885).

² A chapter is given to the slavery conflict in Theodore Roosevelt's *Thomas Hart Benton* (Boston, 1887) in the "American Statesmen Series." Cf. an article by W. C. Todd in the *Atlantic Monthly*, xxvi, and references in *Poole's Index*, p. 113.

³ It is convenient here to examine the leading records of the service of these three men in the public councils, and all that has been written upon them touches more or less upon their relations to this great struggle.

The leading lives of Henry Clay are:—

Life and Speeches of H. C., compiled and ed. by Daniel Mallory (N. Y., 1843), in two vols.

Life and Times of H. C., by Calvin Colton (N. Y., 1846, 2d ed.), in two vols.,—written with access, "entirely at his own discretion," to such papers as Clay preserved, for he was not careful in this way, and to such as could be gathered from Clay's friends. In 1850 a chapter was added to the book, detailing the last seven years of his life. Colton also edited Clay's *Private Correspondence* (N. Y., 1855) and issued the *Works of Clay* (N. Y., 1855) containing in three volumes his life, in a fourth his letters, and in the fifth and sixth his speeches.

Henry Clay, by Carl Schurz (Boston, 1887), in two vols., in the "American Statesmen Series,"—the most satisfactory view of his relations to contemporary politics which has been written. We have a sketch by one who knew him in the biography which R. C. Winthrop contributed to the *Memorial Biographies* (1880) of the N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Society (reprinted in Winthrop's *Addresses*, 1878-1886). Cf. also Reminiscences by J. O. Harrison in the *Century*, xxxiii. 163, 170; Parton in his *Famous Americans* (originally in *No. Am. Rev.*, Jan., 1866) and in his *Jackson* (ch. 19); Ormsby's *Whig Party*; and on Clay's duel with Randolph, Garland's *Randolph* (ii. ch. 31) and Benton's *Thirty Years* (ch. 76).

Of Calhoun there is no extended biography, and perhaps the most trustworthy of the accounts published during his life was a brief anonymous *Life* issued by the Harpers (N. Y., 1843), which appeared with and without "a selection from his speeches, reports, and other writings." The best resource for the understanding of him is in Richard K. Cralle's *Works of Calhoun* (N. Y., 1853), which contains (vol. i.) A Disquisition on Government and a discourse on the Constitution and government of the U. S.,—printed from his MS. as he left it, a notable exemplification of the strict constructionist grounds (vol. ii. to iv.); his speeches in the House and Senate; and (vol. v., vi.) his reports and public letters. Von Holst has contributed the *John C. Calhoun* (Boston, 1882) to the Statesmen Series, which gives Calhoun a more distinct treatment than we get for him from Von Holst's history. Cf. also, for minor notices, Parton's *Famous Americans* and his *Jackson* (ch. 23); A. H. Stephens's *War between the States*; O. A. Brownson's *Works* (xv. 451); Benton's *Thirty Years*; and references in Poole. Benton's *Debates* and Poole's *Catalogue* enable us to trace his career in the government service.

Of Daniel Webster we have a full register of his career under the best auspices. At his death in 1852, he appointed literary executors, and directed the transfer of his papers to them by his son, Fletcher Webster. Chief among these executors was Edward Everett, who had already prepared a considerate memoir as an introduction to an edition of Webster's *Works*, which was published in 1851. There had been a single volume of Mr. Webster's speeches published in 1830, a second added in 1835, a third in 1843, and finally in 1848 a fourth volume of diplomatic papers. The series of six uniform volumes which contained Mr. Everett's memoir included also his legal arguments and public letters,—the whole omitting, however, much that must

The episodes of the slavery question have their distinctive treatment. W. F. Poole published at Cincinnati in 1873 his *Anti-Slavery opinions before 1800, with a fac-simile reprint of Dr. Geo. Buchanan's oration on the moral and evil effects of slavery, delivered in Baltimore, July 4, 1791*.¹

The dying Franklin had, in 1790, launched the shafts of his ridicule at the upholders of slavery (Parton, ii. 611). For the abolition of the slave trade in 1808, see Hildreth, v. 627; Schouler, ii. 125; Quincy's *Josiah Quincy*, 102.

For the text and debates on the Missouri Compromise and congressional papers, see Ben-

ton's *Debates*, vols. vi., vii., and Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*.²

The struggle in Illinois in 1823-24 is mainly illustrated in E. B. Washburne's *Sketch of Edward Coles and the slavery struggle of 1823-24* (Chicago, 1882).³

The personal leadership of the early abolitionists is illustrated in Benj. Lundy, of which the account in Wilson's *Slave Power*, i. ch. 13, is perhaps the best; and in his most absolute successor William Lloyd Garrison, of whom the most complete account yet given is in Oliver Johnson's *Garrison and his Times*, though the sons of Garrison have begun an elaborate and

be searched for in the public prints of his time and in Benton's *Debates*. Particularly not to be found in the editions of his speeches is one made in Boston, October 2, 1820, in which he argued for incidental rather than for the essential protection which he later advocated. It was printed Oct. 11, 1820, in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*. In the preparation of the memoir Mr. Everett acknowledges his obligations to a paper by George Ticknor in the *Amer. Quarterly Review* (June, 1831), and to Chas. W. March's *Reminiscences of Congress, or Daniel Webster and his contemporaries* (1850, and later). The *Private Correspondence of Daniel Webster*, as edited by Fletcher Webster, was published in 2 vols. in 1857, and it included an autobiography, coming down, however, only to 1817, which was written for Mrs. Eliza Buckminster Lee, in 1828, and to this were added some personal reminiscences of his friends. Meanwhile, George Ticknor, another of the literary executors, had assiduously collected from Webster's correspondents all that could be secured of his letters, which, with his own papers and printed material, was put into the hands of Mr. Everett for use in preparing the authoritative memoir. Mr. Everett died (1865), however, without having done anything, when the papers passed to Mr. George T. Curtis, and he, with the countenance of Mr. Ticknor, the surviving executor, prepared and published *The Life of Daniel Webster* (N. Y., 1870), in 2 vols., and later supplemented it with *The last years of Daniel Webster* (N. Y., 1878). Lodge, in the best of the compact lives of *Daniel Webster* (Boston, 1883), acknowledges his main dependence on Curtis, but says he has been constrained to differ from him in many conclusions, such as in his views of Webster compounding with slavery; and this estimate is also sustained in Lodge's *Studies in History* (p. 294).

There are a number of associative recollections of Webster by those who had enjoyed his confidence, like the *Private Life* (1852 and later eds.), by his secretary Lanman, and the *Reminiscences of Webster*, by his Boston companion Peter Harvey, which, as Lodge says, is "the reflection of a great man upon the mirror of a very small mind and weak memory." From three friends of different stamp we have larger estimates: from Edward Everett (*Works*, iii. 158; iv. 186) in his address at the dedication of the Webster statue in Boston, and in his commemorative remarks on his death; from Robert C. Winthrop (*Addresses*, iii. 436; iv. 375) in an address at the unveiling of a statue in New York, and at the Webster Centennial Commemoration at Marshfield in 1882; and from Rufus Choate (*Writings*, vol. i.). The excess of antagonistic views can be found in Parton's *Famous Americans*, Theodore Parker in his *Speeches* (vol. i.), and the *Speeches* of Wendell Phillips. There are some characterizations of Webster in Schouler (iii. 299). A condensed book is S. M. Smucker's *Life, Speeches and Memorials of D. W.* (Philad., 1867). The references in Allibone and Poole and the titles in the *Boston Athenæum Catal.* (p. 3275) make a good beginning for a Webster bibliography.

¹ The rise of Abolitionism is traced in Hildreth (iv. 175; v. 177); Rives's *Madison* (iii. 129); McMaster (ii. 20); and Schouler (i. 143; ii. 129). Wm. Pinkney, in 1789, had argued for the right to manumit slaves (Wheaton's *Pinkney*, 8). On the compromises of the Constitution see Wilson's *Slave Power*, i. ch. 4; Von Holst, i. ch. 7, and the histories of the Constitution by Curtis and Bancroft.

² For personal relations see Colton's *Clay* (ch. 13), and Schurz (i. ch. 8); Garland's *Randolph* (ii. ch. 12, 15); Morse's *John Quincy Adams* (p. 120); Quincy's *Quincy* (ch. 6); Tyler's *Tylers*; Pinkney's speech in Wheaton (p. 573) and Dr. Pinkney (288, 292); George W. Julian's *Polit. Recollections*, 1840-1872 (Chicago, 1884); E. B. Callendar's *Thaddeus Stevens, Commoner* (Boston, 1882); the Virginia report and resolutions sent to the other States; the report of the New Hampshire Legislature, drawn by Jeremiah Mason (*Memoir*, 250); the narratives in such general works as Wilson's *Slave Power* (i. ch. 11, 12); Greeley's *Amer. Conflict* (ch. 7); Stephens's *War between the States*; Draper's *Civil War* (i. 351); J. R. Giddings's *Hist. of the Rebellion* (N. Y., 1864); Von Holst (i. ch. 9), with something of excessive emphasis; Hildreth, vi. 661, 683; Schouler, iii. 147-173, 181, etc.; Gay, *Pop. Hist.*, iv. 262-269; also contemporary comment, as in Jefferson's *Works* (vii.) and Madison's *Letters* (iii.); and references in Lalor (p. 554), C. K. Adams (*Man. of Hist.*, p. 627), and Poole (p. 855).

³ Cf. further in Wilson's *Slave Power*, i. 163; Cooley's *Michigan*, 139; George Flower's *Hist. of the English Settlement in Edwards County* (Chicago, 1882).

extensive record, *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879; the story of his life* (N. Y., 1885), of which we now have the account, coming down to 1840. The authors state that Garrison's manuscripts will eventually go to the Boston Public Library.¹

The *Writings* of Wm. Jay constitute some of the most effective of the early applications of literary help to the cause. The lives of others of the less combative stamp, like Joseph Story (i. ch. xi.) and Channing's *Channing* (Cent. ed., p. 520), mark feelings deep, but less turbulent. Of Boston as the centre of the agitation, the story is told by James Freeman Clarke in a chapter in the *Memorial Hist. Boston* (iii. 369), who has also told the story not so locally in his *Anti-Slavery Days* (N. Y., 1884). The *Memorial of Wendell Phillips* (Boston, 1884), with an oration by George W. Curtis; *The Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker*, by John Weiss (Boston, 1864); and O. B. Frothingham's *Theo. Parker* (1874), need to be added, but further references will be found in the *Mem. Hist. Boston* (iii. 395). Various sets of Garrison's paper, *The Liberator*, as a chronicle of the movement, are preserved (*Ibid.* iii. 372).

The question of the character of slavery in Massachusetts and the process of its extinction has elicited some controversy, conducted by G.

H. Moore in his *Notes on the Hist. of Slavery in Mass.* (N. Y., 1866) on the one side, and by Emory Washburn on the other in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, xxxiv. 333, and *Proc.*, iii. 188, and in *Lectures on the Early Hist. of Mass.* (Boston, 1869).²

E. A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RECORD OF THE SUCCESSIVE ADMINISTRATIONS.—It should be borne in mind that in these notes scant reference is made to questions of constitutional interpretation, territorial acquisitions and the public lands, diplomacy, with military and naval matters, because the principal treatment of those subjects is made in other parts of the present volume.

I. GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1789-97. The documents relating to the making of Washington President,³ with the papers of attending ceremonies, are given in Sparks's *Washington*, x. App. i.; and his inaugural speech is in *Ibid.* xii. p. 12. We find an account of the inauguration ceremonies in Maclay's *Sketches of Debates*, etc. McMaster gives one of the fullest of the later accounts.⁴

It devolved upon the first Congress to begin the settlement of the varied lines of policy which put the government in working order.⁵ After

¹ The biographical annals of the Garrisonian school include the lives of Arthur Tappan, Samuel J. May (with his *Recollections of the Anti-Slavery Conflict*), Gerrit Smith, James and Lucretia Mott, George Bradburn, the letters of Lydia Maria Child, and Parker Pillsbury's *Acts of the Anti-Slavery Apostles*. The latest contribution is *The Life of Cassius Marcellus Clay, Memoirs, Writings and Speeches, written by himself* (Cincinnati, 1886); but Clay was not of the Garrisonian type.

² The Massachusetts view is that the Constitution of Mass. by implication from its Bill of Rights, extinguished slavery. Cf. also "How slavery was abolished in Mass.," by J. S. Clark in the *Congregational Quarterly*, ii. 42; and the correspondence of Belknap, Judge Tucker, and others in the appendix of *Belknap Papers*, vol. ii., and queries by S. G. Tucker in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, iv. 191; also see *Ibid.* xliii. 373; L. M. Sargent's *Dealings with the Dead*, nos. 43, 44, 47; Amory's *James Sullivan*, i. 114; Judge Gray's notes on Cushing's memoranda of the Jennison trial in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1874, and references in *Pool's Index*, p. 1207; *Boston Pub. Library Bull.*, vii. p. 186. Moore's views are adopted in Williams's *Negro Race*, and he maintained his views and conducted a controversy with C. F. Dunbar in the *Hist. Mag.*, vols. x. and xv.

Cf. Joseph Williamson on "Slavery in Maine," in the *Maine Hist. Soc. Coll.*, vol. vii.

³ Cf., on Washington's acceptance of the Presidency, G. T. Curtis in *Harper's Monthly*, Feb., 1882.


A collection of the speeches of the President to both houses of Congress, with their answers. Also, the addresses to the president, with his answers. With appendix, containing the circular letter to the governors of the states, and his farewell orders (Boston, 1796). The speeches, etc., can also be found in the *Statesman's Manual*, and similar books.

A collection of Washington's cabinet papers, part of which Sparks printed (vol. x. App., etc.), are in the *Sparks MSS.*, no. lxiv.; letters of Washington, not printed by Sparks, in *Ibid.* no. lxxv.; and letters to Washington, in *Ibid.* no. xvi.,—during his presidential terms and later. The originals are of course in the Department of State.


Lists of cabinet officers in the successive administrations will be found in Towle's *Constitution*, p. 411, and in various other places.

⁴ Cf. vol. i. 525; on the preparations in New York, p. 532. Cf. also Irving's *Washington*, iv. ch. 37; Rives's *Madison*, iii. ch. 37; Griswold's *Republican Court*, 137; Barry's *Mass.*, iii. 306, with references; and G. W. Curtis's *Address at the unveiling of the statue of Washington, upon the spot where he took the oath as first president of the United States. Delivered on the (25th) 26th Nov., 1883* (New York, 1883).

⁵ On the composition and action of the first Congress, see Garland's *Randolph*, i. ch. 7; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 173; Gay's *Madison*, ch. 10; McMaster, i. ch. 6; Schouler, i. 74; Ames's *Speeches in Congress*, for his



RECEPTION OF WASHINGTON AT TRENTON, N. J., APRIL 21, 1789.*



PREPARATIONS FOR WASHINGTON'S RECEPTION AT GRAY'S FERRY, NEAR PHILADELPHIA, APRIL 20, 1789.†

part in debates; John Adams, *Works*, iii., for an abstract of a debate on the power of the President to remove heads of departments, which was decided in the affirmative by Adams's casting vote.

The various views held in Congress as to the title to be given to the President came out in Maclay's *Sketches of Debate*, p. 38; Benton's *Debates*, i. 65; *The Correspondence of John Adams and Mercy Warren*, 437. Cf. Sparks's *Washington*, x. 21; Griswold's *Repub. Court*, 152; Garland's *Randolph*, i. 43; Hildreth, iv. 39; McMaster, i. 541. On the titles of Excellency, Honorable, and Esquire, as used in the Revolution, see Sparks's *Gouv. Morris*, i. 80.


* Reduced from a plate in the *Columbian Mag.*, May, 1789.

† Reduced from the plate in the *Columbian Mag.*, May, 1789.

Congress had adjourned, Washington made an Eastern tour. We have his own account of this and later journeys in his *Diary, from 1789 to 1791; embracing the opening of the first congress, and his tours through New England, Long Island, and the southern states. Together with his journal of a tour to the Ohio in 1753.* Edited by Benson F. Lossing (Richmond, 1861), being a publication of the Virginia Hist. Society.¹

The most striking result of Hamilton's management as Secretary of the Treasury was his settlement of the public debt and the establishment of a national bank.² After Hamilton, Albert Gallatin³ stands for the most vigorous of these early financiers, and his views are now easily accessible in Henry Adams's *Writings of Gallatin*, vol. iii.⁴

Of special value as to the early finances is



BOSTON, 1790.*

¹ We have other records of his progress in Wm. S. Stryker's *Washington's Reception by the People of New Jersey in 1789* (Trenton, 1882). For his passage through New York, see McMaster, i. 538; Griswold's *Repub. Court*, 134; Hildreth, iv. 55; Bancroft, vi. 470; Marshall, Irving, etc. In Massachusetts there was a foolish point of etiquette raised by Gov. Hancock, as to priority of calls between the President of the United States and the governor of a State, when the Federal executive visited a State. The gouty governor pleaded earlier physical incapacity, when he finally went wrapped in flannels to show the hospitality of Massachusetts to a guest who had properly stood upon his dignity. Ames (*Works*, i. 74) wrote to Thomas Dwight: "The Governor finally waited upon him [Washington]. His friends say that he [Hancock] never doubted the point of etiquette, and that it was a mere falsehood invented to injure him. The popularity of the President seems to bear every thing down." See the correspondence in Sparks's *Washington*, x. 47, and app. vii.; and his *Correspondence of the Rev.*, iv. 289; also see *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 199; Barry's *Mass.*, iii. 310, with references; *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1860; beside Marshall, Irving, McMaster, Griswold, etc. Hancock was prone to make his gout a convenience. Cf. *Belknap Papers*, ii. 134. What Hancock's political enemies thought of him at the time can be read in the rather vigorous onset of Stephen Higginson, *The Writings of Laco, as published in the Mass. Centinel, Feb. and March, 1789* (Boston, 1789), reprinted as *Ten Chapters in the Life of John Hancock* (N. Y., 1857). Cf. *Brinley Catal.*, iii. 4881-82.

Washington avoided Rhode Island in his progress; but the next year, when that erratic State came into the Union, he made it a special visit. A fac-simile of his reply to the freemen of Newport is given in *The Curio*, i. 67. His Southern tour in 1791 is described by Griswold, p. 273, and the general authorities, and in the histories of the States traversed.

² Hamilton's arguments for a bank are summarized in Marshall's *Washington*. The tracts on Hamilton's financial policy, and his reports, are enumerated in Ford's *Bibliotheca Hamiltoniana*. Gouverneur Morris's *Observations on the finances of the U. S. in 1789* are in Sparks's *Morris*, iii. 469. They favor a direct tax and duties on imports. Fisher Ames's speech on the public credit is in Ames's *Speeches in Congress*, p. 19.

³ Cf. H. C. Adams's *Taxation in the U. S.* (*Johns-Hopkins Univ. Studies*, 2d ser., nos. 5-6).

⁴ The later historical treatment of the government, as a whole, are Albert S. Bolles's *Finan-*

* Fac-simile of a print in the *Mass. Mag.*, Nov., 1790. The point of view is in Gov. Hancock's grounds; the common, with the great elm, is in the middle distance, the south part of the town with the Neck, are beyond, and in the further parts are Dorchester Heights.

the very general work of Adam Seybert, founded on official documents, *The Statistical Annals, embracing views of the population, commerce, navigation, fisheries, public lands, post office, revenue, mint, military and naval expenditure, public debt and sinking fund, 1789-1818* (Philad., 1818).

The volumes on "Finance" in the *American State Papers* are of the first importance as setting forth the official statements of the government; and among other governmental documents (see index to Poore's *Descriptive Catal.*) reference may be made to certain historical sections of the *Report of the International Monetary Congress of 1878*.¹

A part of Hamilton's scheme required the as-

sumption by Congress of the debts of the States contracted during the Revolutionary War, and it failed of passage in Congress, till, by a bargain for votes, it acquired Southern support through a plan of placing, after ten years, the Federal city on the Potomac. This combination of interests encountered bitter opposition.²

Although tariff legislation was begun in the first months of the government, and with a purpose to protection as well as revenue, the party differences on this question did not come to be prominent for many years. The most important paper at this time is probably Hamilton's *Report on Manufactures* in 1791.³

As respects the Whiskey Insurrection of 1794,

cial Hist. of the U. S., 1774-1789 (N. Y., 1879), and 1789-1860 (N. Y., 1883). The book is somewhat deficient in clearness, and has met adverse criticism on account of a certain patch-work character; but it is the completest general survey. He refers to the scant treatment in Von Hock's *Die Finanzen und die Finanz-Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika*, and to the "brief efforts of Breck, Schucker, Bronson, and occasional magazine writers." A less extended account is John Watts Kearny's *Sketch of American Finances, 1789-1835* (N. Y., 1887), in which the settlement of the war debt of the Revolution (ch. 1) and the finances of the War of 1812 (ch. 3) are considered. Pitkin (ii.) states the arguments *pro* and *con* for the funding system. Gibbs's *Administrations of Washington and Adams* is a necessary authority, with the letters of Hamilton and Wolcott, contained in the book, — Wolcott (1795) succeeding Hamilton. (Cf. Rives's *Madison*, iii. 485.) Oliver Wolcott's *Address to the people of the U. S. on the subject of the Report of a Com. of the Ho. of Rep. [as to] whether moneys drawn from the treasury have been faithfully applied* (Boston; Hartford, 1802) elucidates his administration of the treasury. There is something of local interest in Mrs. M. J. Lamb's *Wall Street in History*, as republished from the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.* For the early period, see also Hildreth, iv. 65, 153; McMaster, ii. 27; Schouler, i. 133; Gay, iv. 105. See the lives of Hamilton by J. C. Hamilton, Morse (i. 280), and Lodge (ch. 5 and 6); that of Washington by Marshall; the lives of Jefferson by Randall, Parton (ch. 43), and Morse (ch. 9), and Garland's *Randolph*, i. ch. 10, for the urgent opposition of Jefferson to Hamilton's plans; and also lives of Madison by Rives (iii. 71-90, 155, 241, 273), and Gay (ch. 9).

On the bank question, see Benton's *Debates*; Hildreth, iv. 257; Schouler, i. 159; and Morse's *Hamilton* (i. ch. 9). There is a condensed history of bank controversies in Lalor (i. 199-204, with references), and Sumner runs over the early period in his *Jackson* (ch. 11).

¹ The index of *Benton's Debates* affords clues. A few leading references are given in C. K. Adams's *Manual of Hist. Lit.*, 618; and others will be found in Lalor (ii. 185-196; iii. 933, 960-986), under such heads as "Finance," by A. S. Bolles, "Treasury Department," and "U. S. Notes." *Poole's Index* gives references (see pp. 1349, 1351, 1354); and numerous titles are found in the *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 3120.

² Fisher Ames's letters reflect the surging opinions in Congress (*Works*, i.), and his speech on assumption is in his *Speeches in Congress*, 32. Jefferson's retrospect is in the preface (1818) of his *Anas*, in his *Writings*, ix. 92. Cf. Morse's *Jefferson*, i. 99; Benton's *Debates*, i. 191, 216, etc.; Hildreth, iv. 206, 211, 493; McMaster, i. 581; Schouler, i. 139; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 109; *Life of George Read*, 524; Lalor's *Cyclopadia*, i. 352.

³ The tariff and the connected antagonistic policies of free-trade and protection pass down with intermittent prominence through the whole political history of the United States, and the successive authorities may be best noted here. The purely historical literature is not very extensive; but the theoretical and argumentative expression is considerable in quantity; and as they are necessarily more or less compelled to draw on experience, this latter class of monographs is in some degree invariably useful in the history of party differences. The bibliographies of political economy must be looked to for extended reference. Lists of moderate extent can be found in the *Catalogues of the Boston Athenæum* (p. 3161) and of the *Brooklyn Library* (p. 917), — not to name other principal library catalogues. The readiest way to reach the action of the government is by the entries under "Tariff" in the index of Ben. Perley Poore's *Descriptive Catal. of Publ. of the U. S. Government*; by the index to Congressional Documents in the *Boston Public Library Catalogue*, under "United States"; and in the indexes to Benton's *Debates*. Of course, those volumes of the *State Papers* devoted to finance, and the current record of Niles's *Register*, are indispensable. All histories of parties, severally or jointly, touch the subject for a test of party views, as almost invariably the subject is. The published speeches and lives of all leading members of Congress necessarily yield something. Cf., for instance, the views of Madison in his *Letters, etc.*, vols. iii. and iv.; and the incidental history of the tariff in L. G. Tyler's *Tylers* (i. ch. 14).

The reports of the treasury and of various commissions treat the subject historically at times, but perhaps the best survey of this kind is in E. Young's *Special Report on the Customs-tariff legislation of the*

the evidence which induced Judge Wilson to inform President Washington (*Penna. Archives*, 2d ser., iv. 82) that rebellion against the United States laws existed, is in the *Mag. West. Hist.*, Sept., 1887, p. 514, and Nov. 1887, p. 104. The President's proclamation is in Sparks, xii. p. 125, and Washington's letters and other papers are in *Ibid.* x. 439. There is an account of *The Proceedings of the executive respecting the insurgents* (Philad., 1795). The Congressional views are in *Benton's Debates*, i. 551.¹

U. S., 1789-1870. Cf. H. C. Adams's *Taxation in the U. S. 1789-1816*, in Johns-Hopkins University Studies, 2d series.

In *Poole's Index* (under Tariff, Free-Trade, Protection) there is an abundance of reference, from which a few compact historical statements can be gleaned; as in the history of the tariff, 1789-1861, in *Hunt's Merchants' Mag.*, xlv. 561, xlv. 502; the U. S. Tariff before 1812, by A. S. Bolles, in the *Penn Monthly*, xii. 739. Cf. also F. W. Taussig's *Topics and references on Tariff legislation in the U. S.* (Cambridge, 1888), and W. E. Foster's *Reference Lists*.

In Lalor's *Cyclopadia* (iii. 856) there is a compact history of the U. S. tariff by Worthington C. Ford; a paper on "Protection," and in its favor (*Ibid.* iii. 440), by David H. Mason, referring to his principal sources; and another paper by David A. Wells on "Free-Trade" (*Ibid.* ii. 289), and in its favor, and in accordance with the prevailing spirit of Lalor's work.

There is another summarized history of the tariff in W. G. Sumner's *Life of Andrew Jackson*; and, as a free-trader, the same author has written *Lectures on the History of Protection in the United States* (N. Y., 1877). A. W. Young's *Hist. of the American Protective System* (N. Y., 1866) gives summaries of Congressional debates. There are chapters on protection in Bolles's *Financial History*, and others on free trade in Perry's *Political Economy*. The latest survey is in F. W. Taussig's *Tariff Hist. of the United States* (N. Y., 1888). The controversy over protection did not much engage public discussion till after 1819.

¹ Cf., for documents, Poore's *Descriptive Catal.*, index, p. 1305. A report on the trials of the insurgents is in Wharton's *State Trials*, p. 102. Hamilton's relation to the revolt as the author of the Excise Law, which was resisted, is to be studied in his *Works* (Lodge's ed., vols. v. and vi.), and particularly in his *Report on the execution of the excise laws in Penna.* Cf. Ford's *Bibliotheca Hamiltoniana*; J. C. Hamilton's *Life of Hamilton*, 1879 ed., vol. v.; Morse's *Hamilton*, ii. ch. 4. The party views of the Federalists are in *Porcupine's Works*, vol. i.; and a contemporary view of the salutary effect of the exercise of the Federal power in suppressing the revolt is in *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1887, p. 373.

The Republican view is in Randall's *Jefferson*, ii. 241; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 452; and of the violent sort in J. T. Callender's *Sketches of the Hist. of America* (Philad., 1798). Gallatin countenanced the movement till it went beyond control, and his *Speech in the Assembly of Penna.* (Philad., 1795) has an appendix of documents. Cf. lives of Gallatin by Adams and by Stevens. His "Memoir" on the insurrection is in Townsend Ward's "Insurrection of 1794" in the *Penna. Hist. Soc. Memoirs*, vi. (Cf. *Penna. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, i. 349; and *Penna. Mag. of Hist.*, v. 440.) There are personal relations in the *Autobiog. of Charles Biddle*, p. 262; and in G. M. Dallas's *Life and Writings of A. J. Dallas* (Philad., pp. 33 and App.).

There are journals of the military expedition against the insurgents in the *Hist. Register* (Harrisburg, 1883, pp. 64, 134); and (Capt. David Ford's of the N. Jersey forces) in the *N. J. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, viii.

There were some early and later historical accounts: William Findley's *Hist. of the Insur. in the four western counties of Penna.* (Philad., 1796); Henry M. Breckenridge's *Hist. of the Western Insurrection* (Pittsburgh, 1859); Hugh H. Breckinridge's *Incidents of the Insurrection* (Philad., 1795); one by J. Carnahan in the *N. J. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, vol. vi.; the "Nation's first rebellion" in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Oct., 1884; and in the general histories, Hildreth, iv. 373, 499; Gay, iv. 118; Schouler, i. 275; McMaster, ii. 189; Albach's *Western Annals*, 687. Cf. also Egle's *Pennia.*, 371; his *Notes and queries*, Part v.; *Amer. Pioneer*, ii. 206; the excellent statement of its political bearings in Lalor, iii. 1108, with references, and others in *Poole's Index*, pp. 988, 1405.

² *An Essay on the seat of the federal government and the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, over a ten miles district. By a citizen of Philadelphia* (Philad., 1789).

³ Cf., on the various propositions, *Benton's Debates*, i. 145, etc.; Sparks's *Washington*, ix. 549; Towle's *Constitution*, 373; and the Index of Poore's *Descriptive Catal.* On the history of the location of the capital on the Potomac, see J. B. Varnum, Jr., in the *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1847, p. 9; A. R. Spofford's *Founding of Washington City* (Maryland Hist. Soc. Fund publ., no. 17); J. A. Porter's *City of Washington, its origin and administrations* (Johns-Hopkins Univ. Studies, Baltimore, 1885); *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, 1877, p. 583; 1884, p. 46; Jonathan Elliot's *Hist. Sketches of the ten miles square forming the Dist. of Columbia* (Washington, 1830); Towle's *Constitution*, 373; Lalor's *Cyclopadia*, i. 351, 818, with references; Hildreth, iv. 177, 278, 627; Bancroft, final revision, vi. 97; McMaster, i. 555; Schouler, i. 181, 475; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 50-61.

There is a note in Curtis's *Hist. of the Constitution* (i. 226) on the various orders of the Continental Congress, during its career, for the location of the seat of government. There was an early effort made after the organization of the government to have Philadelphia chosen as its permanent abode.² John Adams (*Works*, iii. 412) records a debate on the effort to establish it on the Susquehanna.³

We have a special account of the social life surrounding the administration of Washington

in R. W. Griswold's *Republican Court, or American Society in the days of Washington* (N. Y., 1853, 1867).¹

There is in the *Madison Letters* (i. 554; also see p. 563) the substance of a conversation with Washington relative to his purposed retirement



View of the FEDERAL EDIFICE *in NEW YORK.**


¹ On the ceremonials of Washington's receptions, see Randall's *Jefferson*, iii. App. 12; McMaster, i. 563. For accounts of New York in the beginning of the government (1789-90) we must turn to Griswold, who quotes mainly Wm. A. Duer's *New York as it was during the latter part of the last century* (an address, — N. Y., 1849), and also points out the houses occupied by Washington. For the Cherry Street house, see *N. Y.*

* Reduced from a plate in the *Columbian Mag.*, Aug., 1789, p. 504. Cf. *Massachusetts Mag.* (June, 1789), vol. i. 329, for a folding view of the front; Valentine's *N. Y. City Manual*, 1856, p. 37; 1866, pp. 552, 556; Lossing's *Field-Book of the Rev.*, ii. 864. This was the old City Hall which was repaired and improved by the city of New York for Congress to sit in. Hazard wrote of it in 1788 that he supposed it "the largest and most elegant building on the continent." It stood on the site of the custom-house in Wall Street. It is described in R. W. Griswold's *Republican Court*, 118. Cf. Lamb's *New York City*, ii. 359; Hildreth, iv. 47.

The architect of the altered Federal Hall was the Frenchman Major L'Enfant, who was also the deviser of the original plan of Washington City. He came to America in 1780, and died about 1817.

in 1793; and the letters of Randolph, Jefferson, and Hamilton, urging him to serve for a second term, are in Sparks, x. 509.¹

The authorship of Washington's *Farewell Address* has been the subject of controversy. Madison furnished to him a draft of a contemplated



GOVERNMENT HOUSE, N. Y., 1795.*

City Manual, 1853, p. 304, and Lamb's *N. Y. City*, ii. 330, 362. Cf., for the life of the town, Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 41; McMaster, ii. 236; and Schouler, i. 115.

For the life in and appearance of Philadelphia, see Griswold, Westcott's *Philad.*, and *Hist. Mansions of Philad.*; Watson's *Annals*; Susan Coolidge's *Short Hist. of Philadelphia* (Boston, 1887); Egle's *Pennsylvania*, p. 232; Samuel Breck's *Recollections*, 1771-1862, ed. by H. E. Scudder (Philad., 1877); letter in *Penna. Mag. Hist.*, July, 1886. p. 182; Parton's *Jackson*, i. 197, 214; Schouler, i. 229, 233, 337; McMaster, ii. 280; Higginson's *Larger History*, 312, 323; Edmund Quincy's *Josiah Quincy* (for a glimpse of Washington, p. 50), and the journal of Wm. Maclay in his *Sketches of Debate*. There is a paper by Nath. Burt on the house occupied by Washington, published by the Penna. Hist. Soc. in 1875. Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, iii. 123.

¹ It is needless to particularize all the general works which include Washington's administration, but it may be well to mention Marshall as a contemporary; Sparks (i. ch. 16-19) in a more condensed way, and Irving very fully (vol. v.), in their lives of Washington. The works of J. C. Hamilton (vol. iv.-vi.), Gibbs (vol. i.), and C. F. Adams, Sullivan's *Pub. Men* (pp. 69, 121), Pitkin's *Polit. and Civil Hist.*, Hildreth (vol. iv.), not

* After a sketch in Valentine's *N. Y. City Manual*, 1852, p. 180. Cf. *N. Y. Magazine*, 1795; *Appleton's Journal*, viii. 352; *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, Sept., 1886, p. 222; Lamb's *New York City*, ii. 435.


This building was begun on the site of old Fort George, and its foundations were built of stone from the walls of the old fortress. Before it was finished, in 1791, it had been decided to remove the seat of government from New York, and it was then made the residence of the governors of New York, and here Geo. Clinton and Jay lived, till it was turned into a custom-house in 1799. It was torn down in 1818. Views of New York at the time of its occupancy by Congress, and for the years following during the early part of this century, will be found in Valentine's *New York City Manual* in 1851, p. 270 (taken in 1787); in 1862 (taken in 1790, panoramic from the water); in 1850 (taken by a French officer of the fleet, when driven into port by an English fleet, in 1792); in 1866, p. 553 (taken in 1796); in 1861 (panoramic, in 1798); in 1860 (taken in 1816).

The same publication has various views of localities in the town: in 1856, p. 442 (view of the meadows from the site of the present St. Nicholas Hotel, in 1785); in 1860, p. 480 (view of the park in 1809); in 1835, p. 344 (view of north battery in 1812); in 1856 and 1857 (views in 1812-14); in 1853, p. 90 (Broadway in 1818), etc. There is a view of Trinity Church in the *N. Y. Mag.*, Jan., 1790.

During the same period, there are likewise in the *Manual* the following plans of the city: in 1857 (Hill's plan, 1782-85); in 1857, p. 372 (plan of 1789); in 1851, p. 320 (plan of 1791); in 1853, p. 324 (plan of 1797); in 1856, p. 338 (plan of 1803); in 1849, p. 312 (plan of 1804); in 1853, p. 260 (plan of 1807); in 1852, p. 452 (plan of 1808). Castiglioni's *Travels* (p. 175) has a plan of 1786.

address, to have been used in 1793, had he not consented to fill the Presidential chair for a second term (Sparks's *Washington*, xii. 382, 387). Near the end of his second term he took Hamilton in a large degree, and Jay to a lesser extent, into his counsels, in fashioning the later paper; but in no such manner, it is Sparks's opinion, and seemingly such was the case,¹ as to diminish his own substantial authorship. James A. Hamilton (*Reminiscences*, p. 29, etc.) believed

more in the predominant, if not in the exclusive, share of Hamilton in the address,² and cites the papers which passed between Washington and Hamilton. Jay's belief in Washington's substantial authorship³ is, with other papers, in the *Penna. Hist. Society's Memoirs* (vol. i.), where will be found the letter of Claypole, the printer to whom Washington gave the manuscript used at the press, which was wholly in his own handwriting.⁴



PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN PHILADELPHIA.*

to name others, may, for the Federal side, offset the lives and works of Jefferson, Madison (particularly Rives, vol. iii.), Gallatin, and Monroe, the *History* of Tucker as a Southern view (cf. McMaster, ii. ch. 1, on the condition of the South), and the *Political Parties* of Van Buren, on the side of the Republicans. The incomplete *Constitutional History* of Cocke is a moderate view. A contemporary English view is in George Henderson's *Short View of the Administrations of Washington and Adams* (London, 1802).

¹ Cf. Rives's *Madison*, iii. 579.

² Horace Binney's *Inquiry into the Formation of Washington's Farewell Address* (Philad., 1859) will show how far this was the case. Binney's conclusion is that "the principal party" has "the merit and the responsibility of the fundamental thoughts," and the other "the merit of expounding, defending, and presenting them in the most suitable form" (preface, p. vi.). He gives Washington's original draft; Hamilton's "Points" and original draft; the address as on record, and a copy of the Lenox MS. Binney's book is the essential authority.

³ Cf. Sullivan's *Public Men*, pp. 115, 421.

⁴ This manuscript, bought by James Lenox in 1850 for \$2,300, is now in the Lenox Library in New York. (Cf. Stevens's *James Lenox*, p. 100; Sparks, xii. 396; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 579.) There was an early draft in

* Reduced from a plate in the *Columbian Mag.*, Jan., 1790. The buildings, from left to right, are: 1, back part of Protestant Episcopal Academy, not entirely finished. 2, County Court-House, showing west side on Sixth Street, and the back part extending into State House Square. 3, State House, built 1735; its original lofty steeple has been removed. Cf. view in *Columbian Mag.*, July, 1787, as it appeared in 1778; and the architectural drawing in Henry Wansley's *Journal of an Excursion to the U. S. in 1794* (Salisbury, 1796). 4, Hall of the American Philosophical Society. 5, Library Company of Philadelphia, begun last summer. 6, Carpenter's Hall.

The best map of the suburbs of Philadelphia near this time is that surveyed by John Hills, 1801-1807 (Philad., 1808), showing a ten miles' radius about the city. There are plans of the city by Hills (1796), Vale (about 1802), and in Castiglioni's *Viaggio*, 1790, ii. 29, and in various other places. The roads leading out of Philadelphia to New York and to Washington are given in Moore and Jones's *Travellers' Directory*, 1804.

II. JOHN ADAMS, 1797-1801.—The close of Washington's administration was marked by the struggles of the two parties for the succession.¹ The characters of Adams and Jefferson were in strong contrast, and the two had long been standing menaces to each other's political hopes. (Cf. Hildreth, iv. 293; v. 29.) And when Jefferson became the Vice-President, their relations were soon strained.²

A condensed statement of the force and working of the Alien and Sedition laws³ is in Lalor's *Cyclopadia*, i. 58, with references on their historical and legal bearings. The argument for their constitutionality is given in Judge Iredell's charge, in McRee's *Iredell* (ii. 552). Madison, in a *Report to the Virginia Assembly on the Constitutionality of the Alien and Sedition Laws*, sets forth the Republican view.⁴ Van Buren analyzes them (*Polit. Partics*, 264). Records of trials under the laws are given in Francis Wharton's *State Trials* (pp. 322, 333, 345, 659, 684, 688). Lodge (*Hamilton*, p. 223) points out how the full consent of all who voted for them renders futile the efforts of biographers to shield their heroes.⁵ C. F. Adams (*John Adams*, i. 562) argues that his grandfather was no farther responsible than that he gave his official assent. Patrick Henry was their advocate (Garland's *Randolph*, i. ch. 20).

Cf. Sullivan's *Public Men*, 156; and their effect on the newspapers in Hudson's *Journalism*, 145, 159, and North's *Report on the Census of 1830*, p. 32. The public press was the vehicle of incessant vituperation.⁶ Callender's *American Remembrancer*, which John Adams says (*Works*, x. 117, 118) had a circulation in the Middle and Southern States, was hardly known in New England, and Adams complains that no effort was made by the Federalists to counteract its influence during Washington's administration, nor to answer *The Prospect before us* (Richmond, 1800, 1801). An action was at last set on foot against its author under the sedition law.⁷ These attempts could not silence Callender, and a new part of his *Prospect before us*, more scandalous than ever, was written in Richmond jail. McMaster (ii. ch. 11) gives a good account of these movements. John Wood, an English hireling writer, strung together long patches from Callender's *Prospect* and other writings, and Duane helped him out with clippings from the *Aurora*, and from the scraps in his desk; and so Wood's *History of the Administration of John Adams* (N. Y., 1802) came to be announced as ready for publication. Burr took a glance at the book, and, by buying off the publisher, sought to suppress it as a dangerous weapon for his own

Washington's handwriting, with corrections by himself, making 18½ quarto pages, among the relics of Washington, bought by the N. Y. State Library from Mrs. Lewis W. Washington. I am indebted to Mr. George R. Howell, of that library, for a description of this MS.

The printed editions are very numerous. (Cf., for instance, *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 3259.) Sparks (xii. 214) printed it from the earliest newspaper print, *Claypole's American Daily Advertiser*, Sept. 19, 1796. Lenox printed it privately (N. Y., 1850) from the printer's copy (showing the corrections) used in that first publication of it. It is easily found in such books as Irving's *Washington*, vol. v. (who declines to go into the question of authorship); Lossing's *United States*, 633; Houghton's *Amer. Politics*, 112; Cooper and Fenton, ii. 14; *Washingtoniana*, etc., etc. The effect of the delivery of the address is noted in Morison's *Jeremiah Smith*, p. 109. Cf. references in *Pool's Index*, p. 1387.

William Duane is considered the writer who, under the name of "Jasper Dwight of Vermont," published (Philad., Dec., 1796) *A letter to George Washington, containing strictures on his address*.

¹ Cf. Fisher Ames's letters in his *Works*; and, for modern survey, McMaster, ii. 293.

² Lives of Jefferson by Randall (ii. 8), Parton (ch. 55), and Morse (ch. 12). Cf. *J. Adams*, x. 10, for Rush's endeavors, in 1812, to reconcile Adams and Jefferson. This was accomplished later, and the *Works* of Adams and Jefferson both testify to the frequency of their correspondence in their last years.

³ A synopsis of them is in Cocke's *Const. Hist. U. S.*, i. 175.

⁴ Cf. *Address to the People of Va., on the Alien and Sedition Laws* (Philad., 1797), and *Letter from George Nicholas of Kentucky* (Lexington and Philad., 1799). A minority of the Virginia Assembly issued an address sustaining the laws. For the feeling in the West, see Albach's *Annals of the West*, 747, and Warfield's *Kentucky Resolutions of 1798*.

⁵ The lives of leading Federalists of later years generally contain frank acknowledgments of the blunder committed. Cf. such views as Morse's in his *Jefferson*, p. 193, and *John Adams*, p. 287. Schurz's *Henry Clay* (i. 32) emphasizes their folly. We expect denunciation on the other side, as in Randall's *Jefferson* (ii. ch. 8), and Parton's *Jefferson* (ch. 58). Cf. Gay's *Madison* (p. 240), and Adams's *Gallatin*. Hildreth (v. 215, 225, 297) and Schouler (i. 394) represent the restoration of the judicial balance. Cf. Von Holst, i. 143; *Gay's Pop. Hist.*, iv. 129; *Barry's Mass.*, iii. 347. There is a note elsewhere (*ante*, p. 320) on the Resolutions of 1798 as an effect of these laws.

⁶ Cf. note in Wharton's *State Trials*, 24; and McMaster, ii. 393, 397, 418, 423, 425, 427.

⁷ Hildreth, v. 368, 454. Callender's comments on Fenno and his *Gazette* can be seen in ch. 6 of his *Sedgwick and Co.* (Philad., 1798). One Harry Crosswell charged Jefferson with paying money to Callender, and was indicted therefor for libel. The *Speeches at full length, in the great cause of the people against Crosswell*, were published in N. Y., 1804.

party, and it was accordingly held back long enough to avoid publicity during the election.¹

Adams's independent action in sending an embassy to France completed the downfall of the Federal party.² The President's rupture with Hamilton and Pickering made reconciliation of faction impossible; and Lodge (*Studies*, 159) has some reasonable remarks on this needless and unfortunate alienation.³ The sympathy between Hamilton and Pickering, Wolcott and McHenry, of Adams's cabinet, as Van Buren points out (*Polit. Parties*, 235-241), placed enemies as well as spies in Adams's camp, and this may account in some measure for Adams's omission to consult his cabinet. It was a time when the sense of political honor was running low. Hamilton prepared an arraignment of Adams in a tract professedly private, but there was no sufficient reason for preparation unless it was intended to defeat Adams's chances of reelection; and if such was the intent there was no ground for privacy. One of the few early copies of a *Letter from Alexander Hamilton concerning the public character and conduct of John Adams* fell into the hands of Aaron Burr, who caused large parts of it to be printed in the Republican press.

Hamilton now publicly issued it.⁴ Adams prepared a reply the next year, but it was not published till he made it the essential part of a series of sixty-three letters (April 10, 1809, to February 10, 1810) in the *Boston Patriot*, which collectively (in ten parts) appeared as *The Correspondence of the late President Adams* (Boston, 1809).⁵

The bitter feelings which induced and followed the discharge of Pickering from the cabinet were revived at a much later day. Two years after his retirement, Adams was led, easily no doubt, into pouring out his grievances and hates in a correspondence with a kinsman, William Cunningham, which was continued from 1803 to 1812. In these letters he wrote with irrepresible animosity his own account of his troubled career as President. "No human being but myself can do me justice," he says. In 1823, when J. Q. Adams was a candidate for the Presidency, these letters were given by a son of Cunningham to Adams's opponents, and published as an aid to their political designs, in the *Correspondence between John Adams and the late Wm. Cunningham* (Boston, 1823). It gave occasion to Pickering to print a *Review of the Cor-*

¹ When it was actually ready, a large part of the first issues was burnt up; but some copies escaped, which are occasionally found with the publisher's name cut out. A title-page was then printed without publisher's name, and in this shape it was actually published in June, 1802 (Tompkins's *Bibl. Jeffersoniana*, p. 169). It was reprinted as *The suppressed history of the administration of John Adams. Republished with notes and appendix by J. H. Sherburne* (Philad., 1846). This appendix is made up from the Adams-Cunningham correspondence and Pickering's rejoinder. James Cheatham published *A narrative of the suppression by Col. Burr, &c., with strictures on the conduct of John Adams, by a Citizen of N. Y.* (N. Y., 1802, two eds.). This contained some extracts from the suppressed history; and Cheatham further published, under the name of "Warren," *An Antidote to John Wood's poison* (N. Y., 1802). Wood himself replied in *A correct statement of the various sources from which the History was compiled and the motives for its suppression by Col. Burr* (N. Y., 1802, — two eds.), and in a *Full exposition of the [De Witt] Clintonian Faction and the Society of the Columbian Illuminati, with an acc. of the writer of the narrative and the Characters of his Certificate men; as also remarks on Warren's pamphlet* (Newark, 1802). Cf. *Brinley Catal.*, iii. 4794, 4796, 4948, 4949. All of these books are illustrative rather than credible sources of history.

² Lodge's *Cabot*, ch. 8; Hildreth, v. 353, 417; McMaster, ii. 417. Morse emphasizes Adams's self-sacrifice in disrupting the party and preventing war (*Hamilton*, ii. ch. 6; *John Adams*, ch. 11 and 12. Cf. Garland's *Randolph*, i.).

³ As early as the first election, in 1788, Hamilton was accused of intrigue in Connecticut to cause Adams's vote to fall far enough below Washington's to prevent the appearance of an equality of confidence (*John Adams's Works*, i. 446; x. 124). He had again reluctantly supported Adams against Jefferson in 1796, and he would have used Washington as an opposing candidate to prevent Adams securing a second term. Cf. Washington's views in two letters to Governor Trumbull, July 21, Aug. 30, 1799, in Fisher's *Benj. Silliman*, ii. 380, etc. Cf. his letter to Patrick Henry, cited in Hildreth, v. 306.

⁴ N. Y., 1800, in three eds.; Duane reprinted it in Philad. Ford (*Bibl. Hamil.*, nos. 69-73) gives the replies by James Cheatham, Noah Webster, Uzal Ogden, not to mention other contestants. There is an *Appendix to Aristides' [Webster's] Vindication of the Vice-President, proving that Hamilton exerted all his influence to support Jefferson in opposition to Burr* (Virginia, 1804). Cf. *John Adams's Works*, i. 582; x. 123; McMaster, ii. 504; *Hamilton's Works*, vi. 450-452. Josiah Quincy (*John Quincy Adams*, p. 23) says that the younger Adams considered Hamilton's letter on *The Public Conduct*, etc., a full vindication of his father's administration, though written to injure him.

⁵ *Brinley Catal.*, iii. 4752. Cf. *John Adams's Works*, vol. ix. p. 239, for a reprint of only a portion of the book. This publication (1809) was naturally the occasion of a new edition of Hamilton's tract (Boston, 1809), with a preface, which, while it condemns the original publication as impolitic, justifies the new issue as an answer to the attack on Hamilton's memory embodied in the *Patriot* articles. Cf. Stanwood's *Presidential Elections*.

respondence (Salem, 1824), in which swords were crossed with the old bitterness.¹

III. THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1801 - 1809. — When a tie in the Electoral College between



Lat. Capitol 38. 53. N.
Long. 0. 0.

¹ Jefferson's letter (June 29, 1824) to Van Buren on this philippic is in the App. of Van Buren's *Polit. Parties*. Pickering's letter to C. C. Pinckney, May 25, 1800, describing the opening of the quarrel, is in H. Adams's *N. E. Federalism*. Cf. further in this quarrel, John Adams's *Works*, x. index; *Life of Pickering*, iii. ch. 12; iv. p. 338; Hildreth, v. 413; Gibbs's *Adm. of Washington, etc.*; Lodge's *Cabot*. The only meeting of Adams and Pickering afterwards is described in Ed. Quincy's *Josiah Quincy*, 265.

For general references on the administration of John Adams, we may refer in the first place to the biographies and writings of the leading actors, premising that in those of Adams (*Works*, i. ch. 10, etc.) we must remember what his hostilities were; and in those of Hamilton with the life by J. C. Hamilton, and in the work of Gibbs based on Wolcott's Papers, there is as much control of judgment to be exercised as in the other case. The *Life of Pickering* is softened by the less imperious tempers of his biographers. Beside his *Patriot and Cunningham letters*, we have Adams's private feelings in his *Correspondence with Mrs. Warren* (p. 470, etc.). Morse can be trusted in his *John Adams* (ch. 11), and so can Lodge in his *Hamilton* (ch. 9). Randall needs scrutiny in his *Jefferson*, ii. 332.

The historians are not excessive in their views: Hildreth, vol. v.; Gay, iv. 127; Schouler, i. 341, 393, 492;

NOTE TO ABOVE CUT. — From the *Universal Asylum and Columbian Magazine*, March, 1792 (Philad.). The city was laid out by Peter Charles L'Enfant, who published his Plan "projected in pursuance of an Act of Congress, passed 16th July, 1790, establishing the permanent seat on the bank of the Potomac." A facsimile reproduction, by W. F. Boogher, of this original plan, was published in Washington in 1882. Cf. the plans in *N. Y. Magazine*, June, 1792; on the map of Maryland (53×30 inches), published by Vallance in Philad., 1795; in Weld's *Travels* (London, 1799), i. 65; in Winterbotham's *United States*, 1795, vol. iii.; in S. S. Moore and T. W. Jones's *Traveller's Directory* (2d ed., Philad., 1804); Cassell's *United States*, ii. 523. A view of Washington in 1800 is engraved in Higginson's *Larger History*, 351, and one drawn by Parkyns and engraved by Heath was published in London in 1804. Another in 1830 is given in Gay, iv. 238. McMaster (ii. 483) gives a long account of the appearance of the city in 1800, when it was first occupied by Congress. Cf. Hildreth, v. 392; Gibbs's *Administrations, etc.*, ii. 377; Sparks's *Gouverneur Morris*, iii. 129; *Harper's Mag.*, xl. 186, and B. P. Poore in *The Century*, April, 1883, and in his *Reminiscences*.

Jefferson and Burr threw the election into the House, with its Federalist majority, Morse (*Jefferson*, 205) says it is "one of the strangest tales which history has to tell, that Hamilton was a chief influence in making Jefferson President,—the result was achieved, not by apostate votes, but by the more agreeable process of abstention."¹

The inauguration was the first to take place in the new capital on the Potomac,² and the President made a change from the former custom, by sending in a message instead of delivering a speech. The document was at once scrutinized by Hamilton.³

H. C. Lodge (*Studies*, 166) says, "With the exception of the Alien and Sedition Laws, which

Cocke's *Const. Hist.*, ch. 4. Von Holst (i. 133) scans the party relations of Hamilton and Adams. Gouverneur Morris (Sparks's *Life of M.*, i. ch. 25) and Jackson (Parton, i. 217) were in the Senate; and Marshall led the administration side in the House (cf. Magruder) till he succeeded Pickering as Secretary of State. The story of Marshall signing commissions of Federal officers up to midnight of March 3, 1801, with Levi Lincoln standing by and holding Jefferson's watch to put a stop to the process on the tick, is affirmed by Parton and denied by Magruder.

The Harvard boys in 1798 sent an address to Adams in praise of his dignified firmness (Channing's *W. E. Channing*, Cent. ed., p. 35).

The "Essex Junto," so called, was a set of Massachusetts Federalists, who attacked Adams on his French mission, and stood later for extreme views. Cf. Lodge's *Cabot*, 17; Hildreth, v. 376; Schouler, i. 469; Sullivan's *Public Men*, no. 23; R. S. Rantoul in *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, xix. 226.

¹ Hildreth (v. 403) and Parton (*Burr*, i. ch. 15) show how Burr was kept below Jefferson in the count. The interest in this first disputed election is shown in Lalor, *Cyclop.*, i. 807; Hildreth, v. 355, 389, 402, 407; Schouler, i. 473, 481; McMaster, ii. 522; J. C. Hamilton's *Hamilton* (1879 ed. vii. 430); Morse's *Hamilton*, ii. ch. 7; Jefferson's *Works*, iv. 354; ix. 210; Garland's *Randolph*, i. ch. 26; Whitelock's *Jay*, ch. 22; Von Holst, i. 168, 170, etc.

Cf. P. Linn's *Serious Considerations on the Election of a President* (N. Y., 1800), and De Witt Clinton's *Vindication of Thomas Jefferson against the charges* [of the preceding pamphlet] (N. Y., 1800). This attack on Jefferson was mainly on religious grounds. Manasseh Cutler (*Life*, etc., ii. 56) says that Mrs. Washington, in Jan., 1802, entertaining some Federalists at Mount Vernon, referred to Jefferson as the "most detestable of mankind."

Some remarks in Jefferson's *Anas*, reflecting on James A. Bayard, were answered in R. H. and J. A. Bayard's *Documents relating to the Presidential Election of 1801* (Philad., 1831), and in *Remarks in the Senate by J. A. Bayard* (Washington, 1855).

² The later historians (Schouler, ii. p. 1, with references, p. 4) and McMaster (ii. 533) give more picturesque accounts of the ceremonies than the earlier writers. They disagree as to the truth of the story about Jefferson's hitching his horse to a tree in a plebeian way before going into the building.

³ The *Examination of the President's Message, Dec. 7, 1801, revised and corrected by the author* [Lucius Crassus] (N. Y., 1802). It was originally published in the *N. Y. Evening Post*. The message is annexed to the pamphlet ed.; and is in the usual reference books, like the *Statesman's Manual*; Jefferson's *Inaugural speeches and messages* (Boston, 1809). Cf. Tompkins's *Bibl. Jeffersoniana*, p. 87, for editions of the address.

For general references on this administration one may note that a considerable part of Hildreth's fifth volume and Schouler's second are given to this period. McMaster's second volume carries one only well into the period. Tucker (vol. ii.) gives the distinctively Republican view, and Bradford (p. 119), and Sullivan's *Public Men*, pp. 201, 313, the Federalist. There is a popular narrative in Gay (iv. 144, etc.). The lives by Randall (ii. 630), Parton (ch. 61, 62), and Morse (ch. 13); those of Gallatin, the Secretary of the Treasury; of Madison, the Secretary of State, give the administration view. Gideon Granger, the Postmaster-General, under the name of "Algernon Sidney" published at Hartford, in 1803, a *Vindication of the measures of the present administration*, and in 1809, an *Address to the People of New England*. John Randolph becomes prominent as the recusant leader of a Republican faction, and we need the lives of him by Garland and Adams, and the picture of him in Wirt's *British Spy* (1803). Schouler (ii. 112) describes this break in the Republican ranks, and characterizes the Federal leaders (ii. 185, 189, etc.). Josiah Quincy had a great repugnance to Jefferson, and became the leader of the small band of Federalists (*Life of Quincy*, 87, 115). Josiah Quincy (*Life*, by Edmund Quincy, p. 118) said in 1807: "Smith was the only stenographer in the house, and we were wholly at his mercy. In general, however, he was fair, and often submitted his reports of speeches of members of the minority to them for correction." Cf. *Life of Manasseh Cutler*, ii. 63. Clay (Schurz, i. ch. 4), and Judge Story (*Life of Joseph Story*, 151) were in Congress, and so was Manasseh Cutler (*Life by W. P. and J. P. Cutler* (Cincin., 1888)). On Jefferson's use of executive patronage, see J. M. Merriam in *Amer. Hist. Assoc. Papers*, ii. 47.

Cf. Cocke's *Const. Hist.* (ch. 5, 6); Fowler's *Sectional Controversy* (ch. 5); Houghton's *Amer. Politics* (ch. 7); Gillet's *Democracy*, 15; *Statesman's Manual*, i. 150; Lalor, iii. 994; Von Holst (i. ch. 4); and C. De Witt's *Étude historique sur la démocratie américaine* (Paris, 3d ed., 1861—reprinted with additions from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1857-60). Schouler, ii. ch. 7, gives an account of the social condition of

expired by limitation, there was no act of the Federalists that the Democrats either dared or could undo." They, however, impeached Judge Chase for his method in the conduct of trials under those acts, and his acquittal was held by the Federalists as a great point gained,¹ but the hasty and partisan repeal of the Act to increase the Federal judiciary was a counter-blow.²

It is probably not possible to give a wholly satisfactory explanation of the so-called conspiracy of Burr. The story is told most fully and graphically by Parton (ii. ch. 22-26, with appendices), and by Davis, but not with much more elucidation of its mysteries than Burr himself would have given. The *Autobiography of Charles Biddle* (p. 313) details Burr's talk of his expedition beforehand, as does Lyon's deposition in Parton, ii. 33. Burr's preliminary visit to the West in 1805 is examined in Hildreth (v. 595).³ Burr was entertained by Jackson at his home, which led to accusations of Jackson's being in league with Burr (Parton's *Jackson*, i. 309-329). Burr now met Wilkinson (Hildreth, v. 607; Parton's *Burr*, ii. ch. 21), who tells the story in his *Memoirs*, ii. ch. 8, 9⁴; but Wilkinson's book, as well as its writer, has a loose scattering way, and is unsafe as an unsupported authority.⁵

The doctor, Erich Bollman, whom Wilkinson subsequently arrested at New Orleans for complicity in the plot,⁶ taken to Washington, made a statement of what he knew, under promise of immunity for his admissions, and this communication is in the *Madison Letters*, ii. 393. Daniel Clark, with whom Wilkinson and Burr conferred at New Orleans, published what he called *Proofs of the Corruption of Gen. James Wilkinson, and of his connection with Aaron Burr, with a full Refutation of his Slanderous Allegations in Relation to the Character of the Principal Witness against him* (Philad., 1809), but it must be taken with caution.⁷ Late in 1805, Burr enticed Blennerhassett into the scheme, and the fullest details of his subsequent connection can be found in Wm. H. Safford's *Life of Harman Blennerhassett* (Chillicothe, 1850; Cincinnati, 1853, — Thompson, *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 1009), and in *The Blennerhassett Papers embodying the Private Journals of Herman Blennerhassett, and the hitherto unpublished correspondence of Burr, Alston, Dayton, Emmett, Theodosia Burr, Mrs. Blennerhassett, and others; developing the purposes of the Wilkinson and Burr Revolution, with a memoir of Blennerhassett* (Cincinnati, 1864), which were collected by Safford.⁸

the country. Cutler (*Life*, ii. 71) gives us a glimpse of a presidential dinner. On Washington life at this time, see Dr. Mitchell's letters in *Harper's Mag.*, 1879.

On the return of Thomas Paine, and his intimacy with Jefferson, see McMaster, ii. 595; *Life of William Plumer*, 242; T. C. Richman's *Life of Paine* (London, 1819), and Paine's own *Letter to the Citizens of the U. S.* (N. Y., 1802).

For contemporary repositories see *The Amer. State Papers; authentic documents relative to the history, politics, and statistics of the U. S., 1805-1807* (Boston, 1808); and *The American Register, a general repository of History, Politics, and Science for 1806-7, vol. i.* [ed. by Charles Brockden Brown], Philad., 1807, which includes American and foreign state papers and intelligence. Vol. vii. (1810) is the last in the Harvard College set.

¹ Cf. contemporary views in Sullivan's *Public Men*, 227; and the *Life of Wm. Plumer*, p. 320, and later ones in Schouler, ii. 76; Adams's *Randolph*, ch. 5 and 6; Morse's *Jefferson*, 260; Lalor, ii. 482. Sumner traces the sequel in his *Jackson*, ch. 8. Burr presided at the trial in the Senate (Davis, Parton). The removal of Judge Pickering, in a similar way, was regarded as mainly a political movement. Cf. *Memoirs of J. Q. Adams*, i. 283; *Life of Manasseh Cutler*, ii. 166; A. P. Peabody in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1883, p. 332, taking exception to statements in Randall's *Jefferson*, and in Morse's *Jefferson*, in which last book an App. is given in later copies, correcting errors into which Randall had probably led its author.

² Cf. Sparks's *Gouv. Morris*, iii. 365, 378, for his speeches in opposition to the repeal; McMaster, ii. 609.

³ Cf. Monette's *Hist. of the Discovery, etc., of the Valley of the Mississippi*; and Albach's *Annals of the West*, 799, 807, 815.

⁴ He published this second volume earlier than the rest of the book, as *Burr's Conspiracy exposed and Gen. Wilkinson vindicated against the slanders of his enemies* (Washington, 1811, — Brinley, iii. no. 5081; J. J. Cooke, no. 2729). On Jan. 20, 1808, Jefferson sent a *Message* to Congress "touching the official conduct of Gen. Wilkinson" (Washington, 1808); and reports on his conduct were made in Congress, May 1, 1810, and Feb. 26, 1811.

⁵ Schouler (ii. 121) says that the book "fairly illustrates his own character, and reveals a career open to frequent suspicions and requiring the most elaborate self-justification, — a justification accompanied by the admission of unworthy motives." Shaler (*Kentucky*, 139) says of him, "there is no more enigmatical or pathetic figure in American history." Henry Adams (*Randolph*, 222) speaks of his "playing fast and loose with treason for twenty years."

⁶ Hunt's *Livingston*, 128. Cf. Cable's *Creoles of Louisiana*, ch. 22.

⁷ Clark, also, in Congress, made, Jan. 11, 1808, depositions against Wilkinson, and presented papers in support of his allegations, April 25.

⁸ On Blennerhassett and his island, which Burr made his headquarters, see Hildreth's *Pioneer Settlers*,


Parton (ii. 59) enumerates the principal persons who were induced to embark with Burr, ostensibly in some land purchase. One was Commodore Truxton, and we have his correspondence with Burr and Wilkinson in the appendix of Charles Biddle's *Autobiography*. The *Life of Gen. Wm. Eaton*, by Prentiss (1813; cf. also life by C. C. Felton in Sparks's *Amer. Biog.*), is that of another important witness in the crisis.

Of Burr's premature arrest in Kentucky, by Daveiss, the District Attorney, there is an ac-

count in Collins's *Kentucky* (i. 292), and Clay (Schurz's *Clay*, i. 35) was his counsel.¹

In the beginning of 1807 Jefferson submitted (Jan. 22, 26, Feb. 10) to Congress three several messages conveying intelligence of the progress of events, as he obtained it, with depositions, etc. (Cf. Tompkins's *Bibl. Jeff.*, pp. 99, etc.)

We have the story at length of Burr's final arrest in Pickett's *Alabama*. Of the trials we have minor reports by Seaton Grantland and Wm. Thompson, and two extended short-hand reports by T. Carpenter,² and David Robertson.³



AMERICAN STAGE-COACH.*

p. 491; Lossing's *War of 1812*, 136; J. S. C. Abbott in *Harper's Monthly*, Feb., 1877; W. Wallace in *Amer. Whig Rev.*, ii. 133; A. C. Hall in *Potter's Amer. Monthly*, xvi. 289; *Macmillan's Mag.*, June, 1880; *Lif-pincott's Mag.*, Feb., 1879, and *Poole's Index*, p. 141. A report was made in Congress, April 5, 1842, in favor of paying Margaret Blennerhassett for property destroyed by the troops on the island.

¹ Cf. John Wood's *Full statement of the trial and acquittal of Burr* (Alexandria, 1807).

² *The Trial of Col. Aaron Burr, including the arguments and decisions, and on the motion for an attachment against Gen. Wilkinson* (Washington, 1807-8), in 3 vols.

³ *Reports of the Trials of Col. Aaron Burr for Treason and for a Misdemeanor in preparing the means of a Military Expedition against Mexico, a territory of the King of Spain with whom the United States were at peace. To which is added an Appendix containing the Arguments and Evidence in support*

* This sketch of the coach in use in the early years of this century, is reduced from a drawing made "with the camera lucida by Capt. B. Hall, R. N.," in his *Forty Sketches in No. America*, London, 1829. For the better sort of private vehicles see Washington's coach, figured in Smith's *Hist. and Lit. Curiosities*, 2d series, pl. xix. Christopher Colles's *Survey of the roads of the U. S.* (N. Y., 1789) is a series of copper-plate maps, showing routes from Connecticut to Virginia. The *Brinley Catal.*, iii., no. 4818, shows a set of eighty maps. On the stage-coach travel in early days to reach Washington, see B. Perley Poore's "Reminiscences of Washington City" in the *Atlantic Monthly*, xlv. 53. There is a view of the Waterloo Inn, the first stage from Baltimore to Washington, in Fitzgerald de Roos's *Travels in the U. S.* (London, 1827). Upon early methods of travel see McMaster's *History*, ii. 560; E. Everett in *Old and New*, vii. 47; R. S. Rantoul in *Essex Institute (Mass.) Hist. Collections*; and George L. Vose's *Notes on Early Transportation in Mass.*, reprinted from the *Journal of the Asso. of Engineering Societies*, Dec., 1884. Benjamin Hall, the pioneer of the eastern lines of stages running from Boston (1796) is said to have invented the trunk rack, by which the baggage was made to ballast the coach.

William Wirt was the counsel for the government.¹ Jefferson wrote frequent letters of advice respecting the conduct of the case,² and conviction and acquittal became the party cries of the Republicans and Federalists.³ Luther Martin, by the vigor of his defence, acquired from Jefferson the name of the "Federal Bull-dog." Marshall presided at the trial (Magruder, ch. 11). Washington Irving was in attendance, and we have his observations in his letters (*Life of Irving*, i. 191, etc.).

The writings on the embargo controversy, though the measure was an outcome of diplomatic complications, will be enumerated here. Francis Blake's *Examination of the Constitutionality of the Embargo Laws* [in U. S. District Court at Salem, Mass., with the opinion of the Court] (Worcester, 1808), gives a case "in which for

the first and only time," says the preface, "the constitutionality of the laws became a subject of judicial decision." Mr. Blake's argument was for the government, and the decision was an affirmative one.

Daniel Webster's *Considerations on the Embargo Laws* (Boston, 1808) set forth the grounds of a belief in their unconstitutionality.⁴

The opposition to the embargo was naturally most urgent in New England, and the fear of an attempt at secession was renewed (*Life of Wm. Plumer*, p. 369). The largest ship-owner of his day, however, Wm. Gray, a Boston merchant, sustained the measure (*Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 209). The speeches in the Mass. legislature and the uprising throughout New England, from the distress which it occasioned, finally frightened Congress into a partial repeal of the law.⁵

and defence of the Motion to commit A. Burr, H. Blennerhassett, and J. Smith, to be sent for trial to the State of Kentucky, for Treason or Misdemeanor alleged to be committed there. Taken in shorthand by David Robertson. 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1808.)

There is also a *Trial of Aaron Burr for High Treason, in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia, Summer Term, 1807: to which is added an account of the subsequent proceedings against Burr, Blennerhassett, and Smith, in the same Court, with notes on the Law of Treason as applicable to the existing Rebellion. Prefaced by a brief Historical Sketch of Burr's Western Expedition in 1806. By J. J. Coombs (Washington, 1867).*

J. Q. Adams made a report to the Senate on the complicity of John Smith, December 31, 1807, and his deposition in defence is dated June 13, 1808 (*Pub. Docs.*). Cf. *Trials of Cols. Lewis Kerr and James Workman for setting on foot an expedition against Mexico* (New Orleans, 1807).

¹ Kennedy's *Wirt*, ch. 13, 14; and Wirt's *Two principal arguments on the trial of A. Burr* (Richmond, 1808).

² *Works*, v.; Morse's *Jefferson*, 281; Randall's *Jefferson*.

³ Cf. *An examination of the various charges against Aaron Burr and a development of the characters and views of his political opponents, by Aristides* [Wm. P. Van Ness] (Philad., 1803; revised ed., 1804; Virginia, 1804), in Burr's defence. *A reply to Aristides, by James Cheetham* (N. Y., 1804).

Cf. Sullivan's *Public Men*, p. 245; John T. Danver's defence of Burr and attack on Jefferson in his *Picture of a Republican Magistrate of the new school* (N. Y., 1808), and J. H. Daveiss's *View of the President's Conduct, concerning the Conspiracy of 1806* (Frankfort, 1807), for Federalist views.

For later views see Hildreth, v. 669; *Life of Pickering*, iv. 111; Randolph's *Jefferson*, iii. 175; Parton, ii. ch. 26; Schouler, ii. 118; Claiborne's *Mississippi*, i. ch. 24; *Poole's Index*, p. 179. The Rt. Rev. C. F. Robertson's "Attempts made to separate the West from the American Union" (St. Louis, 1885), and his papers in the *Mag. Western Hist.*, March and April, 1885 (i. 381, 467).

⁴ Cf. Curtis's *Webster*, i. 94-96.

⁵ Cf. *Life of Joseph Story*, i. ch. 6; Benton's *Debates*, iii. 692; iv. 64; Lodge's *Cabot*, 366; Von Holst, i. 272; Hildreth, vi. 93; Barry's *Mass.*, with references, 352; Schouler, ii. 193. For commercial distress see Gould's *Portland*, 423, and the New England local histories generally.

Josiah Quincy as the leading New England Federalist in the House at Washington made his speeches (Ed. Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy*, 127, 139, 183). Of the two Massachusetts senators, John Quincy Adams broke from his party on the question and sustained the administration (Hildreth, vi. 79, *Memoirs of J. Q. A.*; Morse's *J. Q. A.*, 39, 52; *Life of Quincy*, 123). The governor of Massachusetts was a Republican (T. C. Amory's *Life of James Sullivan*). Timothy Pickering, the other senator, wrote to him a letter in Feb., 1808, asking him to lay it before the legislature. The governor returned it to the writer (T. C. Amory in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Oct., 1877), but Pickering had sent a duplicate to Geo. Cabot, who printed it as *A Letter, exhibiting to his constituents a view of the imminent danger of an unnecessary and ruinous war* (Boston, 1808). It was also printed at Northampton, 1808, preceded by a *Federal Address to the people of the U. S.* Pickering also published a *Speech in the Senate, Nov. 30, 1808 (Life of Pickering, iv. ch. 4)*, and referred to his letter to the governor in his *Review of the Correspondence of Adams and Cunningham* (Salem, 1824), p. 49. Sullivan addressed a letter to Pickering, March 18, 1808, and received a reply, April 22, which constitute the *Interesting Correspondence between Gov. Sullivan and Col. Pickering, in which the latter vindicates himself against the charges by the Governor and others* (Boston, 1808, in two eds.).


The controversy is further illustrated in John Quincy Adams's *Letter* [March 31, 1808] to H. G. Otis, with

We have the Federalist view in Wm. Sullivan's *Public Men*, no. li., and in W. C. Bryant's earliest poem, *The Embargo*, which was written at thirteen (Boston, 1808; corrected ed. 1809), and reflects, says Duyckinck, "the prevalent New England Anti-Jeffersonian Federalism."

We must look to Jefferson's *Writings* (correspondence in vol. v.) for the leading views of the advocates of the embargo. The sentiments of Congress are in Benton's *Debates* (vol. iii.). Much of the documentary material, with the proceedings of the several States, is in Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 24, 25.¹

IV. JAMES MADISON, 1809-1817.—Most of the interest of Madison's administrations² comes under the head of diplomacy and war, and is treated elsewhere.

The aspects of the war of 1812, as connected with party movements, need only be touched upon here. Madison's messages and the reports of committees (see Poore's *Descriptive Catal.* under these years, and the index) will help us,—such are his messages of Nov. 6, 1811, with



JAMES MADISON.*

remarks upon Pickering's letter to the Governor (Boston, 1808, two eds.; Portland, 1808; Salem, 1808). Cf. Wm. Coleman's *Remarks and Criticisms on the Hon. J. Q. Adams's letter to the Hon. H. G. Otis* (Boston, 1808).

T. C. Amory (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Oct., 1877, p. 322) says that he was wholly denied assistance from the family of Cabot, and was but partly successful in his application to the family of Pickering, in writing his *Life of James Sullivan*. Some of these withheld papers have appeared in Lodge's *Cabot*.

¹ Later historical treatment is in Hildreth, vi. 37, 71, 87, 93, 99, 111, 121, 129; Schouler, ii. 106, 138, 159, 175; Von Holst, i. ch. 6; Gay's *U. S.*, iv. 178; lives of Jefferson, by Randall (iii. 243), Parton (ch. 66), and Morse (300); Gay's *Madison*, ch. 17; Garland's (i. ch. 33) and Adams's (p. 227) *Randolph*; Lalor's *Cyclop.*, ii. 79.

² There is no more extended life of Madison, for his presidential career, than Gay's (ch. 18); but we can depend on his *Letters, etc.* Cf. Benton on his death (*Debates*, i. ch. 147). We have the story of course in the general histories like Hildreth, vi.; Schouler, ii. 279; Tucker; Gay; Cocke's *Const. Hist.*, ch. 7; Von Holst, i. ch. 6; Fowler's *Sectional Controv.*, ch. 6; Houghton's *Amer. Politics*, ch. 8; Stanwood's *Pres. Elections*, p. 51; Van Buren, ch. 5, 6; and in leading biographies like those of his cabinet officers, Monroe (Gilman, ch. 5), Gallatin, A. J. Dallas, and William Pinkney. H. Adams (Gallatin, 462) says the weight of the administrative labor fell on Gallatin and Monroe. The Vice-President during the second term was Gerry (Austin's *Gerry*). There is in Madison's *Letters, etc.* (ii. 495) a paper on the President's rupture with his first Secretary of State, Robert Smith; and Smith issued an *Address to the people of the U. S.* Crawford, his last Secretary of the Treasury, is depicted in Schouler, iii. 17, with other leading members of Congress like Randolph, who ill concealed his enmity to Madison (Garland, i. ch. 35, etc., and Adams), Quincy, Clay, Calhoun (Von Holst's C., ch. 2), etc. Jefferson watched events from Monticello (Randall, iii.; *Writings*, vi.).

The current view of the administration can be followed in the files of the *National Intelligencer*; and of the opposition in the *N. Y. Evening Post* (cf. Hudson's *Journalism*). The *State Papers* and Benton's *De-*

* After an engraving in the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1839, made by Wilmer, from a print by D. Edwin, following a portrait by Stuart. The picture belongs to Mr. Edward Coles of Philadelphia. Other Stuarts are owned by T. Jefferson Coolidge of Boston (engraved in Higginson's *Larger History*, p. 363), A. A. Low, of Brooklyn, and by Bowdoin College. The last has been reproduced in photogravure in a book on their art treasures published by the college. Stuart's likeness is also engraved by Balch in the *Statesman's Manual*; and another is in Irving's *Washington*, vol. v. There is a picture in Independence Hall. Engravings are numerous,—one by H. B. Hall & Sons in the *Letters of Madison*, published by the United States. A profile medallion head by Ceracchi (1792) is engraved by S. A. Schoff, in Rives's *Madison*, vol. i.



MRS. MADISON.*

documents; of June 1, 1812,¹ — but they as a rule are concerned with measures of diplomacy. His *Letters* (vol. ii.) give more political illustration. After his signing of the declaration of war, June 18, 1812, the Federal members published a protest in the shape of an address to their constituents.²

Henry Clay, Speaker of the House, soon became the leader of the war party and brought Congress to a belief in the necessity of fighting.³ Randolph did what he could to keep New England in line (Garland, ii. 51), but the opposition in that part of the country was not easily appeased. William Pinkney wrote as "Publius" to sustain the war (Wheaton, p. 116; and Pinkney's *Pinkney*, 63). J. T. Austin had remonstrated against the expected action of Massachusetts in *Resistance to the laws of the U. S. considered in four letters to H. G. Otis* (Boston, 1811). Gov. Plumer of New Hampshire, who had been a disunionist, now urged in an *Address* (Concord, 1814) the clergy to abate their opposition. A good deal of the pamphleteering on the side opposed to the war fell to John Lowell, who published

bates are the official records. *Niles's Register* began Sept., 1811, and henceforward becomes important. *The National Register*, published weekly, no. 1, March 2, 1816, included State papers and connected intelligence, domestic and foreign.

¹ This message reviewed the history of the difficulties with England, and the committee to whom it was referred, in reporting in favor of the war, summarized the grievances, such as impressment of American seamen, the Orders in Council, the paper blockade, etc. Before the war closed, Dallas prepared "An Exposition of the Causes and Character of the War," as an official vindication of the government, but the news of peace caused the suppression of it, after copies had been printed at Baltimore and Philadelphia in 1815 (Madison's *Letters*, ii. 600, — letter accompanying a copy sent to Jefferson). It is reprinted in the *Life and Writings of A. J. Dallas*, App. 5, and is helpfully provided with references. The federal presentation is given in Sullivan's *Public Men*, 321, and in John Lowell's *Appeal to the people on the Causes and Consequences of a War with Great Britain* (Boston, 1811), with an examination of the grounds of complaint as to the impressment of seamen, and the Orders in Council. The history of impressments is given in Carey's *Olive Branch* (ch. 32-38), with documents, 1789-1818. Edward Stanwood reviews the subject in "An old time grievance" in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov., 1885. A Canadian view of the causes of the war is given by J. Stevenson in the *Quebec Lit. and Hist. Soc. Trans.*, 1879-80.

A Mr. McCornish of Edinburgh visited the United States and published a *View of the state of parties in the U. S., being an attempt to account for the present ascendancy of the Anti-English or Democratic party* (Edinburgh, 2d ed., with additions, etc., 1812).

On the political aspects of the war in general, see Garland's *Randolph*, i. ch. 36; Joseph Gales in *Hist. Mag.*, 1873-75, etc.; Cocke's *Const. Hist.*, ch. 8; Lalor, iii. 1089; Von Holst, i. 233. There are numerous titles in the *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 3151.


Cf. N. M. Butler on *The Effect of the War upon the Consolidation of the Union*, in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, 1887.

² *Address to their Constituents on the subject of the war*, signed by George Sullivan, Josiah Quincy, and others. Printed in 1812, at Portsmouth, Raleigh, etc.

³ Edward Quincy's *Life of Quincy*, 227, 237, 255, 272, 280, 297; Colton's *Clay*, i. ch. 9; Schurz's *Clay*, i. ch. 5; Hildreth, v., 199, 265. Clay and Quincy were pitted against each other in debate.

* After the engraving by Prud'homme, as drawn by J. Herring after the picture by J. Wood, — in the *Nat. Portrait Gallery*. There are engravings of Stuart's portrait of Mrs. Madison, by D. Edwin and by J. Rogers. It is reproduced in R. W. Griswold's *Republican Court*. It shows her at an earlier age.

some vigorous tracts.¹ Daniel Webster, now in his early prime, was fighting beside his Federalist friends, and delivering speeches, which were eagerly read in New England.²



HENRY CLAY.*

¹ *Mr. Madison's War. A Dispassionate Inquiry into the reasons alleged by Mr. Madison for declaring an Offensive and Ruinous War against Great Britain* (Boston, 1812).

He had earlier published: *Peace without dishonor — War without Hope; being a calm and dispassionate enquiry into the question of the Chesapeake and the Necessity and Expediency of War*. By a Yankee Farmer (Boston, 1807).

² Curtis's *Webster*, i. 101, 117; Lodge's *Webster*, 49. His *Private Correspondence* begins at this time.


In a *Speech*, Jan. 14, 1814 (Portsmouth, 1814), he urged upon Congress that commerce compelled the formation of the Constitution, and continued restrictions on commerce would destroy it.

For the New England opposition, see Carey's *Olive Branch* (1818 ed.), ch. 42, etc.; Sullivan's *Public Men*, 334, 336; *Hist. Mag.*, 2d series, i. 18, 114, 143; Ingersoll's *War Dept.*, 51; *St. Pap. Mil. Aff.*, i. 319, 604; Ingersoll's *War of 1812*, i. 59; Lodge's *Studies*, 247. S. G. Goodrich's *Recoll. of a lifetime*, i. no. 27, exhibits the feelings of opposition; and (p. 503) he describes the jubilation over the peace.

* After a likeness in the rooms of the Long Island Historical Society. Engravings of Clay are very numerous; by Longacre, after a painting by W. J. Hubbard in the *National Portrait Gallery*; after a drawing by Davignon in Higginson's *Larger History*, p. 391; a daguerreotype by Brady is reproduced in Bartlett and Woodward's *United States* (vol. ii.); one by Root is engraved by Sealey; another is engraved by T. Johnson, in the *Century*, July, 1885, accompanying a sharp and short characterization by George Bancroft, — these three last pictures being taken, of course, in his later years. On some earlier pictures see *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Feb., 1884, p. 31.

V. JAMES MONROE, 1817-1825. — Monroe's messages to Congress are in such collections as the *Statesman's Manual*, and Dr. Jameson gives an abstract of them in an appendix to Gilman's *James Monroe in his relation to the public service during half a century* (Boston, 1883), — one of the "American Statesmen Series," and the only

life of importance. Gilman points out that while the papers of all Monroe's predecessors have been in large part published, the student of Monroe's administrations must depend upon publications in which others are central, unless he is in convenient relations with the manuscript collections in Washington.¹



JAMES MONROE.*

¹ A few leading references to Monroe's administration: Hildreth, vi.; Tucker; Schouler, ii.; Gay, iv. 238; Samuel Perkins's *Hist. Sketches of the U. S., 1815-1830* (N. Y., 1830); Fowler's *Sect. Controversies*, ch. 7; Houghton's *Amer. Politics*, ch. 9; Stanwood's *Presidential Elections*; Joshua Leavitt in *Harper's Mag.*, xxix. 461. S. G. Goodrich (*Recollections*, ii. 401) gives a picture of Monroe at the close of his administration. Curtis's *Buchanan* (i. ch. 2) affords some recollections of Randolph and others at this time. On Randolph's death, see Benton's *Thirty Years*, i. ch. 48; Madison's *Letters*, iv. 188.

In New York the "Albany regency" began their ascendancy (Lalor, i. 45). The Whig party first took shape at this time (Ormsby's *Whig Party*, and Thurlow Weed's *Autobiography and Memoir*). On the application of the phrase "Era of Good Feeling" to his administration, see Schouler, iii. 12. These feelings were helped by two adventitious circumstances a few years apart: the tour of Monroe to the Northern States in 1817, and Lafayette's visit to the country in 1824-25.

Of the President's journey we have record in *A Narrative of a Tour of Observation* (Philad., 1818); and in S. P. Waldo's *Tour of James Monroe* (Hartford, 1818; new ed. with tour of 1818, Hartford, 1819).

Of Lafayette's visit we have a book by his secretary, A. Levasseur, *Lafayette en Amérique en 1824 et 1825* (Paris, 1829), and an anonymous *Voyage du Général Lafayette aux États-Unis d'Amérique* (Paris, 1826), known to be written by C. O. Barbaroux and J. A. Lardier. John Foster, of Portland, Me., issued *A Sketch of the tour of Gen. Lafayette* (Portland, 1824), and there are records of the tour in *Niles's Register*. James Schouler has described the tour in the *Mag. Amer. History*, Sept., 1883 (x. 243).

* From the *National Portrait Gallery* (1839), engraved by A. B. Durand, after a painting by Vanderlyn, which is in the N. Y. City Hall. It is also engraved by H. B. Hall in Irving's *Washington*, vol. v. The Stuart likeness, owned by T. Jefferson Coolidge of Boston, is engraved in Higginson's *Larger History* (p. 385). Likenesses after Stuart are also in the *Statesman's Manual*, engraved by Balch, and in Bartlett and Woodward's *United States*, vol. iii. On a portrait by Morse, see *Charleston Year-Book*, 1883, p. 162.

Apart from the foreign relations considered elsewhere, the main political bearings of Monroe's term were the questions of the tariff,¹ internal improvements,² and the Missouri Compromise.³

In a general way, the lives of Monroe's cabinet officers and political contemporaries will necessarily serve us.⁴



BACK VIEW OF THE CAPITOL.*

There is a compiled account by Mrs. Martha J. Lamb, illustrated with reproductions of pictures from J. Milbert's *Picturesque Sketches in America* (Paris, 1826), in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Dec., 1887. His visit to Boston is made graphic in E. Quincy's *Josiah Quincy* (pp. 401, 423, 435, 448), and in the *Figures of the Past* by the younger Josiah Quincy (p. 101). Cf. Kennedy's *Wirt* (ii. 159, 177); Benton's *Thirty Years* (i. ch. 12); Bonney's *Historical Legacy* (i. ch. 19); Thurlow Weed's *Autobiography* (p. 191).

Something of the life in Washington at this time can be got from Schouler (iii. 211); Nathan Sargent's *Public Men*; letters of Elijah Mills in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* (xix. 14-53), and in George Watterson's *Letters from Washington, 1817-18* (Washington, 1818). The House of Representatives is described in L. G. Tyler's *Letters, etc. of the Tylers* (i. 289).

¹ See also the references as connected with the public finances in C. K. Adams's *Manual of Hist. Lit.*, p. 621; and the lives and speeches of leading Congressional contestants like Randolph, Webster and Clay. The texts of the tariffs of 1816 and 1824 are in the *Annals of Congress*, etc.; and the debates of Congress in Benton's *Debates*, vols. vi. vii.


² Cf. arguments against the constitutional right of Congress to aid internal improvements, in Madison's Report of 1800, and his veto message of 1817, and Monroe's message of May 4, 1820. The arguments in favor are in Clay's speech of March 13, 1818, and Webster's *Works* (index). Cf. Story's *Constitution* (ii. 692); Sumner's *Jackson* (ch. 9); Lalor (i. 711, "Cumberland road," and ii. 568); Von Holst, i. 389-395; *Statesman's Manual*, i. 191, 332, 402, 491, 515; *Niles's Register*, xxvii. 270; xxviii. 255; Benton's *Debates*, vi. 67, 120. There is a map of the Cumberland Road in John Melish's *Geog. Description of the U. S.* (Philad., 1822), p. 113.

³ See *ante*, p. 325.


⁴ The *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams* (vols. iv.-vi.), with the lives by Quincy (ch. 5) and Morse (ch. 2); Von Holst's *Calhoun* (ch. 3); and such accounts as we can find of William H. Crawford. Cf. Jos. B. Cobb's *Leisure Labors* (N. Y., 1858). "Hardly any public man of his time has so completely disappeared from general recollection" (Johnston in Lalor, i. 694). For estimates of Crawford, see Benton's *Thirty Years*, ii. ch. 125; Parton's *Jackson*, ii.; S. F. Miller's *Bench and Bar of Georgia* (Philad., 1858), vol. i. p. 218; and Morse's *J. Q. Adams*, 155.

* After a print in the *Analectic Magazine* (1820). Cf. W. Birch's *Country Seats of the United States* (Springland, Penna., 1808).

VI. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, 1825-1829. — sources, as given for preceding administrations, Without enumerating the ordinary official we turn to the *Memoirs* (vols. vi, vii, viii.)¹ of



PLAN OF THE REPRESENTATIVES HALL, 1820.*




EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL AT WASHINGTON.†

¹ *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, comprising portions of his diary from 1795 to 1848, ed. by C. F. Adams* (Philad., 1874, etc.). The typography of this book is unfortunately such that it is not readily to be distinguished what is the diary and what the editor's comment. The memoir is condensed in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, vol. ii. Cf. *International Review*, Feb., 1881.

* After an engraving in the *Analectic Magazine* (1820), where the occupants of the several seats are designated by a Key.

† Reproduced from the *Reise des Herzogs Bernhard zu Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach durch Nord Amerika, 1825-26, herausgegeben von Heinrich Luden* (Weimar, 1828). Cf. view in *Amer. Mag.*, i. 519, and numerous other engravings.

the President as a chief unofficial source, and to public men of Adams's time illustrate in their lives the political views and conflicts of his administration, — like those of his Secretary of H. Seward, and John T. Morse.¹ The leading



GROUND PLAN OF THE CAPITOL, 1825.*

¹ Seward's was first published in 1849, the next year after Adams's death, as the *Life and Public Services of J. Q. A., with an Eulogy delivered before the legislature of N. Y.* (Auburn, 1849). Josiah Quincy's *Life of J. Q. A.* (Boston, 1858), — a book written with the aid of family papers. (Cf. Parton's opinion, in his *Jackson*, i. p. xix.) Morse's contribution to the Statesmen Series, *John Quincy Adams* (Boston, 1882), has the great advantage of the prior publication of the *Adams Memoirs*, and gives the best picture of the man in a moderate compass. The inquirer must be referred to the entries in the *Catal. of the Boston Athenæum* (i. 15), in *Poole's Index*, pp. 5, 6, and in *Poore's Descriptive Catal.*, for the beginnings of a bibliography of Adams's career; but to select a few entries, see Benton's *Thirty Years* (i. ch. 21; ii. ch. 172); Curtis's *Buchanan*, i. ch. 13; Edw. Everett's *Speeches* (ii. 555); Wm. Everett in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Aug., 1875; Schouler, iii. 399; and for a very depreciatory view Hugh Hastings' "Pricking an historical bubble," in the *Mag. Am. Hist.*, July, 1882.

The choice of Adams for the presidency by the House of Representatives was a marked stage in our constitutional government. Cf. Stanwood's *Presidential Elections*; the *Counting the electoral votes, 1789-1876* (Washington, 1876); Lator, i. 808; Morse's *J. Q. A.*, 149; Parton's *Jackson*, iii. 49; Sumner's *Jackson* (ch. 4); L. G. Tyler's *Tylers*, i. 358; Lodge's *Webster*, 137; and on Clay as the arbiter, Schurz's *Clay* (ch. 10). Clay published an *Address to the Public*, defending himself against charges of bargain in securing the election of Adams; and Colton enlarges on the matter. Cf. also F. P. Blair's *General Jackson and James Buchanan* (Washington, 1856); Curtis's *Buchanan* (i. ch. 3; also p. 506); and the letter of Albert H. Tracy in Thurlow Weed's *Autobiography*, p. 173.


* Reproduced from the *Reise des Herzogs Bernhard zu Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach* (Weimar, 1828). KEY: A, House of Representatives, 96 feet radius; B, Senate Chamber, 75 feet radius; C, Central Rotunda, 96 feet in diameter; D, Library, 92×34 feet; E, Eastern portico; F, Western portico; G, open areas. The eastern front is 350 feet long.

State, Clay, and of the Vice-President, Calhoun, and of the Attorney General, Wirt.¹ The same biographical memorials will help us picture the life at the capital.²

VII. ANDREW JACKSON, 1829-1837.— The two most recent lives of Jackson give each a

bibliography, that of Parton being much more full than that in Sumner.³

Much of the biographical material for Jackson's career as a soldier is noted elsewhere; but the comprehensive accounts of his life may find special treatment here,⁴ as well as those surveys of his administrations in the more general



WILLIAM HARRIS CRAWFORD.*

¹ Cf. Schurz, i. ch. 11; Von Holst, ch. 4; Kennedy. What an erratic opponent could do is seen in Adams's *Randolph*, 284, and in Garland (ii. ch. 29). The lurking antipathy of Jackson, who was not satisfied with the way in which Clay had worsted him, is shown by Parton (ch. 19) and Sumner (ch. 5). Cf. also Curtis's *Webster* (i. 237); Sullivan's *Pub. Men*, 145; Ormsby's *Whig Party*; Von Holst's *History* (ii. ch. 10, 11); Schouler (iii. 336); Gay (iv. 280); Houghton's *Amer. Politics* (ch. 10); Fowler's *Sectional Controversy* (ch. 8). In passing from Monroe, we unfortunately get beyond the range of Hildreth. For the influence of New York upon national politics at this time, see Roberts's *New York* (ii. ch. 33). The Anti-Masonic movement was dividing the Democrats (Lalor, i. 101; Hammond's *Polit. Hist. of N. Y.*; Schurz's *Clay*, i. 340; W. H. Seward's *Autobiog.*, pp. 69, 147, 231; Curtis's *Webster*, i. 391; Sumner's *Jackson*, 250; Hammond's *Polit. Parties*, ii. 369; Thurlow Weed's *Autobiography*, ch. 20-28). The literature of this episode of Freemasonry is considerable. Cf. H. Gassett, *Catal. of [adverse] books on the masonic institution* (Boston, 1852); titles in *Boston Athenæum Catal.*, p. 1075; and references in *Poole's Index*, under "Antimasonry" (p. 46), and "Freemasonry" (p. 487).

² Cf. also Quincy's *Figures of the Past*, 254; Ben. Perley Poore's *Reminiscences of Washington* in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Jan., 1880.

³ Cf. titles in Sabin, ix. pp. 172-177. Beside *Niles's Register* for the period, there is much documentary evidence in the *Annual Register*, 1825-33, and, of course, in Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*, not to name other general sources. For his messages, beside these sources, we have them grouped in *Messages of General Jackson* (Concord, N. H., 1837). Current and later comment is recorded in *Poole's Index*, p. 674.

⁴ The earliest of these accounts of any moment is the *Life of Andrew Jackson, commenced by John Reid; completed by John H. Eaton* (Philad., 1817), which passed through several editions, and was enlarged with a

* From the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1839, vol. iv., after a painting by J. W. Jarvis. Cf. Gay's *United States*, iv. 277.

works,¹ and illustrations of it in the lives of his political supporters and opponents.² The course of party contests began with the struggle in the election between Jackson and

narrative of the Seminole War in 1828. An anonymous *Memoir* (Boston, 1828) is based upon it. William Cobbett filched mainly from Eaton his *Life of Andrew Jackson* (N. Y., 1834). The beginning of a *Life of Andrew Jackson, private, military, and civil* (N. Y., 1843), was made by Amos Kendall, who brought it down nearly to the end of the Creek War, and not much to the satisfaction of Jackson. The papers which Jackson had entrusted to him were then put into the hands of Francis P. Blair, who did nothing with them; and they passed out of sight till they were discovered in the garret of the Globe building in Washington in 1882 (G. F. Hoar in *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, Oct., 1882, p. 130. The legal representatives of Jackson have entered a suit for their recovery). The correspondence of Jackson and Maj. Wm. B. Lewis, 1814-1845 (213 letters), was sold in N. Y., June 3, 1884. Extracts from some of his letters addressed to a ward, and illustrating his private character, are edited by Charles Gayarré in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1885, p. 161. One of the accounts produced after Jackson's death is John S. Jenkins's *Life and public services of Andrew Jackson; including the most important of his state papers. With the eulogy, at Washington city, June 21, 1845, by George Bancroft* (Buffalo, 1851). Cf. G. Bancroft's *Lit. and Hist. Miscellanies* (1855), p. 444. The most extensive narrative is James Parton's *Life of Andrew Jackson* (Boston, 1859), in three volumes. It is very readable and not over-partial; but, like most of Parton's biographies, not wholly in good taste. Von Holst in his *History* (vol. ii.) writes of the "Reign of Andrew Jackson," and Alexander Johnston (Lalor, ii. 626) points to Von Holst as a corrective of Parton, though he says that Von Holst allows the dictates of expediency to Jackson's opponents as a guide, and does not allow them to Jackson himself. Von Holst began his studies in American history in a separate examination of Jackson's administration, which is reviewed by Henry Adams in the *No. Amer. Rev.* (cxx. 179). The latest biography is Wm. G. Sumner's contribution to the "Statesmen Series," his *Andrew Jackson as a public man, what he was, what chances he had, and what he did with them* (Boston, 1882). It is conveniently arranged for the student's apprehension of the distinct phases of the various commanding questions that elicited the energy of Jackson and the antagonism of his opponents. The lesser campaign lives — not a few — are noted in Parton's list. A few minor characterizations: Jefferson's opinions of Jackson are given in Randall's *Jefferson*. The accuracy of Daniel Webster's reports of Jefferson's conversations at Monticello, respecting Jackson, has been questioned (Parton's *Jackson*, i. 219; Randall, ii. 507). A paper with illustrations by Lossing, in *Harper's Monthly* (x. 145). A recent statement of the "Political influence of Andrew Jackson," by Prof. Anson D. Morse, in the *Polit. Science Quarterly*, June, 1886. "Two years with Old Hickory," by T. H. Clay in the *Atlantic Monthly*, lx. 187. The *Oration* of S. A. Douglas (Washington, 1853) was delivered at the inauguration of Clark Mills's equestrian statue of Jackson in Washington.

¹ Of the comprehensive histories, Tucker, Gay, and Bradford (*Federal Government*) are the only ones which cover Jackson's two terms. Schouler (vol. iii.) has as yet not gone beyond his first term. The more specially political accounts are in the *Statesman's Manual*; Benton's *Thirty Years' View*; Fowler's *Sectional Controversy* (ch. 9); Houghton's *Amer. Politics* (ch. 11); Van Buren's *Polit. Parties*; Ormsby's *Whig Party*; Stanwood's *Presidential Elections*. A mass of tracts, *pro* and *con*, are listed in Parton. The most popular of all the humorous burlesques was the *Letters of Mej. Jack Downing* (N. Y., 1834), by Seba Smith. (Cf. Allibone, 2155.)


² Principal among the accounts of his cabinet officers are: C. H. Hunt's *Life of Edw. Livingston*; Samuel Tyler's *Memoirs of Roger B. Taney* (Balt., 1872). There is little of party politics in the *Writings of Levi Woodbury* (Boston, 1852), in three vols.; but in the third volume is his "Life and character of Jackson." W. T. Young's *Life and Public Services of Lewis Cass* (Detroit, 1852), — a book which, in Parton's phrase, "tells nothing more voluminously than usual."

Of the so-called "Kitchen Cabinet" (see Parton, iii. 278; Lalor, ii. 677), we have the *Life of Amos Kendall* by Stickney, and Kendall himself gives some anecdotes of Jackson in the *Democratic Rev.*, xi. 272. Of Duff Green we get glimpses in Hudson's *Journalism*, 236, 249. The little *Biography of Isaac Hill of New Hampshire, with selections from his speeches and miscellaneous writings* (Concord, N. H., 1835). Of James A. Hamilton, one of Jackson's advisers, and at one time acting Secretary of State, we have his *Reminiscences* (N. Y., 1869).

Upon the disruption of Jackson's cabinet, we have Eaton's version in a *Candid appeal to the Amer. Public* (Washington, 1831). How it appeared to the opponents of the administration is effectively told in an *Address to the people of Maryland* by Joseph Kent and others (Balt., 1832).

The characteristics of Congress at this time can be discovered in Benton's *Thirty Years* (vol. i., beginning with ch. 40, — with which compare Kennedy's *Wirt*, ii. ch. 14); the *Memoirs* (vols. viii., ix.) of J. Q. Adams, during his remarkable career in the House, and Morse's *J. Q. A.* (ch. 3); *Memoir of Hugh Lawson White, with selections from his speeches and correspondence*, ed. by Nancy N. Scott (Philad., 1856); the lives of Clay by Colton and Schurz (particularly for a sharp characterization of Jackson, i. 320); G. T. Curtis's *Webster* (i. 337, etc.); his *James Buchanan* (i. ch. 6); S. G. Brown's *Rufus Choate*; etc. The relations of Randolph to Jackson are described in Garland (ii. ch. 38). S. G. Goodrich (*Recollections*, ii. 406) describes the Senate at

Adams.¹ The confusion of party lines became perplexing. G. T. Curtis in his *Life of James Buchanan*, who at this time entered Congress, makes a survey of the state of parties (vol. i.



JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.*

this time. There is an occasional homely touch of ways in Congress and in Washington in W. C. Richards's *Memoir of George N. Briggs* (Boston, 1866).

A Jacksonian of independent judgment, and editor of the *N. Y. Evening Post*, is figured to us in *A Collection of the political writings of Wm. Leggett, with a preface by Theo. Sedgwick, Jr.* (N. Y., 1840). The *Recollections of the life of John Binns* (Philad., 1854) is anti-Jacksonian in temper.

The speeches of some members of Congress at this time, like Everett's, are not included in their published writings, and we must search for them in the records of the debates.

Of the political life of Washington city we have, apart from the lives of Congressmen, a few books, written on such opposite grounds that they offset one another. Robert Mayo's *Political Sketches of eight years in Washington, 1820-1837* (Balt., 1839), is called by Parton "the tirade of a disappointed office-seeker," to be mated with his *Fragments of Jacksonism* (Washington, 1840). James Gordon Bennett was the Washington correspondent of the *Courier and Inquirer* during Jackson's term, and the *Memoirs of J. G. Bennett and his Times* (N. Y., 1855) throw some light.

Parton refers to the *New York Courier and Inquirer* of 1831 as containing all the documents of the Mrs. Eaton scandal. A sufficient outline is given by Parton. L. A. Gobright's *Recollections of men and things at Washington* (Philad., 1869) begins with Jackson's inauguration; but it is scant on this early period. Story wrote some letters home from the capital, which are given in W. W. Story's *Life of Joseph Story*. There are some observations of a foreigner in Harriet Martineau's *Society in America* (Lond. and N. Y., 1837) and *Retrospect of Western Travel* (N. Y., 1838). A few transient observations are in the *Journal of Frances Anne Butler* (Philad., 1835), and in Michel Chevalier's *Lettres sur l'Amérique du nord* (Paris, 1836; ed. spéciale, 1837).

For Jackson's presidential tours, see Parton (iii. 485); and on his appearance in Boston, see Quincy's *Figures of the Past*, 352.

¹ Cf. Parton, iii. 137; a letter of Calhoun in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xix. 280; and the spectacle of the silk-stocking Democrats under Theodore Lyman and others in Boston (*Ibid.* xix. 281).

* From the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1839, vol. iv., following a portrait by A. B. Durand; also in *The Statesman's Manual*. An engraving by H. W. Smith, after the painting by Durand, is in Quincy's *John Quincy Adams*. One by G. P. A. Healy, in the Corcoran Gallery, is engraved in T. W. Higginson's *Larger History*, p. 409. A bust by Powers is represented in the *Memoirs of J. Q. A.*, vol. iii., and a medal in Loubat, no. 54. There are numerous other engravings.

231).¹ The suppression of nullification is considered elsewhere (*ante*, p. 322); but the war conducted by Jackson against the bank needs to be examined here.² Jackson sounded the first alarm in his *Message* of Dec. 8, 1829. The history of the succeeding banks from the beginning of the government can be followed readily in Sumner's *Jackson* (ch. 12, 13, 14), and there is a good summary in Curtis's *Webster* (vol. i.); the documentary proofs are reached through Poore's

Descriptive Catal., the current views through *Poole's Index*, the opposing parties of Congress in Benton's *Debates*, and in his *Thirty Years' View*, epitomized in Roosevelt's *Benton* (ch. 5). The rupture in the cabinet owing to the refusal of Duane to remove the deposits is explained by himself in his *Narrative and Correspondence concerning the removal of the deposits, and occurrences connected therewith* (Philadelphia, 1838).³



VAN BUREN.*

¹ There was the rise of the Whig party as opposed to Jackson's ideas of prerogative (Curtis's *Webster*, i. 499; W. H. Seward's *Autobiography, etc.*, i. 237). The seceders from the Jacksonian Democracy are followed in F. Byrdsall's *Hist. of the Locofoco or equal rights party* (N. Y., 1842). Cf. Sumner's *Jackson*, 369; Lalor, ii. 781; and i. 476 for the later Democrats.

The spoils system took shape at this time. The speech of Holmes of Maine calling on the President for his reasons for removals from office (Washington, 1830) gives a list of removals from Washington to J. Q. Adams. Cf. on the revolution it now brought about, Lalor (iii. 783); Benton's *Thirty Years* (i. ch. 50); Roosevelt's *Benton* (ch. 4); Curtis's *James Buchanan* (i. ch. 12); Dorman B. Eaton's *Spoils System and Civil Service Reform*.


² See, however, *ante*, p. 329, for general references on the history of finance in the U. S.

³ This tract is scarce, as he printed only 250 copies to give to friends. Cf. specially on the removal of the deposits, Benton's *Thirty Years* (i. ch. 92, etc.); the note in Von Holst (ii. 59); Sumner's *Jackson*, p. 297; Colton's *Clay* (ii. ch. 3, 4); Schurz's *Clay* (ii. ch. 15). The speeches are almost without number, as in the collected works of Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Tristram Burges, Peleg Sprague, and of course in Benton's *Debates*. Parton (*Jackson*, i. p. xxii, etc.) notes a good deal of the transient publications, and calls *The War on the Bank of the U. S.* (Philad., 1834) one of the strongest statements against the administration. Buchanan

* From the *Nat. Portrait Gallery*, where it is engraved by Wellmore after a painting by Holman. The engraving in the *Statesman's Manual* is from a daguerreotype. He is represented in the seventy-fifth year of his age in the engraving by Ritchie from a photograph in Van Buren's *Political Parties* (N. Y., 1867). The portrait by H. Inman, at a table, with the hand on an upright book, is engraved by Wellman. Cf. cuts in Gay, iv. 358, etc.; and the medal in Loubat, no. 57.

VIII. MARTIN VAN BUREN, 1837-1841. — This administration has never been well considered as a whole. Van Buren's own political affiliations can easily be made out from his own *Political Parties*, though it does not touch his administration as such.¹ There are no lives of

Van Buren of value, — perhaps W. L. Mackenzie's *Life and Times of M. Van Buren* (Boston, 1846) is as good as any.² We shall find his messages and the Congressional documents in the usual places.³ The lives of his cabinet officers and other public men help us.⁴ The general



GENERAL HARRISON.*

defended Jackson's policy throughout (Curtis's *Buchanan*, i. 409). Webster represents the opposers (Curtis's *Webster*, i. ch. 20), and a pamphlet by Albert Gallatin was circulated in the interests of the bank, *Considerations on the Currency and Banking System of the United States* (Philad., 1831).

Cf. Van Buren's *Polit. Parties*, 314, 412; L. G. Tyler's *Tylers*, i. ch. 15; J. A. Hamilton's *Reminiscences*; Parton's *Jackson*, iii. 255, 493; Tyler's *Taney*; William M. Gouge's *Short History of Paper Money and Banking in the U. S.* (N. Y., 1835); Royal's *Andrew Jackson and the Bank of the U. S.* (N. Y., 1880). Jackson's protest against the censure of the Senate is in *Niles's Register* (xlv. 138), and some of the speeches in the long debate on receiving it (pp. 213, 249), but others can be found in the *Debates* of Benton, who pressed for several sessions his motion to expunge the censure from the records. (Cf. Benton's *Thirty Years*; Poore; Curtis's *Webster*, i. 545; his *Buchanan*, i. 293, — not to name other references.)

¹ For his connection with New York politics see Roberts's *New York* (ii. ch. 33).

² Parton (*Jackson*, i. p. xx. — where will be found other titles) calls it "a formidable mass of letters and gossip," and "a revolting view of interior politics."

³ *Congressional Globe*; *Niles's Reg.*, v.; Benton's *Debates*, v.; *Statesman's Manual*, ii. 1157, etc. Cf. also Poore's *Descrip. Catal.*, — not to name other places.

⁴ Hunt's *Edward Livingston* (ch. 16, — his Sec. of State). Stickney's *Amos Kendall* (his Postmaster-general); Sargent's *Public Men*; The *Memoirs* of John Quincy Adams (vol. x.); Benton's *Thirty Years* (vol. ii.), and *Life* (ch. 9) by Roosevelt; Curtis's *Buchanan* (i. ch. 15); Jenkins's *Silas Wright*; James A. Hamilton's *Reminiscences*; Curtis's *Webster* (i. 565); Schurz's *Clay* (ii. ch. 20); Von Holst's *Calhoun* (ch. 7).

* From the *National Portrait Gallery* (1859) after a painting by J. R. Lambdin. A portrait by Hoyt is engraved in the *Statesman's Manual*. A full length, with a cloak, is in Mrs. Bonney's *Gleanings*, i. 437. There is another likeness, engraved by H. B. Hall & Sons, in the *Mag. of Western History*, February, 1885. The campaign of 1840 produced very many engraved likenesses.

histories do not as a rule come down so late, and the most can be got from Von Holst.¹

IX. HARRISON AND TYLER, 1841-1845.—The political campaign of 1840 has kept its reputation as the most hilarious on the part of the Whig victors ever known.² Their confidence and enthusiasm was equal to their electoral preponderance; but far exceeded their majority in the popular vote. There is no commendable life of Harrison.³ The life of Tyler is best

studied in H. A. Wise's *Seven decades of the Union, the humanities and materialism, illustrated by a memoir of John Tyler, with reminiscences of some of his great contemporaries* (Philadelphia, 1872), and in Lyon G. Tyler's *Letters and Times of the Tylers* (Richmond, 1884-85), in two volumes,—the author is the son of the President. The messages and Congressional documents are in the usual repositories.⁴ The accounts of his cabinet officers and other public men are necessary aids.⁵ The general histories



HARRISON'S HOUSE AT NORTH BEND.*

¹ Vol. ii. ch. 3, 4. Cf. Gay (iv.); Tucker (iv.); Hammond's *Polit. Parties*; Ormsby's *Whig Party*; Fowler's *Sectional Controversy* (ch. 10); Lator (iii. 1061); *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1880; Hodgson's *Cradle of the Confed.* (ch. 10); C. T. Congdon's *Reminiscences* (Boston, 1880); Poole's Index, 1361. Some glimpses of Washington life can be got in Gobright, and in N. P. Willis's *Famous Persons and Places* (N. Y., 1854).

The references to the progress of finance (given *ante*, p. 329) will largely avail here. The sub-treasury system was established and the debates of Congress, collectively, or in the speeches of members, record the arguments which prevailed or failed.

The great financial crisis of 1837, as an outcome of Jackson's policy, was an important concomitant of political views. It is very well depicted in Schurz's *Clay* (vol. ii. ch. 19). Cf. also Sumner's *Hist. Amer. Currency*; Von Holst (ii. 173, 194); *Statesman's Manual* (ii. 1157); Benton's *Thirty Years* (ii. 9).

The anti-rent troubles in New York (1839-1846), while not immediately touching national politics, disturbed the relations of national parties in an important State. There is a short bibliography of the subject in Edward P. Cheyney's *Anti-Rent Agitation in N. Y.* (Philad., 1887), being no. 2 of the "Political Economy and Public Law series," published by the Univ. of Penna. Cf. Roberts (ii. ch. 35) and other histories of N. Y.; local histories like Jay Gould's *Delaware County*; Barnard's *Rensselaerswyck*; biographies like Jenkins's *Silas Wright*; D. D. Barnard in the *Amer. Whig Review*, 1840, ii. 577; *New Englander*, iv. 92; A. J. Colvin's *Review of Anti-Rent decisions*; and also J. Fenimore Cooper's *Littlepage Tales*.


² Stanwood's *Presidential Elections*; Ormsby's *Whig Party*; Johnston in Lator, iii. 1101; Gay's *Pop. Hist.*, iv. 357; Von Holst, ii. ch. 5; Schurz's *Clay*, ii. ch. 22; H. Greeley's *Busy Life*; Thurlow Weed's *Autobiog.*, ch. 48; and *Memoir*, p. 80. E. Eggleston's *Roxy* illustrates the days in the West.

³ Perhaps H. Montgomery's *Life of Maj.-Gen. Harrison* (Cleveland, 1852, and later eds.) is the best. There is a foundation for a Harrison bibliography in Peter G. Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, pp. 150-156.

⁴ *Congressional Globe*; Niles's *Reg.*; Benton's *Debates*; *Statesman's Manual*, ii.; Poore's *Desc. Catal.*

⁵ Of Secretaries of State: Curtis's *Webster* (ii. 39); Lodge's *Webster* (ch. 8); the lives of Calhoun; the writings of Hugh S. Legaré; with Coleman's *Life of J. J. Crittenden*, his Attorney-General. Tyler in 1856 made an address on the dead members of his cabinet, which is in L. G. Tyler's *Tylers*, ii. 384. Of public characters: The *Memoirs* of J. Q. Adams (vols. x. xi.); Schurz's *Clay* (ii. ch. 23) and Clay's *Private Cor-*

* Fac-simile of cut in Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 231. There are cuts of the house and tomb in Lossing's *War of 1812*, pp. 573, 574.



respondence; Roosevelt's *Benton* (ch. xi.); Curtis's *Buchanan* (i. ch. 16); *Writings of Levi Woodbury*; J. D. Shields's *Life and Times of Seargent Smith Prentiss* (Philad., 1884); George W. Julian's *Polit. Recollections, 1840-1872* (Chicago, 1884), particularly elucidates the slavery controversy; S. G. Brown's *Life of Rufus Choate* (Boston, 3d ed. improved; cf. Jones's *Index to Legal Periodicals*, p. 83), and Joseph Neilson's *Memoirs of Rufus Choate* (Boston, 1884).

For Washington life see B. P. Poore's papers in *Atlantic Monthly* (vol. xlv. 369, 531) and his collected reminiscences.

* From a picture painted by Daniel Huntington for the Mass. Historical Society. There is another standing figure by the same artist in the House of Representatives at Washington.

and purely political records are somewhat deficient. Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, and Von Holst's *History* are the best.¹

X. JAMES K. POLK, 1845-1849. — There is not yet any judicious history of Polk's administration, — Chase's *Administration of Polk* (1850) being as good as anything;² but the *Statesman's Manual* (vol. iii.) and the usual reference books must suffice for the student who wishes to collate Von Holst's account (vol. iii.), where the references,³ in addition to the lives of prominent public men, will help him.⁴ The questions of the

tariff and internal improvements must be followed in books already referred to (p. 329, *ante*). The Oregon boundary and the annexation of Texas are reserved for consideration in the sections on diplomacy and boundaries; and so are certain phases of the Mexican War, while the chapter on the Wars of the United States will follow its military aspects. The relations of that war as a party question are fully set forth in Von Holst's *History* (iii. ch. 7-12); and Curtis in his *Life of Buchanan* (i. ch. 21) entitles his sketch the "Origin of the War, and the efforts of Polk's administration to prevent it."⁵

¹ Benton (ii. 211-638); Von Holst (ii. 406-509); Lalor, iii. 959; Gay, iv.; Botts's *Hist. of the Rebellion*; Houghton's *Amer. Politics* (ch. 13); Fowler's *Sectional Controversy* (ch. 11). The contemporary periodicals of the opposing parties were: *Democratic Review*; *Amer. Whig Review*; *Brownson's Review*, — a significant part of the latter is easier found in O. A. Brownson's *Writings*.

The question of the tariff (that of 1842 is in the *Amer. Almanac*, 1843, p. 180), as showing the ascendancy of protection, is a leading interest of this administration, but reference is made to a preceding page (*ante*, p. 329). The beginning of the Liberty party forms a part of the slavery movement (*ante*, p. 323) and includes the rising of the question of the annexation of Texas (see ch. on diplomacy).

The Dorr rebellion in Rhode Island, though not of national relations, was an important phase of the general suffrage question. The references are: —

The R. I. charter of Charles II is in *Federal and State Constitutions*, ii. 1595 (cf. this *History*, III., 379). The proposed Constitution of 1842 is in Greene's *Short Hist. of R. I.* (p. 317); and the Constitution adopted is in *Fed. and State Const.* (ii. 1603). Cf. E. R. Potter's *Considerations on the R. I. question* (1842, 1879); Frieze's *Concise Hist. of the efforts to secure an Extension of the Suffrage in R. I.* (1842) — in favor of the movement; D. King's *Life of T. W. Dorr*; Lalor, i. 835; Gay's *U. S.* (iv. 367); L. G. Tyler's *Tylers*, ii. 192; Thurlow Weed's *Autobiog.* (ch. 53); C. T. Congdon's *Reminiscences* (ch. 8); Jameson's *Constitutional Convention* (p. 216); a paper with references by W. L. R. Gifford in *New Princeton Rev.*, Sept., 1887. W. E. Foster, who has guided the editor to some of these references, also refers to Burke's *Report on the interference of the Executive in the affairs of R. I., June 7, 1844* (Washington, 1844); and Webster's argument in the Supreme Court, *Luther vs. Borden*, 1848 (*Webster's Works*, vi. 217). Cf. *Report of the Trial of Thomas Wilson Dorr for Treason against the State of Rhode Island, containing the arguments of counsel and the charge of Chief Justice Durfee. By Joseph S. Pitman* (Boston, 1844). S. S. Rider gives some details about Burke's *Report* (*Book Notes*, Jan. 21, 1888), and has announced his intention of publishing a monograph on *The Dorr War in Rhode Island*, having in his possession large MS. material.

² Cf. J. S. Jenkins's *Life of Polk*, Hudson (1850).

³ Cf. Houghton's *Amer. Politics* (ch. 14); Fowler's *Sectional Controversy* (ch. 12).

⁴ Curtis's *Buchanan* (Sec. of State), vol. i. ch. 19; J. Q. Adams's *Memoirs* (vol. xii., — Adams died Feb. 23, 1848); *Life* of him by Morse; lives and works of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun; the writings of Levi Woodbury, including a eulogy on Polk; Benton's *Thirty Years*, and Roosevelt's *Life of Benton* (ch. 13); Seward's *Autobiog.*, i. 772, and *Works*, edited by G. E. Baker (N. Y., 1853-84); John A. Dix's *Speeches and Addresses* (N. Y., 1864), and Morgan Dix's *Memoirs of J. A. Dix* (N. Y., 1883) in 2 vols. H. G. Wheeler's *History of Congress* (i. 376, 424) is the best record of R. C. Winthrop's career in Congress — Speaker of the House in 1847-48. Horace Greeley (*Busy Life*, 226) considers that at this time Massachusetts had the strongest delegation in the lower house of Congress.

William Henry Milburn (*Ten Years of Preacher Life*, N. Y., 1859) describes the Senate at this time (ch. 13) with a characterization of Calhoun (p. 152), and gives the impression that A. H. Stephens and S. A. Douglas (pp. 126, 131) made at this time. Cf. B. P. Poore in *Atlantic Monthly* (xlvii. 799), and in his *Reminiscences*.

⁵ William Jay's *Review of the Causes and Consequences of the Mexican War* (Boston, 1849 — various eds.) sets forth vigorously the views of the opponents of the war. Cf. other presentations in A. A. Livermore's *War with Mexico reviewed* (Boston, 1850); C. T. Porter's *Review of the Mexican War* (Auburn, 1849); E. D. Mansfield's *Mexican War* (N. Y., 1873); *Southern Quart. Rev.*, xv. 83; and *Am. Whig Rev.* (vols. v.-vii.) Webster disapproved of the war, but stood for maintaining it when begun (Curtis's *Webster*, ii. 291, 301; *Works*, v. 253, 271). The speeches of Charles Sumner and Thomas Corwin are types of the uncompromising opponents. Cf. also speeches of John A. Dix, Rufus Choate, and Robert C. Winthrop. For other personal attitudes see Benton's *Thirty Years* (i. ch. 149, 161-165, 173); Schurz's *Clay*, ii. ch. 25; Von Holst's *Calhoun* (ch. 9) and his *History* (iii. ch. 4); Greeley's *Amer. Conflict* (ch. 14); Lalor's *Cyclopaedia of Political Science* (iii. 1070); *Poole's Index*, 832. Lowell's *Biglow Papers* is the satirical expression of the Abolitionists'

sentiments against the war. Probably the best exposition of the Mexican side of the political controversy can be found in Hubert H. Bancroft's *History of the Pacific States, Mexico, vol. v.* (San Francisco, 1885), chap. 13, whose views are indicated by his opening sentences: "It was a premeditated and predetermined affair, the War of the United States on Mexico; it was the result of a deliberately calculated scheme of robbery on the part of the superior power." Bancroft is very full in his references (especially pp. 344-45) both to American and Mexican official documents; and as to William Jay's *Review*, he holds that, "whatever differences of opinion there may be as to Jay's conclusions, his facts are incontrovertible."

CHAPTER VI.
THE WARS OF THE UNITED STATES.
1789-1850.

BY JAMES RUSSELL SOLEY,
Professor in the United States Navy.

SHORTLY after the close of the Revolutionary War, the army was in great part disbanded, and the navy ceased to exist. According to a return made by General Knox on January 3, 1784, the entire military force of the United States was composed of one regiment of infantry numbering 527 men, and one battalion of artillery numbering 138 men. With unimportant breaks and re-enlistments, and with slight changes in numbers, this regiment and battalion continued in service until the adoption of the constitutional government.¹ The first Congress at its first session, by the act of September 29, 1789, converted this force, with its organization unchanged, into the regular army. At this time the infantry was commanded by General Josiah Harmar, and the artillery by Major Doughty. A small increase of the force was made in the next year, and it was with a detachment of these troops and a body of worthless militia that Harmar made his ineffectual campaign of 1790 against the Miami Indians. In 1791, a new regiment of infantry was created, and Arthur St. Clair was appointed major-general. The second campaign against the Miamis, under the new commander, ended still more disastrously in the defeat of November 4, 1791. In the spring of the following year, the number of troops was increased to 5,000 men, Anthony Wayne was appointed major-general, and a legionary organization was adopted. With this army General Wayne took the field against the Indians, whom he overthrew at the battle of Maumee Rapids, on August 20, 1794.

The War Department was organized under the act of August 7, 1789, with the charge, under the President, of matters relative to the land and naval forces and to Indian affairs. General Knox, who, as commander-in-chief of the artillery during the Revolutionary War, had gained a substantial reputation as a professional soldier, and who had been in charge of military affairs under the Confederation, was appointed the first Secretary

¹ According to a report of the War Office, Aug. 8, 1789 (*Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.*, i. 1), the establishment at that time was as follows:—

Two companies of artillery, one at West

Point and the other at Springfield, 76; troops stationed at the posts northwest of the Ohio, 596; total, 672 men; wanting to complete the establishment, 168; total complement, 840.

of War. Knox's successors, down to the war of 1812, namely, Pickering, McHenry, Dexter, Dearborn, and Eustis, were all men of a certain capacity, and, with the exception of Dexter, who held office for less than a year, had seen active service in the Revolution. Nevertheless, during this period, no complete and well-digested scheme of army organization was adopted. The active service of the little army, which alone could afford a real test of efficiency, and thus reveal the weak points in the system, was for twenty years confined to desultory Indian campaigns. The military calling, as a distinct and exclusive profession or occupation, seems not to have reached any high development, and in consequence the operations of the first important war that engaged the army's attention, that of 1812, were of an amateurish and feeble character. The organization of the general staff was by no means equal to that of the Revolution, when Gates, Reed, and Scammell were adjutant-generals, Steuben was inspector-general, Knox the chief of artillery, and Mifflin, Greene, and Pickering had the quartermaster's department. The strong prejudice against a standing force inherited from the Revolutionary period prevented the enlargement of the army, and interfered somewhat with its development. On the other hand, the plan for raising a militia, adopted in 1792, became fairly adequate when supplemented by the action of the States. The question, however, was not so much one of numbers as of administrative organization, education, and discipline. The country did not need a large standing army, but it needed all the machinery of a military establishment, capable of ready expansion to meet the demands of war. Under the persistent pressure of Hamilton, Congress enacted, in 1792, that the purchase of all supplies for the army should be under the direction of the Treasury Department. This not only had a disastrous effect upon the Indian wars, then in progress, but its mischievous consequences, by delaying and confusing all attempts to perfect the organization of the general staff, were projected far into the future. By the act of March 3, 1799, the enactment was repealed, and authority to make its own purchases was vested in the War Department. The scheme of departmental reorganization then adopted did not have time, however, to take root before the reduction of the army under Jefferson in 1802, when all the reforms that had been accomplished were swept away.

In 1794, a combined corps of engineers and artillery had been established by Congress. Up to this time the artillery, although a distinct body, had been little more than an adjunct of the infantry, to which it furnished artificers and gunners. The new corps was to be devoted to much more important uses ; among others, the supervision of the newly projected and elaborate system of fortifications. This work was to be conducted principally by accomplished foreign engineers, and three of them, Rochefontaine, Tousard (who was rather an artillerist than an engineer), and Rivardi, were appointed to the highest grades in the corps. The plan failed from various causes, but chiefly from the confusion brought about by the union

of two essentially distinct arms of the service, under officers of foreign origin, whose absorbing occupations in works of construction left them no time for other duties. When hostilities with France became imminent in 1798, foreigners came to be looked upon with disfavor, and they were gradually discharged. The reorganization of 1802 did away with the combined corps, and created a new corps of engineers and a separate regiment of artillerists. At the same time, the numerical strength of the army, which had been temporarily increased in expectation of war, was fixed at 3,200 men, and the staff departments were virtually abolished.

During the next ten years, little was done to add to the efficiency of army administration. The military academy had already been established, work on the fortifications continued, and as difficulties with England and France became more threatening, the number of men was increased; but the organization remained palpably defective. The Secretary of War, in addition to his proper duties, was his own commissary-general, quartermaster-general, and ordnance officer. Among the additions to the force in 1808 was a regiment of light artillery, and Secretary Dearborn took energetic measures to organize it, but he retired from office before the completion of the work, and his successor, Dr. Eustis, allowed it to lapse, even going so far as to sell the horses rather than bear the cost of their maintenance. The consequence of this policy was that at the end of three years the field artillery, an indispensable arm of the service, though its personnel was excellent, was wholly inefficient. Attempts were made on the eve of war to remedy the defects of the organization in this and other respects, but they came too late to be of real benefit.

During this period of twenty years, the navy, although starting with the most discouraging prospects, had a much more prosperous development. At first there was not even the nucleus of a maritime force. Beyond the recital in the act of 1789, creating the War Department, of the fact that it was charged with matters relative to the "naval forces, ships, or warlike stores of the United States," no recognition was given to the navy by either the Executive or the legislature.

The first steps towards the creation of a naval force were brought about by the depredations of Algerine cruisers upon the merchant vessels of the United States. Two of these had been seized in 1785, the schooner "Maria" of Boston and the ship "Dauphin" of Philadelphia, which were captured off the coast of Portugal, and carried, with their cargoes and their crews, numbering twenty-one persons, to Algiers. Attempts were made to effect the ransom of the imprisoned Americans, at first through an agent, and later through the Order of the Mathurins, whose ancient and peculiar vocation was the redemption of Christian subjects captured by the infidel powers. The negotiations were protracted through several years, but without success, owing to the exorbitant demands of the Algerines, who insisted on a ransom of \$60,000, or nearly \$3,000 per head.

Matters remained in this shape until September, 1793, when the war between Portugal and Algiers, which had held the corsairs in check, came to an end, and the seizure of American vessels was renewed. In October and November of that year, eleven ships, with crews aggregating 109 men, were captured. In consequence of these events, as set forth in the preamble, an act was passed, March 27, 1794, to provide a naval armament consisting of six frigates, four of 44 and two of 36 guns. The act met with violent opposition from many members of Congress, in some cases ostensibly from motives of economy, in others from traditional prejudice or habitual antipathy to standing forces in general, and to the navy in particular. As a concession to this sentiment, it was provided that work on the frigates should be stopped upon the conclusion of a treaty with Algiers, for the purchase of which a large sum had already been set apart.

The act of 1794 provided only for the crude elements of a naval organization, and in pursuance of it six captains were immediately appointed, — Barry, Nicholson, Talbot, Dale, Truxtun, and Sever, — all of whom had seen Revolutionary service. The work of construction, under the superintendence of the six captains, was distributed among the different seaports : Portsmouth, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Norfolk.

No event in the history of the navy is of greater importance than the construction of these six frigates. By a remarkable piece of good fortune as well as good judgment, the design and direction of the work were placed in the hands of a man of extraordinary capacity, — Joshua Humphreys, a Pennsylvania shipbuilder. In 1793, some time before the frigates were projected, Humphreys had written a letter to Robert Morris, then in the Senate, stating his views about the navy. In it he proposed to build “such frigates as in blowing weather would be an overmatch for double-decked ships, or in light winds may evade coming to action by outsailing them ;” and he added : “If we build our ships of the same size as the Europeans, they having so great a number of them, we shall always be behind them. I would build them of a larger size than theirs, and take the lead of them, which is the only safe method of commencing a navy.”

Upon this general principle the frigates were built, and Humphreys had a leading hand in their design, taking personal charge of the building of one of them at Philadelphia. Although they were not equal to two-deckers, they were much stronger and better than the majority of frigates of their day ; and the advice of Humphreys, adopted thus early, was the foundation of the policy of naval construction adhered to for the next sixty years, namely, to build ships which should be the best of their class afloat. The fleets with which the great maritime powers of that day fought their naval battles were composed wholly of line-of-battle ships, powerful but slow and unwieldy vessels, carrying two or three gun-decks, and mounting from 60 to 120 guns. These the United States made no attempt to rival, the cost of their construction and maintenance being far beyond its resources at the time. By building superior frigates it accomplished all that was

really needed, for they could avoid the enemy's ships-of-the-line, while they were more than a match for his smaller vessels. Herein lay one principal cause of the naval successes of 1812.

Owing to delays in procuring materials, none of the new ships were ready in September, 1795, when a treaty with Algiers was concluded, and, under the law, the work of construction came to a stop. The cost of the treaty, including the redemption of prisoners, presents to the Algerine government, and gratuities or bribes to officials, was stated by the Secretary of the Treasury as \$992,463.25.¹ The total cost of the six frigates, whose completion would have obviated the necessity of purchasing a treaty, was estimated at \$1,142,160.² In addition to the original expense of securing the treaty, an annual payment was agreed upon, to be made to Algiers by the United States, of 12,000 sequins, or \$21,600; and, in accordance with Algerine usage, further payments were exacted, including \$20,000 upon presentation of a consul, \$17,000 in biennial presents to officials, and "incidental and contingent presents," of which, according to the report of the Secretary of State in 1808, "no estimate can be made."³ The convention with Algiers was followed in the next two years by treaties with Tunis and Tripoli, obtained by similar means, though at somewhat cheaper rates, and without stipulations for annual payments. The treaty with Morocco, which had been concluded in 1787, still remained operative.

As a compromise measure, and in spite of vehement opposition, Congress passed an act, April 20, 1796, providing that the President should continue the construction of three of the frigates, and that the perishable materials which had been purchased for the others should be sold. The three that were selected — the "United States" and "Constitution" of 44 guns each, and the "Constellation" of 38 — thus composed the first fleet of the reorganized navy.

Before this time, other questions affecting our foreign relations had arisen, which gave additional reasons for the existence of a naval force. During the wars incident to and following the French Revolution, from 1793 to 1815, the United States was in the position of a feeble and timid neutral between aggressive belligerents. As early as December, 1793, the President called attention to the vexations and spoliations suffered by American commerce. From year to year these outrages continued, and protests were made to the offending governments, based upon complaints filed with evidence at the Department of State, but efforts at redress were for a long time unsuccessful. The treaty with Great Britain concluded November 19, 1794, commonly known as Jay's treaty, disposed of the principal points in dispute with that power, and provided for a commission to pass upon claims of American citizens for loss or damage sustained by reason of the illegal capture or condemnation of their vessels. The other principal offender

¹ *Annals of Congress, 4th Cong., 2d sess., 2239.*

² Letter of the Secretary of War to chairman of House Committee, Jan. 20, 1796.

³ *For. Rel.* iii. 33.

was France, from whose government the United States, by a series of abortive missions, made fruitless endeavors to obtain satisfaction. Meanwhile, the outrages grew more and more frequent. They included aggressions of privateers, indiscriminate seizures of merchantmen by French cruisers, oppressive decisions of admiralty courts, payments of contract obligations in a debased currency, unrecognized and unwarrantable extensions of the list of contraband, delays, ill-treatment of the crews of prizes, and a variety of similar acts, by which American commerce was annoyed and harassed, its operations delayed, and its legitimate profits wasted. Each year a larger list of complaints was transmitted to Congress, and the necessity for action became more apparent.

The growing spirit of French aggression and the pronounced anti-French tendencies of the Adams administration led to the adoption of a definite policy of defence. In 1798, the last effort at negotiation made by the mission of Charles C. Pinckney, Marshall, and Gerry ended in scandal and failure. At the first session of the fifth Congress, held in May and June of the previous year, a few measures of defence had been adopted, among which were appropriations for fortifications, for revenue cutters, and for completing the three original frigates, together with acts authorizing their employment and the detachment of a large body of militia. At the next session, in the winter and spring of 1798, the energetic opposition of the Anti-Federalists, under able leaders, blocked the way to further preparation until the publication, early in April, of the despatches of the American envoys, which had been transmitted by the President in answer to a resolution of the House. The startling revelation, made by the so-called X Y Z correspondence, of the attempt of the French Directory to obtain, both personally and for the state, a pecuniary compensation for repairing the injuries it had deliberately permitted, destroyed the power of the opposition, and before the session was over Congress was fully committed to the policy of armed naval reprisal, if not of actual war.

Measures of defence followed in quick succession. On the 27th of April, an act was passed for the construction or purchase of twelve vessels of 22 guns, to be armed, fitted out, and manned, \$950,000 being appropriated for the purpose. On the 30th, the conduct of naval affairs was vested in a newly created Department of the Navy, of which Benjamin Stoddert was appointed Secretary. On May 4, \$80,000 were appropriated for small vessels for harbor service. On the 28th, an act "more effectually to protect the commerce and coasts" authorized the President to instruct the commanders of ships of war to seize any French armed vessel which had committed depredations, under whatever authority, upon American merchantmen, or which was found hovering on the coast for the purpose, as well as to retake captured Americans. In June, the strength of the revenue-cutter force was increased, and provision was made for the condemnation of prizes, the distribution of prize-money, and the confinement of prisoners; while a further increase was made in the naval force by authorizing the President

to accept, on the credit of the United States, twelve vessels, six of 18 guns or less, and six of 32 or more. Shortly after, a marine corps of 880 men was created, — a force which, from its first establishment, has proved most efficient for its purpose. Finally, on the 16th of July, an appropriation of \$600,000 was made for three frigates, which covered the completion of the "President," "Congress," and "Chesapeake," these being the vessels on which work had been suspended three years before in consequence of the treaty with Algiers. As a result of these measures, the country, which up to this time had been without the shadow of a navy, became possessed, in addition to eight revenue cutters, of twelve frigates of from 32 to 44 guns, twelve vessels of from 20 to 24, and six sloops of 18 or less, — in all, thirty-eight excellent vessels, with a cabinet officer at the head, a full complement of officers and men, and a well-equipped and sufficiently large force of marine infantry. At no other time in the history of the country, except during the Civil War, has the service undergone such rapid and successful development; and this development, which was largely due to Adams's resolute efforts, may fairly entitle him to be considered the father of the reorganized navy.

Already, on the 7th of July, 1798, Congress had declared the treaties with France to be no longer obligatory, and two days later had authorized the President to instruct the naval force to "subdue, seize, and take" any armed French vessel whatever, and to issue commissions or letters of marque to privateers for the same purpose, the vessels so taken being subject to condemnation and forfeiture. On the day following the passage of the act the instructions were issued, and the ships were sent to sea as fast as they could be got ready. The "Ganges," under Captain Richard Dale, a purchased vessel, had sailed immediately upon the receipt of her orders of May 22d. She was followed in June by the "Constellation," under Captain Thomas Truxtun, and the "Delaware," Captain Stephen Decatur. The latter made the first capture of the war, the French privateer "Croyable," a 14-gun schooner. The instructions of July 10th, authorizing all captures of French armed vessels, had not yet been issued, but the prize was taken under the act of May 28th, having been guilty of seizing American coasters. She was received into the service, named the "Retaliation," and assigned to Lieutenant William Bainbridge.

In July, the "United States," the first of the 44-gun frigates, got to sea, under the command of Captain John Barry, the senior officer of the navy. The "Constitution," the second of the 44's, under Captain Nicholson, came next, and was followed by the ships "George Washington" and "Merrimack," the sloops "Baltimore," "Montezuma," "Richmond," and "Herald," the captured schooner "Retaliation," and several of the cutters. All these were cruising actively during the autumn, and in December the whole force was assembled in the West Indies, which offered an excellent station for operations. It was near the base of supplies, it was filled with French armed merchantmen which were not protected by any adequate force, and

it was one of our own principal fields of commercial activity. The fleet was arranged in four squadrons, so disposed as fairly to cover the ground. The largest force, under Barry, with the "United States" and "Constitution" and eight smaller vessels, had its rendezvous at the island of Dominica, and cruised among the Windward Islands as far south as Tobago. The second squadron, under Truxtun, with the "Constellation" as flagship, had its rendezvous at St. Kitt's, and cruised among the Leeward Islands as far to the west as Porto Rico. Four smaller vessels were also under Truxtun's command. A third squadron of three vessels, under Captain Tingey, in the "Ganges," cruised about the channel between Cuba and San Domingo; while the fourth, composed of the "Delaware" and two revenue cutters, was stationed near Havana, to protect American commerce on the coast of Cuba.

In addition to these, a small flying squadron under Captain Murray, composed of the "Montezuma," "Norfolk," and "Retaliation," made a roving cruise, which was not of long duration. Murray fell in with the French frigates "Volontaire" and "Insurgente," and the "Retaliation" being sent to reconnoitre them, her captain, Bainbridge, with characteristic overconfidence, ventured too near, and was captured. The "Insurgente" was a fast vessel, and Bainbridge's consorts, the "Montezuma" and "Norfolk," little 20-gun sloops, which had kept at a distance, were only saved by his assurance in doubling their force in his statement to the French captain.

Three months later, on the 9th of February, 1799, the "Insurgente" fell in with the "Constellation," cruising near Nevis. The French frigate fired a challenge gun, and waited for Truxtun to come up. She was an exceptionally fine ship, and in the number of her guns and of her men was a little superior, but this numerical superiority was of no importance beside the fact that the ordnance of the American ship was nearly double her own in weight.¹ The "Insurgente" was therefore by no means a match for her antagonist in force; and the course of the battle showed that her captain and crew were still less a match for their opponents in skill. By rapid manœuvring, Truxtun repeatedly gained an advantage in position, and raked his enemy effectually. The Frenchmen, pointing their guns too high, only injured the "Constellation's" upper works, while the Americans, aiming at the enemy's hull, covered his decks with killed and wounded. The battle was short and sharp, and the result was decisive. After a spirited fight of an hour the "Insurgente" struck, having seventy casualties in her crew. The "Constellation" had but three men wounded, one of whom afterwards died.² After the battle, the prize, then in charge of Lieutenant John Rodgers, with Midshipman David Porter and eleven men, was separated from the "Constellation" by a gale of wind, before the prisoners, numbering 160 or more, could be transferred. Rodgers, with his feeble

¹ The "Constellation's" main battery was composed of 24's, the "Insurgente's" of 12's.

² Besides the above, one man who flinched at his gun was killed by the third lieutenant.

crew, performed the double task of holding in check the prisoners and navigating the ship. At the end of three days he brought her safely into St. Kitt's, whither the "Constellation" had preceded him.

Several months before this event, in fact as early as the summer of 1798, the French government, influenced by the active preparations for war then going forward in America, had issued certain decrees calculated to remove in part the most serious ground of complaint. In consequence of overtures made through the French and American ministers at the Hague, the Adams administration resolved, towards the close of the year, to reopen negotiations by sending a new mission, composed of Murray, the minister at the Hague, Chief Justice Ellsworth, and Governor Davie of North Carolina. The frigate "United States" was assigned to take out the two envoys, and was thus withdrawn from the West Indies. Captain Barry's place on the Guadalupe station was taken by Truxtun, the "Constellation" being in turn replaced at San Domingo by the "Constitution," under Talbot.

The "United States" sailed with the envoys in November, 1799. The reopening of negotiations did not lead to any change in the naval policy of the administration; on the contrary, forcible measures during this year and the next were pushed more vigorously than before, to strengthen the hands of the American negotiators, as well as to protect American commerce. Two schooners, the "Enterprise" and "Experiment," were built for light service against the picaroons or quasi-pirates of the West Indies, — a service for which they were peculiarly fitted, and which they executed with remarkable success. Other ships, forming the remainder of those projected under the acts of 1798, were added to the squadron, and in spite of frequent absences, due to the short term of enlistment of the crews,¹ the operations of the squadron were actively continued.

On the 2d of February, 1800, the "Constellation" had a protracted and bloody engagement off Guadalupe with the French frigate "Vengeance." After a long chase the "Constellation" overtook her enemy at eight P. M., and the fighting continued for five hours at close quarters. It was Captain Truxtun's impression that the French ship was beaten, but the darkness of the night and the falling of his mainmast prevented him from following up whatever advantage he might already have gained. The "Vengeance" was a heavier ship, with a larger crew, and was in a position, had she been so disposed, to continue the engagement. As she made sail from the "Constellation," the latter is entitled to the credit of a victory, though not a decisive one. The casualties on the American side were fourteen killed and twenty-five wounded, eleven of the latter dying subsequently

¹ Limited by § 10 of the act of July 1, 1797, to one year. The act of April 27, 1798, § 2, provided that the President might extend the term beyond one year if the vessel should then be at sea, and until ten days after the vessel should arrive at some convenient port. This privilege

did not meet the necessities of the case; but it was not until 1809, by the act of Jan. 31, § 2, that the term was extended to two years. By the act of May 15, 1820, the term was further extended to three years, and by that of March 2, 1837, to five years.

from their wounds. The "Vengeance" put in at Curaçoa in distress, a few days later.¹

The only other encounter between ships of war was that of the "Boston," Captain Little, with the corvette "Berceau," Captain Senez, on the 12th of October, which resulted in the capture of the latter. In this battle, as in that of the "Constellation" and "Insurgente," the advantage in force was with the Americans. In addition to the strictly naval prizes, ninety French vessels, carrying altogether more than 700 guns, were captured during the war, and a very large number of American merchant vessels were recaptured. By the close of the year 1800 the purposes of the campaign had been accomplished. The treaty with France had been concluded three months before, and it only awaited ratification. This was completed in the following February, and on March 23, 1801, the "Herald" was dispatched to the West Indies, with orders of recall for the whole squadron.

In the instructions to the American envoys in France they had been directed to secure a claims commission, the abrogation of the former treaties, and the abolition of the guarantee of 1778, as it was called, contained in Article XI. of the Treaty of Alliance of that year, and covering "the present possessions of the Crown of France in America, as well as those which it may acquire by the future treaty of peace." Upon none of these points were the envoys able to carry out their instructions. In reference to claims, a distinction, which was finally embodied in the treaty, was drawn by the French government between two classes of claims: first, debts due from the French government to American citizens for supplies furnished, or prizes whose restoration had been decreed by the courts; and secondly, indemnities for prizes alleged to have been wrongfully condemned. The treaty provided that the first class, known as debts, should be paid, but excluded the second, or indemnity class. In reference to the indemnity claims, and to the questions involved in the old treaties, including, of course, the guarantee of 1778, as the envoys were not able to come to an agreement, the treaty declared that the negotiation was postponed. The Senate of the United States expunged this latter article, inserting in its place a clause providing for the duration of the present convention; and this amendment was accepted by the French government, with the proviso that both governments should renounce the pretensions which were the object of the original article. To this the Senate also agreed, and upon this basis the convention was finally ratified. It thus appears that the United States surrendered the claims of its citizens against France for wrongful seizures, in return for the surrender by France of whatever claim it might have had against the United States for the latter's failure to fulfil the obligations assumed in the earlier treaties. The United States, therefore, having received a consideration for its refusal to prosecute the claims of

¹ For the relative force of the two vessels, see Roosevelt, pp. 460, 461; Goldsborough, p. 168; Emmons, pp. 50, 51.

its citizens, thereby took the place, with respect to the claimants, of the French government, and virtually assumed the obligations of the latter.¹

The convention of 1800 contained a large number of detailed provisions with reference to commerce, blockade, contraband, passports, search, seizure, condemnation of prizes, and privateers. It was intended to be a code for the two countries, defining the rights of belligerents and neutrals. Provision was made for the restoration of public vessels captured on both sides during the quasi-war,² and for other property captured but not yet condemned.

After the settlement of the difficulties with France it was decided to reduce the navy, and on March 3, 1801, the Peace Establishment Act was passed, by which the President was authorized to sell all the vessels except the thirteen largest frigates, namely, the "President," "United States," "Constitution," each of 44 guns; "Congress," "Constellation," "Chesapeake," "Philadelphia," "New York," each of 36 guns; "Essex," of 32 guns; and "Adams," "John Adams," "Boston," and "General Greene," each of 28 guns.

The schooner "Enterprise," which had shown herself a very efficient vessel in the West Indies, was also retained, although not specified in the law. Six of the frigates were to be kept in commission, with two thirds of their full complement, and the others were to be laid up in ordinary.

The Peace Establishment Act also reduced the corps of officers. The material composing this corps, though collected hastily to meet an emergency, was somewhat better than at the outbreak of the Revolution. The highest officers, selected from among the well-known Revolutionary names, had been for twelve years or more in private life, but they retained the traditions of their Revolutionary training, and they created at the beginning in the new navy that professional spirit which the old navy had only been able to acquire after several years of war. The lieutenants came from the merchant service, and the midshipmen directly from home. Among them there were many who, according to Commodore Morris, "had few or none of the higher qualifications proper for their new situations."³ The important

¹ The claims for indemnity thus devolving upon the United States, known as the French Spoliation Claims, have been from that day to this the subject of frequent report and discussion in Congress, but with no result until the passage of the act of Jan. 20, 1885, referring them to the Court of Claims. At the present time (1888) they are undergoing judicial examination before that tribunal.

² The only public vessels captured from the French were the "Insurgente" and "Berceau." The "Insurgente," commanded by Captain Fletcher, left the Chesapeake, under orders of July 14, 1800, for an eight weeks' cruise, and was never afterwards heard of. On the other side, the only vessel captured was the "Retaliation," which had been previously captured from the

French. In reference to the restoration of the "Berceau," see *American St. Pap., For. Rel.*, ii. 428.

³ Morris (*Autobiography, Nav. Inst.*, vol. vi. 117, 119, 120) had a low opinion of the officers of this period. He says: "All our commissioned lieutenants [in the "Congress," 1799] . . . were good seamen, but with one exception had few qualifications as officers." The second detail of lieutenants, "as with their predecessors, were unwilling to give that full and ready obedience to orders which the captain required, and which was due from them." Again: "The navigators who could ascertain the longitude by lunar observations were few in number, and the process of the calculations a mystery beyond ordinary attainments."

question was, how to get rid of the bad officers and to develop the good. The hostilities with France, which kept four cruising squadrons for two years in the West Indies, gave the veterans at the head an opportunity to work the raw material into shape, while the best of the juniors were enabled to show of what they were capable. This made easy the problem of winnowing out, under the Peace Establishment Act, the chaff which had entered the service in 1798. The measure was unnecessarily severe, seeing that it excluded three hundred officers out of a total of five hundred, but its general result was highly beneficial. The officers retained, who formed the nucleus of the modern navy, comprised a large number of able men, most of them young men, who were animated by an intense *esprit de corps* and ambition for their profession, and who discovered later an extraordinary aptitude for it. All that they needed was training in active service, and a field for the exercise of their undeveloped powers. This came to them almost immediately afterwards.

The difficulties with France were no sooner at an end than new difficulties arose with the Barbary powers. About the time of the conclusion of the convention of 1800, the "George Washington," under Captain Bainbridge, proceeded to Algiers with the annual instalment of supplies, in pursuance of the treaty. During her stay at Algiers, the Dey insisted upon her undertaking a voyage to Constantinople, with presents for the Porte, whose vassal he was. Bainbridge thought it prudent to comply with the demand, in view of the unprotected condition of American commerce in the Mediterranean.¹

The "tribute," as it was commonly called, sent annually to Algiers now began to arouse the envy of the neighboring governments of Tunis and Tripoli, which, though not so powerful as Algiers, were equally rapacious. In the spring of 1801, the Bey of Tunis sent a summary request to the President of the United States for forty cannon, stating that he wished them all to be 24-pounders, and in June he demanded of the American consul ten thousand stand of arms, assuring him that peace depended upon compliance.

With Tripoli affairs were even worse. The Pasha could not understand why remittances should be sent to Algiers and nothing to him. In April, 1800, he had told Cathcart, the American consul, to say to the President that he was "pleased with his proffers of friendship," but adding, "Had his protestations been accompanied by a frigate or a brig of war, he would be still more inclined to believe them genuine." In May of the same year he said, "Why do not the United States send me a voluntary present? I am an independent prince as well as the Pasha of Tunis, and I can hurt the commerce of any nation as much as the Tunisians."² In the same month he wrote an insolent letter to the President, in which the following passage occurred: "Our sincere friend, we could wish that these your

¹ For the consular report of this incident, see *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, ii. 353.

² *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, ii. 350.

expressions were followed by deeds, and not by empty words. You will therefore endeavor to satisfy us by a good manner of proceeding. We on our part will correspond with you with equal friendship, as well in words as in deeds. But if only flattering words are meant, without performance, every one will act as he finds convenient. We beg a speedy answer without neglect of time, as a delay on your part cannot but be prejudicial to your interests."¹

As the United States government paid no attention to these demands, the Pasha, on the 14th of May, 1801, cut down the flag-staff of the American consulate in Tripoli, and notified the consul that he declared war. Cathcart thereupon left the city.

This was the state of affairs when the first Mediterranean squadron, composed of the frigates "President," "Philadelphia," and "Essex," and the schooner "Enterprise," all under the command of Commodore Richard Dale, left the United States early

in June, 1801. Dale was a capable officer, but his operations were so restricted by the orders of the government that he could accomplish little or nothing. At the time of his departure it was not known in the United States that war had been declared by Tripoli, but the Department's instructions provided for this contingency by directing Dale to proceed to that port, and so dispose his ships as to prevent the entrance or egress of Tripolitan vessels. At the same time he was instructed that any prisoners he might take should be released and landed at convenient points on the Barbary coast. No authority was given to him to retain either prisoners or prizes.

These instructions were not changed during the course of the summer. According to the constitutional theory of Jefferson's administration, as the power to declare war was vested in Congress, no war measure could be undertaken, certainly no measure of offensive war, until Congress had adopted a declaration, not even though an enemy had issued his manifestoes and made an overt attack. "Unauthorized by the Constitution," said the



RICHARD DALE.*

¹ *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, ii. 352.

* From the *National Portrait Gallery* (1839), following a drawing by Longacre, after a painting by J. Wood. Cf. *Lossing*, 118.

President in his message of December, 1801, "to go beyond the line of defence," the Executive gave its officers instructions to use force to repel an attack, but forbade them to take the offensive, or to make captures of persons or prisoners.

Under such instructions, Dale could do little more than convoy American merchantmen. Two Tripolitan cruisers were found at Gibraltar, and a vessel was stationed off the port to blockade them. The blockade was maintained for two years by one ship or another, the enemy never daring to come out. The "Enterprise," commanded by Lieutenant Sterrett, met and captured a Tripolitan polacca of about her own size, but being forbidden to make her a prize, stripped her and sent her back to Tripoli. In December, the squadron returned home, the time of service of the crews, limited by law to one year, having nearly expired.

At the session of Congress in the following winter, an act was passed, February 6, 1802, which amounted to a declaration of war against Tripoli, and a new squadron, larger than the last, was fitted out under Commodore Richard V. Morris. The vessels composing the new squadron were the frigate "Chesapeake," flagship, the "Constellation," "New York," "Adams," and "John Adams," and the schooner "Enterprise." Ample powers and an efficient force were thus given to the new commander-in-chief, but, being an inert and unready man, he allowed the fifteen months of his command to be trifled away without any results of importance. Towards the end of his term, in June, 1803, one of his captains, John Rodgers, was left for a time in charge of the blockade of Tripoli; and on the 21st of that month, observing preparations in port, he disposed the blockading vessels in such a manner as to cut off any vessels attempting to pass out. Early the next morning the squadron succeeded in destroying the "Meshouda," a large Tripolitan cruiser, in the act of attempting to force the passage. This was the only event of importance during Morris's command. Shortly afterward he was recalled, and upon his return to the United States the President at once called a court of inquiry, and dismissed him from the service. Rodgers was left in command of the squadron.

Early in 1803,¹ Congress authorized the construction of four new vessels, the brigs "Argus" and "Siren," of sixteen guns, and the schooners "Nautilus" and "Vixen," of twelve guns, all well-modelled and well-built vessels, designed for coast and blockade operations. These ships, with the "Constitution" and "Philadelphia" and the schooner "Enterprise," which had remained out, were to constitute a new squadron, under the command of Commodore Edward Preble. Preble was at this time forty-two years old, and had seen active service in the cruisers of Massachusetts during the Revolutionary War. He was a man of remarkable professional ability and high character, austere in his manners, a severe disciplinarian, and liable to violent outbursts of temper; but he was an active and capable organizer, prudent but resolute in his operations, full of resource and ingenuity, and

¹ Act approved Feb. 28, 1803, appropriating \$96,000 dollars for the purpose.

he never shrank from a responsibility when he thought that the circumstances justified him in taking it.

Tripoli, the objective point of Preble's operations, was a town of twenty or thirty thousand inhabitants, protected, especially on the water-front, by massive masonry walls and by several outlying forts of considerable strength. It was garrisoned by a large force of troops, Arabs, Berbers, and Moors, accustomed to war, upon whom the small force, imperfectly armed, which Preble could have landed from his squadron would have made no impression. The position of the harbor and the character of the adjacent coast presented peculiar difficulties of attack. On both sides of the city the coast stretches away in long reaches of sand, in which Tripoli is the only harbor. The basin is formed by a line of rocks and reefs, making a break-water to the north. The narrow northern entrance, made by an opening between the rocks, has only nine feet of water. The main entrance is deeper, but the channel is difficult, and the harbor abounds in shoals and sunken rocks. Around it, at this time, lay a semicircle of batteries, armed with a hundred or more heavy guns, and within it was the Tripolitan navy, composed of a brig and two schooners and a flotilla of twenty-one gunboats. The anchorage outside, in consequence of the incessant northerly gales, was dangerous and difficult.

Preble's squadron, as already stated, consisted of two frigates, two brigs, and three schooners. The 24-pounders carried by these vessels were too light to tell much on solid walls of masonry, and the smaller guns were useless. This force, already too small for the service required of it, was further diminished by the loss of the "Philadelphia," in October, 1803.


When Preble first arrived out he was detained for some time on the coast of Morocco by difficulties with that state. It appears that in the previous summer the governor of Tangier had given orders to certain Moorish cruisers to seize American merchantmen, in violation of the treaty of 1787. In pursuance of these orders, the "Mirboka," a Moorish ship, had captured the brig "Celia" of Boston, but had herself been discovered and seized, with her prize, by Captain Bainbridge in the "Philadelphia." These occurrences compelled Commodore Preble to devote his attention for several weeks to Morocco. He immediately issued orders to the vessels of his squadron to capture all Moorish cruisers, and, proceeding to Tangier, entered upon negotiations with the Emperor. These resulted in the renewal and ratification of the treaty, the disavowal of the acts of the governor of Tangier, and the issue of an order to Moorish cruisers to abstain from further depredations; Preble, on his part, restoring the "Mirboka," and revoking the instructions to his squadron.

On the 15th of October Preble arrived at Gibraltar, and made a formal declaration of the blockade of Tripoli, at that time actually maintained by the "Philadelphia" and "Vixen." A few days later, while he was still at Gibraltar, the "Philadelphia," then blockading Tripoli, having imprudently run close to the shore in pursuit of a blockade-runner, struck on a rock,

and, after protracted efforts to get off, surrendered to the enemy's gun-boats. This event not only deprived the squadron of one of its best vessels which had fallen into the enemy's hands in good condition, but the capture of the three hundred officers and men on board of her would lead to complicated questions about ransom, and increase enormously the difficulty of securing a peace honorable to the United States.

Notwithstanding this severe blow at the outset of his cruise, Preble at once set about active measures. He fixed his rendezvous at Syracuse, made a reconnoissance of Tripoli, set on foot measures to carry on a secret correspondence with Bainbridge, sent an agent to Malta to forward supplies to the prisoners, and finally went there himself to superintend the arrangements.

On leaving Malta, towards the end of January, Preble returned to Syracuse. He had now matured a plan for the destruction of the "Philadelphia." A month before, a small Tripolitan ketch or square-rigged gunboat had been captured on a voyage to Constantinople, and had been taken into the service under the name of the "Intrepid." Preble resolved to use her for the expedition, which he placed under the command of Stephen Decatur, a young officer, who, although he had gone to sea for the first time only five years before, had already given proof of remarkable professional aptitude. On the 3d of February Decatur received his orders. He was to take the "Intrepid," with seventy-five officers and men of his own



STEPHEN DECATUR.*

selection, to Tripoli, and the "Siren" was to go with him to support and cover his retreat. His preparations were made in a few hours, and on the evening of the day on which the orders were issued the two vessels sailed.

A storm kept them off for ten days, but on the afternoon of the 16th they were in sight of Tripoli, and, the wind being light and favorable, Decatur made up his mind to attack that night. The boats of the "Siren" were to join him; but the brig, by arrangement, kept out of sight to lull suspicion,

* [From the *Nat. Portrait Gallery*, engraved by A. B. Durand after a copy by Herring of a picture by T. Sully, which belongs to the Penna. Hist. Soc., and was engraved for Mackenzie's *Decatur*. There is a picture by Stuart, which is at the Navy Yard, Brooklyn. Edwin's engraving of it is in the *Analectic Mag.*, vol. i. Jarvis's picture, engraved by J. W. Cook, is in the London ed. of Cooper's *Naval Hist*.

There is a portrait of Decatur in Independence Hall. A picture by Chappel is in Dawson's *Battles*, ii. 41.

Cf. Lamb's *New York*, and Lossing, 988. There is a profile likeness on the medal given to him by Congress (Loubat, no. 28, and Lossing, p. 458) to commemorate the capture of the "Macedonian." — Ed.]

and her boats did not come up in time ; or rather, Decatur, fearing delay, was unwilling to wait for them, and decided to make the attack alone. The "Philadelphia" was lying in the inner harbor, within easy range of all the batteries. She mounted forty guns, which were kept loaded, and she had a full crew on board. Between her and the shore lay the flotilla of gunboats.

The "Intrepid" entered the harbor at nine o'clock, passed slowly in, her men hidden under the bulwarks, and approached the "Philadelphia." On being hailed, her Maltese pilot answered that she had lost her anchors, and requested permission to ride by the "Philadelphia" for the night. This was granted, and the ketch was hauled close alongside. As soon as the vessels touched, the crew of the "Intrepid," headed by Decatur, leaped on board the "Philadelphia," and after a short struggle drove the enemy out. Fires were then started in different parts of the frigate, and Decatur and his men returned to the ketch and pushed off. As soon as the alarm was given, the Tripolitan gunboats got under way and the batteries opened on the "Intrepid," but she passed out of the harbor without receiving any injury. Soon after the party reached the "Siren," the "Philadelphia" blew up.

During the rest of the winter and spring Preble was engaged in preparations for the summer campaign. The blockade was closely kept up, notwithstanding the bad weather. The flagship was at Syracuse, Tunis, Tripoli, Malta, Messina, and Naples, as occasion called her, but never long in one place. The longest stay was at Naples, in May, where the commodore was occupied for ten days in negotiating for gunboats. At the end of this time he sailed for Messina, with an order from the king of the Two Sicilies for six gunboats and two mortar-boats, which last were indispensable for shell bombardment. The gunboats were clumsy vessels, but they were necessary for operating against the enemy's flotilla.

On the 25th of July the entire squadron took its station before Tripoli, and from this time until the 10th of September attacks followed each other in rapid succession, whenever the weather would permit. The first engagement was on the 3d of August ; on this day the Tripolitan gunboats, twenty-one in number, had ventured outside of the rocks. The American flotilla of six boats, in two divisions, commanded respectively by Lieutenant Richard Somers and Lieutenant Stephen Decatur, advanced to attack them, under cover of the fire of the fleet. The action was exceedingly warm, and resulted in the capture, by boarding, of three of the Tripolitan boats, and the dispersion of the remainder. Three boats were sunk. During the encounter of the gunboats, a separate action had been going on between the batteries and the fleet. Late in the afternoon, the wind coming out from the north, Preble withdrew. The casualties on the American side were one killed (Lieutenant James Decatur) and thirteen wounded.

The second engagement took place on the 7th of August. The gunboats, now increased to nine, and the mortar-boats, made an attack on the 7-gun battery to the westward of the city. The battery was silenced and

its walls badly breached. As the wind was on shore, the larger vessels could not join in the bombardment. During the engagement, one of the prize gunboats was blown up by a hot shot which passed through her magazine. The explosion killed Lieutenant Caldwell, the commander, Midshipman Dorsey, and eight petty officers and men.

During the engagement of the 7th of August, the "John Adams," Captain Chauncey, arrived off Tripoli from the United States. She was the first of the new and more powerful squadron which the government had determined to send out. As, however, there were only two captains junior to Preble in the United States at this time, and as the law required an officer of this grade for the command of a frigate, the Navy Department had thought it necessary to supersede him, and the new squadron had been placed under the command of Commodore Barron. This action was a bitter disappointment to Preble, but as some time must elapse before the new squadron would arrive, he continued his operations.

Towards the close of August, two smart and successful night attacks were made by the squadron, in which serious injury was done to the town. These were followed up, on the 3d of September, by a general engagement in the eastern part of the harbor, where a new battery had been thrown up by the American prisoners, working under compulsion. While the smaller vessels were occupied in this quarter, the mortar-boats were shelling the town, though exposed to the fire of all the harbor batteries. Seeing their unprotected situation, Preble ran down in the "Constitution," and brought to within the mortar-boats and close to the rocks, to divert the enemy's attention. In this position he kept up a heavy cannonade, directed at each of the batteries in turn, and silenced them one by one, finally drawing off when the freshening wind made it imprudent to remain longer.

In the last three attacks, the ships, although freely exposed to the fire of batteries largely superior to their own, suffered only in their sails and rigging, and that not to any serious extent. The Tripolitans could not stand to their guns under the "Constitution's" fire. The effectiveness of the attacks was best shown by the progress of negotiations. Before Preble's first action the Pasha's terms included a ransom of half a million dollars for the prisoners. He now made a proposal, through the French consul, to treat for peace, reducing the amount to \$150,000. This offer Preble rejected.

On the 4th of September Preble made his final demonstration against the city. It was of an experimental character, and resulted in failure. The "Intrepid" had been converted into a floating magazine by stowing one hundred barrels of powder on board, and distributing fixed shells about the vessel. The powder was to be fired by a fuse. Lieutenant Somers was in charge of the operation, having with him Lieutenants Wadsworth and Israel, of the "Constitution," and ten men. The plan was for the "Intrepid" to enter the harbor in the night and take a position close to the mole. Her officers and crew, after lighting the fuse, were to make their

escape by boats. Notwithstanding the darkness of the night, the "Intrepid" was sighted from the batteries soon after she entered the harbor; fire was opened upon her, and before the time fixed, indeed before she could have reached her destination, the explosion took place. All on board were killed, and it is not known whether the explosion was their voluntary act, or whether it was caused by the enemy's fire. No serious damage was done to the town.

As the bad season was now approaching, further operations were impossible, and the squadron was sent into port, with the exception of the "Constitution" and two of the smaller vessels, which continued the blockade. On the 10th of September Commodore Barron arrived in the flagship "President," and Preble gave up his command.

During the next winter the fleet was necessarily inactive, but in the spring of 1805, Commodore John Rodgers, whom Commodore Barron's illness now placed in command, arrived before Tripoli, with six frigates, two brigs, three schooners, a sloop, two mortar-boats, and ten gunboats. In the presence of such a force, the Pasha, who had already lowered his terms under the stress of Preble's attacks, was easily induced to conclude a treaty. An adventurous expedition undertaken by General William Eaton about the same time, in conjunction with Hamet Pasha, a claimant of the Tripolitan throne, which resulted in the capitulation of Derne, doubtless had a strong additional influence with the Tripolitan government, though it is hard to see how it could have acted otherwise in face of the overwhelming naval force. The negotiations lasted a week, and were conducted on board the flagship; \$60,000 were paid for the prisoners, and on the 4th of June the treaty was concluded which has since that day governed the relations of the United States and Tripoli.¹

During the interval between the Tripolitan war and the war of 1812, one noticeable campaign was made against the Indians. The operation took place in 1811, under General William H. Harrison, governor of Indiana Territory, and was directed against the Shawnees and other tribes which adhered to Tecumseh. This chief, with his brother, known as "the Prophet," had been engaged since 1806 in planning a species of crusade against the whites, and had acquired great influence among the northwestern Indians. For the previous two years Harrison's suspicions had been aroused by reports of Tecumseh's intrigues, and attempts had been made from time to time to negotiate with him, but without satisfactory results. In the summer of 1811 it was decided to strike a decisive blow at the Indians, and in the autumn Harrison, with a regiment of regulars under Colonel Boyd, and a force of militia, marched upon Tecumseh's town, situated on the Tippecanoe River. On the 7th of November the Indians, in Tecumseh's absence, attempted to surprise Harrison's camp, but in the

¹ The treaty is given in the volume published by the Department of State, p. 840. Eaton's services are set forth in the petition of his heirs to Congress (*Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.*, vi. 1).

battle which followed they were driven off, and presently abandoned their town, which Harrison burned. The invading force then retired. The importance of the expedition was largely due to the military reputation which Harrison acquired by it.¹

Apart from the expedition against Tecumseh, no military or naval operations took place during this period, although the condition of foreign relations was far from satisfactory. The foreign policy of Washington and Adams had been one of compromise and adjustment, where compromise did not involve too great a surrender, and where compromise was impossible, of careful and judicious preparation for defence. Menace and hostility were carried only so far as was warranted by the state of preparation and the necessities of the controversy. This policy met with definite and indisputable success in 1798-1800. The policy of Jefferson, on the other hand, especially in dealing with England, was to yield nothing by way of compromise, to insist on every point in dispute, and to induce compliance by commercial restrictions; at the same time avoiding all preparations for hostility, as inherently objectionable on financial grounds, and for reasons connected with internal politics. The outcome of this course was the embargo, which as a coercive measure of foreign policy was a failure, and as a domestic measure was productive of serious loss. Notwithstanding this failure, the administration of Madison followed along the same general lines of futile negotiation, restrictions upon American commerce, and the absence of military preparation. But Madison lacked the strong hold of his predecessor over his party, and a growing spirit of impatience began to make itself felt. The interminable protests, the aggressions and injuries repeated year after year, the incessant worry and clamor and bad feeling, the disturbance of business, with no prospect of an harmonious settlement, were calculated to try men's nerves to the utmost. At this juncture, in 1811, a small knot of resolute men within the party determined upon active measures, and compelled the administration, however unwillingly, to follow them. As the military policy of the government had for ten years been one of diminution and enfeeblement, and as the administration, yielding to the war movement under protest, was not disposed to take any measures itself, it was all-important that Congress should make the necessary preparations; but unfortunately the leaders, in concentrating their energies upon pushing the President, left everything else undone, and in the act of June 18, 1812, declaring war against Great Britain, while securing a political victory, they prepared the way for a series of military defeats.

By the act of April 12, 1808, the army had been increased by the addition of five regiments of infantry, and one regiment each of riflemen, light artillery, and light dragoons, or about 6,000 men in all.² Previous to the

¹ Harrison's report, containing a full account of the battle, will be found in *Am. St. Pap., Ind. Aff.*, i. 776.

² *Stat. at Large*, ii. 481.

passage of the act, the number in service, according to a return of the War Department of December 2, 1807, was 3,358 officers and men.¹ The effect of the new legislation was shown in the Department's return of January 30, 1810, which placed the total at 6,954.² This number was maintained with little change for the next two years, the Secretary's report of June 6, 1812, showing a total at that date of 6,744.³ The first of the war measures passed at the session of 1811-12, was the act of January 11, 1812, which provided for the general staff, including two major-generals, five brigadier-generals, an adjutant-general, and an inspector-general, and for an additional force of 25,000 men.⁴ Of this additional force, the Secretary of War on June 8 estimated from imperfect returns that 5,000 men had probably been enlisted.⁵ This conjectural force of 5,000 raw levies represented all the preparation which had actually been made, at the time of the declaration of war, to meet the emergency. Other acts authorized the President to accept the services of volunteers to the number of 50,000 men,⁶ and to require of the states 100,000 militia, according to their quotas.⁷ The total number of the militia at this time, according to the latest return (Feb. 19, 1811), was 694,735.⁸ The remaining acts passed at this session to improve the efficiency of the army had reference chiefly to organization. Among them were that of March 12, establishing the quartermaster's and commissary departments; of April 23, organizing a corps of artificers; of April 29, enlarging the corps of engineers; of May 14, establishing the ordnance department; of May 16, for the appointment of paymasters; and of June 26, providing for a new regimental organization. Other acts were passed relating to privateers, prisoners, and prizes.

The army entered upon the war with few officers of professional training or traditions. The general officers were appointed largely for political reasons, and with one or two exceptions had been out of military life since the Revolution, or had seen no service at all. They were not competent even to discipline their men, and much less to conduct strategic operations against the enemy. The senior major-general, Henry Dearborn, had served in the Revolution, and had been for eight years at the head of the War Department, but he was at this time over sixty years old, in bad health, and in every way unfitted for the chief command. The rank and file, of whom nearly all were new levies, were unable to learn the rudiments of their calling, and had no confidence either in themselves or in their officers. That Americans, when properly led, could make as good fighting material as any other people had been shown earlier in the Revolution, and was still more forcibly shown later in the war with Mexico and in the Civil War; but in 1812-15 they were without leaders. With the exception of Brown, Jackson, Scott, Gaines, Harrison, Macomb, and

¹ *Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.* i. 222.

² *Ibid.* i. 249.

³ *Ibid.* i. 319.

⁴ *Stat. at Large*, ii. 671.

⁵ *Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.* i. 320.

⁶ February 6, 1812. *Stat. at Large*, ii. 676.

⁷ April 10, 1812. *Stat. at Large*, ii. 705.

⁸ *Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.* i. 297.

Ripley, most of whom were at first in subordinate positions, there were few general officers worthy of the name, and it required only the simplest strategic movement to demonstrate their incompetency.

With the navy the case was different. Although it had never been regarded by the government with favor, it happened that the three most essential measures had been adopted to secure its efficiency, — the ships built for it were the best of their class in the world, the officers had been



ISAAC HULL.*


carefully selected (200 out of a total of 500 having been retained under the Peace Establishment Act), and they had received — at least a large number of them — in Preble's squadron at Tripoli a training such as has fallen to the lot of few navies, either before or since. To these three causes the successes of 1812 were directly due; and although Commodore Preble died in 1807, the credit of the later war belongs more to him than to any other one man. It was not only that he formed many of the individual officers who won the victories of 1812–15, — for Hull, Decatur, Bainbridge, Macdonough, Porter, Lawrence, Biddle, Chauncey, Warrington, Charles

* [After an engraving in the *Analectic Mag.*, vol. i. (March, 1813), following Stuart's picture, as engraved by David Edwin. It is in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston; but owned by the family. The engraving in the *Memorial Hist. Boston* (iii. 339) was made from the original.

A profile is on the medal given to him by Congress, on account of his escape from the British fleet in July, and his capture, in the "Constitution," of the "Guerrière," in Aug., 1812. The medal is figured in Lossing, p. 446, Frost's *Commodores*, and in Loubat, no. 26. — ED.]

Morris, and Stewart were all in his squadron, — but he created in the navy the professional spirit or idea, which was the main quality that distinguished it from the army in the war with Great Britain.

At the outbreak of the war there were 18 vessels in the navy, ranging from 44-gun frigates to 12-gun brigs. There were also 176 gunboats, on which a large sum of money had been expended, but which were of no use whatever. The annual abstracts of the British navy show that it possessed at this time 230 ships-of-the-line, of from 60 to 120 guns each, and 600 frigates and smaller vessels. From the English standpoint, no vessel of the American fleet was large enough to take her place in the line of battle, or was regarded as being really a combatant.



THE CONSTITUTION.*

Immediately after the declaration of war, the frigates in commission in the home ports, together with two of the sloops, put to sea as a squadron under Commodore John Rodgers. They fell in with the English frigate "Belvidera," but she got away from them; and after an ineffectual cruise across the Atlantic, they returned home, without meeting anything of consequence.

Three weeks later, the "Constitution," under Captain Hull, sailed from Annapolis. Soon after leaving the Chesapeake she came upon a British squadron of one sixty-four and four frigates, and then ensued the famous three days' chase, in the course of which, by a marvel of good seamanship and good discipline, the American frigate escaped. After a short respite

* [From the *Amer. Mag.*, 1834, vol. i. 84, where it is said that the cut was made "on a piece of wood taken from one of her live-oak knees in 1833." There is in *Ibid.* i. 86, a view of the ship at her moorings at the Charlestown Navy Yard. Cf. *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 332, 334. A posthumous publication of Cooper on "Old Ironsides" appeared in *Putnam's Mag.*, new series, May and June, 1853. — ED.]

in Boston, Hull set out again, and on the 19th of August he fought and captured the "Guerrière," Captain Dacres, in an engagement lasting about an hour. The "Constitution" being armed with 24-pounders instead of 18's, threw at a broadside a weight of shot half as large again as that of the "Guerrière," and her crew was numerically superior in a still greater



COMMODORE BAINBRIDGE.*

degree. Nevertheless, the immensely greater disproportion in the casualties which the "Constitution" inflicted and received, and the short time which she took to do the work, cannot be explained by the difference in force alone; for the "Guerrière" had five times as many killed and wounded as her opponent, and at the close of the engagement she was a dismantled wreck, while the "Constitution" had suffered no injury of importance. The essential point of difference lay in the practical training and skill of the crews in gunnery. The English often appeared to fire without pointing their guns; the Americans always fired to hit. This was seen in all the subsequent victories.

In the next action, in October, the sloop "Wasp," Captain Jacob Jones, captured the English brig "Frolic," of approximately the same force. The relative loss of English and Americans was again five to one. Both vessels were soon after taken by a seventy-four. Later in the same month, another frigate action took place, the "United States," under Decatur, capturing the "Macedonian." The advantage of the Americans in men was about the same as in the first action, while in guns it was greater. The American casualties were 13, the English 104. This difference was not due to the fact that the American guns were 24's and 42's instead of 18's and 32's, or that the Americans had three more of them in a broadside; it was really due to the way in which the guns on both sides were handled.

* [From the *Nat. Portrait Gallery* (1839). Engraved by G. Parker, after a painting by J. W. Jarvis. Stuart's picture is at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and has been engraved by Edwin, and by Sartain, in John Frost's *Commodores*, and in Harris's *Bainbridge*. Cf. the engraving in the *Analectic Mag.*, vol. ii., and the full-length by Chapell in Dawson, ii. 183. The medal given to him by Congress to commemorate this capture (June 29, 1812) of the "Java" by the "Constitution" gives his likeness in profile. It is figured by Lossing, p. 463, and by Loubat, no. 29. — ED.]

Shortly after this capture, a cruise in the Pacific was projected for a squadron to be composed of the "Constitution," "Essex," and "Hornet." The "Essex" failed to meet the other vessels at the rendezvous off the coast of Brazil, and went on the Pacific cruise alone. The "Constitution," now commanded by Bainbridge, met the frigate "Java," near Brazil, on the 29th of December. The antagonists were more nearly matched than in the previous frigate actions, but the fight, lasting a little over an hour, resulted in the total defeat and surrender of the "Java," with a loss of 124



DAVID PORTER.*

to the Americans' 34. The "Java" was a wreck, and could not be taken into port, and Bainbridge returned home. Two months later, February 24, 1813, the "Hornet," commanded by Lawrence, met the "Peacock" off the Demerara, and reduced her in fifteen minutes to a sinking condition, while the "Hornet's" hull was hardly scratched. The English sloop sank so quickly that she carried down part of her own crew and three of the "Hornet's" who were trying to save them. The casualties, apart from those drowned, were five in the "Hornet" and thirty-eight in the "Pea-

* [From an engraving in the *Analectic Mag.* (Sept., 1814), vol. iv., made by Edwin after a picture by Wood. There is a portrait in Independence Hall. Cf. Lossing, 721, who copies the picture by J. Wood, engraved by Prud'homme in Porter's *Journal of a Cruise*, where there are engravings after drawings made by Porter, one showing his fleet at Madison Island, and the other his final fight in the "Essex," both of which are copied by Lossing. — ED.]

cock." This action shows even more than the others that the difference between the contestants was not so much in numerical force as in skill in handling weapons.

The moral effect in England of these defeats was very great. The long succession of victories over the French, Spaniards, Dutch, and Danes had led the English to regard their navy as invincible, and to place in it unlimited confidence. The five actions caused a shock, which was all the more severe from the feeling of contempt with which naval men in England had taught their countrymen to regard the American ships of war. The prevailing notions about United States frigates evidently required readjustment, and the admiralty and the navy were bitterly attacked for having underrated their enemies.

With the exception of two isolated attempts at invasion, the first on the Chesapeake and the second at New Orleans, the war on land was almost wholly on the northern frontier. It had been the vague intention of the leaders of the war party in Congress to make the conquest of Canada the main feature of the land campaigns. Little had been done, however, by the War Department to prepare for the movement. Indeed, the War Department did not have at its command either the men or the machinery to draw up a strategic plan or to put it into successful operation. Eustis, the Secretary, had formerly been a surgeon in the army, and had but slight knowledge of military affairs. Few of the general officers had seen any military service since the Revolution. The troops were mostly raw recruits. Among the regimental officers were some men of decided military talent, but until the latter part of the war their efforts were neutralized by incompetent commanders. The invasion of Canada presented a complex problem which should have been seriously and deliberately worked out. Apart from the intrinsic difficulty of invasion, the facility of communication between different points in the enemy's country, the remoteness and inaccessibility of the northern frontier, the unfriendliness of the Indians, and the superiority of the Canadians on the lakes, created obstacles which could only be overcome by an efficient organization in the government, and a capable strategist in the field. In the absence of both, the first campaign of the summer of 1812 was a disastrous failure.

The events of the campaign may be briefly told. Governor William Hull of Michigan Territory, one of the recently appointed brigadier-generals, was ordered to advance into Canada. His point of departure was Detroit, then a small frontier settlement, 200 miles by land from the

[NOTE. — The map on the opposite page is reduced from a plate in Bouchette's *British Dominions in No. Amer.* (London, 1832). Cf. the map in Lieut. Francis Hall's *Travels in Canada and the United States in 1816-17* (London, 1819, 2d ed.); and the "Straits of Niagara, from a map by Mr. Darby," in *An Excursion through the United States and Canada, 1822-23*, by an English gentleman [William Newnham Blane] (London, 1824). There is also a map in John Melish's *Travels* (Philad., 1814), vol. ii. Cf. those in Wilkinson's *Memoirs, Atlas*, no. 15; Lossing, 382; Gay, *Pop. Hist.*, iv. 191; Cullum's *Campaigns of the War of 1812-15*; James's *Mil. Occurrences* (London, 1818); and Gen. Van Rensselaer's *Affair of Queenstown* (N. Y., 1836). — ED.]

WILLOUGBY T.P.

Grand Lake

North Hill

Chippewa T.P.

New Road

Chippewa River



Point of View

STAMFORD DISTRICT

NIAGARA

STATE OF NEW YORK

Sketch of NIAGARA RIVER

between

Wilmington & Chippewa

Portage Road, from Niagara to Chippewa

Brook Monument

Road to York

ONEONTA

LEWISTON

Portage Road & Mills

Planting & Store House

Old Fort Station

Call Oak

School House


Embury Mill

Old Chippewa & Lodiak Mills

Theodore Village



advanced posts in Ohio, and he had with him about 2,000 men, of whom 350 were regular troops. Not having received word of the declaration of war, Hull sent his supplies by Lake Erie, but the British, getting earlier information, captured them on the way. On the 12th of July Hull crossed into Canada. The British post at Malden, garrisoned by a force less than half his own, might have been captured by a bold stroke; but Hull, after issuing an ineffectual proclamation and fortifying his camp, delayed action until Malden had been reinforced, and after losing a part of his troops in an attempt to open communications which had been closed by the Indians, finally returned to Detroit. On the 16th of August, General Brock, the



FORT NIAGARA.*

governor of Upper Canada, a professional soldier of experience and courage, appeared before Detroit with a force composed chiefly of Indians and militia. Without waiting for the enemy's attack, Hull surrendered his command, and with it the Territory of Michigan.

At the other advanced posts of the frontier, the Niagara River and Lake Champlain, the army, though it accomplished nothing, did not meet with such conspicuous disaster. At the Niagara, General Stephen van Rensselaer was in command of about six thousand men, half of whom were militia. On the 13th of October an attack was made upon the enemy at Queens-town. Imperfect organization, hap-hazard preparations, and the absence of discipline in the militia, made the operation a fiasco. Colonel Solomon van

* [Fac-simile of a woodcut in P. Stansbury's *Pedestrian Tour in North America, 1821* (New York, 1822). A view of Fort Niagara from the British side of the river, 1814, is given in the *Doc. Hist. N. Y.*, ii. 1105. Lossing (p. 274) also gives a view from Fort George; and copies a picture (p. 597) which was made in 1813, and originally appeared in *The Portfolio*, July, 1817, and in which both Fort Niagara and Fort George are seen from a point on the lake opposite the entrance to the river. Cf. *Harper's Mag.*, xxvi. 730; xxvii. 596.—ED.]

Rensselaer, who commanded the attack, was severely wounded early in the day, and on the British side Sir Isaac Brock was killed. Colonel Scott, who had volunteered for the occasion, assumed command of the detachment, but the failure to send him reinforcements from the New York side, and the arrival of General Sheaffe with a force from Fort George, finally compelled him to surrender. The British loss was trifling. General Van Rensselaer resigned his command, and was succeeded by General Alexander Smyth, a most incompetent officer, who also presently retired.¹

The force on the New York frontier, under the immediate command of General Dearborn, confined its operations to desultory forays, one of which captured a small garrison at the village of St. Regis, and the other a block-house at La Colle. Neither event was of any strategic importance, and the army soon after withdrew to winter-quarters.

After Hull's surrender, nothing was done in the West beyond raising a new army, chiefly composed of volunteers from Kentucky, which, after some changes, was finally placed under the command of General Harrison. Raids were made upon various Indian settlements, and the country south of Lake Erie, which now represented the advanced line of defence, was effectively garrisoned. These events concluded the land campaign of 1812.



*H. Dearborn**

In March, 1813, Admiral Sir John Warren assumed the command of the British squadron on the American coast. Although rather past his prime, his defects were more than compensated by the activity of his second in command, Rear-Admiral Cockburn, who during this summer and the next kept the coasts of Chesapeake Bay in a continuous state of alarm by suc-

¹ Part of Smyth's correspondence while in command, transmitted by him to the House of Representatives, will be found in *Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.*, i. 490-510.

* [Cf. Lossing, p. 249. Dearborn was born in 1751, and died in 1829. There is a woodcut of a portrait by Stuart, painted in 1812, in the *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 574 (Mason's *Stuart*, p. 170). The original, now belonging to Miss Mary Dearborn, is deposited in the rooms of the Bostonian Society. I find a statement that a Stuart likeness belongs to Herbert Welsh of Philadelphia. On the Dearborn portraits, see Goodwin's *Provincial Pictures* (Chicago, 1886, pp. 72, 74). There is a portrait in Independence Hall. For views of Dearborn's house, see Drake's *Roxbury*, p. 327; Lossing's *Field-Book of the War of 1812*, p. 250. — Ed.]

cessful raids, in which much valuable property was destroyed. Among the more important of the actions of 1813 were the capture and destruction (in part) of Havre de Grace, Md., early in May, and an attack on the village of Hampton, Va., on the 25th of June. "Acts of rapine and violence"¹ on the part of the invading forces characterized the latter attack, which excited intense indignation throughout the country. An attempt to capture Craney Island, made a few days earlier by a boat expedition from the British fleet, was repulsed, with severe loss to the enemy.



JAMES LAWRENCE.*

In the summer of 1813 occurred the first serious reverse of the navy during the war. On the 1st of June the frigate "Chesapeake," Captain James Lawrence, sailed from Boston to engage the "Shannon," which was lying outside, waiting for the battle. The two ships were nearly matched in guns and men, what slight difference there was being in favor of the "Chesapeake"; but the crew of the latter had been recently shipped and was partly composed of disaffected men, and Lawrence had had no time to discipline them. The engagement was short and decisive. Ranging up

¹ James's *Nav. Hist.*, vi. 234.

* [From an engraving in the *Analectic Mag.* (1813), vols. ii. and iii. (separate engravings), after Stuart's picture, which is owned by Mrs. Wm. Redmond of Newport, R. I., and has been engraved by Edwin, by N. Rollinson, and by W. S. Leney. (Cf. Mason's *Stuart*, 212.) The medal given to Lawrence for his capture of the "Peacock" has a profile likeness (Loubat, no. 34; Lossing, 700). A view of Lawrence's tomb in Trinity Church is given in *Harper's Mag.*, Nov., 1876, p. 872. — ED.]

alongside of the "Shannon," whose crew had been brought to the highest state of efficiency by Captain Broke their commander, the "Chesapeake" at the first fire received a severe injury in the loss of several of her officers. Falling foul of the "Shannon," she was effectually raked, and presently a boarding party, led by Captain Broke, got possession of her deck. The great mortality among the officers,¹ and the want of discipline in the crew, resulted in a victory for the boarders. The battle lasted fifteen minutes only, and the "Chesapeake" was carried as a prize to Halifax.

During this summer the naval war on the ocean continued with varying fortunes, two important actions being fought. The brig "Argus," Captain Allen, after a successful voyage in the Irish Sea, in which many prizes were taken and destroyed, was captured by the English brig "Pelican," on the 14th of August. Early in September the brig "Enterprise," commanded by Lieutenant Burrows, captured the English brig "Boxer," near Portland, Me.

The opening event of the land campaign of 1813 took place in January. General Winchester, who commanded the advance of Harrison's army of the West, reaching the Maumee Rapids on the 10th, received an urgent call for succor from the village of Frenchtown, on the River Raisin, which had been attacked by the English and Indians. Winchester sent a detachment to its relief, which beat off the assailants, and then marched to Frenchtown in person. Meanwhile, Colonel Proctor, taking advantage of the ice on the lake, crossed over in force from Malden, attacked the Americans, and made Winchester a prisoner. The latter then ordered his late command to surrender, which was done. Taking with him six hundred prisoners, Proctor returned to Malden, leaving the wounded, mostly Kentucky volunteers, at Frenchtown, where they were massacred by the Indians.

The massacre of the River Raisin aroused intense indignation in the army of the Northwest, but for the present it was decided to act on the defensive. General Harrison's advance post was now Fort Meigs, on the Maumee River. The fort was invested in May by Colonel Proctor with a force of British and Indians, but the timely arrival of General Clay with a body of Kentucky volunteers compelled Proctor to retire. Another attempt to take Fort Meigs, made by Proctor in July, met with no better success, and the English general moved against Fort Stephenson, on the Sandusky, from which, on the 2d of August, he was repulsed, with great gallantry, by Major Croghan and a small garrison.

During the spring of 1813, Secretary Armstrong, who had succeeded Eustis at the War Department, had issued an order dividing the territory of the United States into nine military districts, the eighth comprising the neighborhood of Lake Erie, under Harrison, and the ninth the rest of the frontier from Niagara to Lake Champlain, under Dearborn. It was now recognized that the command of the lakes was essential to the

¹ See list of killed, wounded, and prisoners, *Amer. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, ii. 629.

success of military operations in the adjacent territory, and the judicious efforts made by the navy, with this object, were destined shortly to lead to definite results. Already in the autumn of 1812, Commodore Isaac Chauncey had taken command at Sackett's Harbor, the naval depot of the Americans on Lake Ontario. At the beginning the only naval vessel on the lake was the small sloop of war "Onecida." Before Chauncey's arrival, Lieutenant Woolsey had captured the schooner "Julia," and had purchased



ISAAC CHAUNCEY.*

six other schooners. With these, Chauncey, on the 9th of November, made a brisk attack on the Canadian flotilla in Kingston harbor, — a much stronger force, but badly officered and manned. Although he could not capture the Canadians, Chauncey obtained virtual control of the lake for the time. Meanwhile the construction of new vessels was actively pushed under the direction of a skilful constructor, Henry Eckford. Four additional schooners were purchased, the ship "Madison" was completed and launched, and a powerful corvette, the "General Pike," by far the largest vessel on the lake, was begun.

When the spring navigation opened, General Dearborn, being now sure of efficient coöperation on the water, determined on an offensive movement, which met with greater success than any which had hitherto been

* [From an engraving in the *Analectic Mag.* (1816), vol. viii., made by Edwin after a picture by J. Wood. Stuart's picture is at the Navy Yard, Brooklyn. Cf. Lossing, 887; Lamb's *New York*, vol. ii. — Ed.]

undertaken on the frontier. The chief ports of the enemy on the lake were Kingston and York, at each of which a large vessel was building. Kingston was supposed to be well protected by forts and by the flotilla, while York was poorly fortified, and defended only by a garrison under General Sheaffe. Against the latter post General Dearborn now directed a combined military and naval expedition. On the 27th of April, the troops, led by General Pike, landed under cover of the fire of the flotilla, which was skilfully handled. The attack was successful; the enemy was driven off with the loss of over half their numbers, the town was taken, one ship under construction was burnt, and the brig "Gloucester" was captured. Unfortunately the Parliament House was also burnt, which served as the pretext for the destruction of the government buildings at Washington in the following year. The American loss was 286, of which the largest part was caused by the explosion of a magazine. Among the killed was General Pike.

A month later a still more important movement was directed against Fort George, at the mouth of the Niagara River, an excellent position, with a strong garrison. The skilful management of the fleet was conspicuous here, as at York. The hot fire of the vessels made it impossible for the enemy's troops to make an effectual opposition to the landing, and his batteries were silenced. The disembarkation was ably conducted by Captain Oliver H. Perry, who had come from Lake Erie to act as Chauncey's chief of staff, and the troops were led to the assault with great gallantry by Lieutenant-Colonel Winfield Scott. The enemy blew up the fort and retreated, with a total loss of about 900. The American loss was between 60 and 70. The capture of Fort George turned the remaining British posts on the Niagara frontier, and they were presently abandoned.



WINFIELD SCOTT.*

While the American forces were thus occupied, an attack was made (May 29th) on Sackett's Harbor by the enemy under Sir George Prevost and Sir

* [From the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1839, vol. iv., following a painting by C. Ingham. There is a profile likeness on the medal awarded by Congress for his gallantry at Chippewa, which is engraved in Lossing, 826, and in Loubat, no. xlv. Cf. the engravings in the *Analectic Mag.*, vol. iv., and in Scott's *Autobiography*. — ED.]

James Yeo, the former commanding the land forces and the latter the fleet. Notwithstanding the inadequacy of the defences and the misconduct of the militia, General Brown, of the New York militia, a man of native military genius, who commanded the defence, was able to repel the attack, thereby saving the "General Pike," the largest of the American vessels, which was then in course of construction.

The campaign during the remainder of the year 1813, on the New York frontier, which had opened so successfully, was from this time a long and unbroken succession of miserable failures. Even on the lake, although with the launch of the "Pike" Chauncey obtained a force superior to the enemy, he was unable to obtain any decided advantage. The strength of Dearborn's army was wasted in detached enterprises, which would have been of no great moment had they succeeded, but which generally ended in humiliating disasters, owing to the professional ignorance and inexperience of the officers and want of discipline among the men. In July Dearborn was recalled from the command, and his place was taken in August by General James Wilkinson, a professional soldier, but of impaired powers, and at this time in bad health. A considerable force was assembled, and an important expedition projected, the preparations being directed personally by General Armstrong, the successor of Eustis at the War Department, who proceeded to Sackett's Harbor in October for the purpose.

The object of the proposed expedition was Montreal, which was selected in preference to Kingston, a far more accessible, and in some ways more important, point. General Hampton, who had been appointed to the command in Northeastern New York, and who had soon after made an unsuccessful incursion into Canada, was to march directly north from Lake Champlain, and coöperate with the main force under Wilkinson. The latter set out from Sackett's Harbor late in October, and, though the season was far advanced, descended the St. Lawrence, and penetrated some distance into the Canadian territory after a small engagement at Chrysler's Farm. Notice had already been sent to Hampton to advance with his troops and supplies and effect a junction at St. Regis. But at this point a despatch was received from Hampton, declining, for various reasons, to cooperate. This defection, together with the want of supplies and the lateness of the season, led Wilkinson to give up the expedition, and his army retired to winter-quarters.

In December, General McClure, a militia officer who had been left in command of the Niagara region after Wilkinson's departure, abandoned Fort George, after burning, entirely without cause or justification, the adjoining Canadian village of Newark. Reprisals followed upon all the American posts in the neighborhood, which were at the time imperfectly defended, including Lewiston, Fort Niagara, Black Rock, and Buffalo. Fort Niagara was held by the enemy till the end of the war.

On Lake Erie and in the adjacent territory, the campaign of 1813 offered a marked contrast to the ineffectual operations of the Ontario forces. The

abandonment by the enemy of the Niagara frontier in the previous May had had a most important bearing upon the movements in the Northwest. The squadron on Lake Erie, which in March had been placed under the command of Commander Oliver H. Perry, was composed of two good-sized



O. H. PERRY.*

brigs and three schooners, building at the town of Erie, and of the small brig "Caledonia" and four gunboats, which were lying at Black Rock, in the Niagara River. The evacuation of the British posts enabled Perry to move the vessels at Black Rock out of the river, and thence by the lake to Erie, thus uniting the two portions of the fleet.

By May, the two new brigs, the "Lawrence" and the "Niagara," were launched, and every effort was made to fit them out for a cruise. The bar at the entrance of the harbor had only a few feet of water, rendering the passage of the brigs exceedingly difficult at any time, and quite impossible under the fire of the enemy. Commodore Barclay, however, who commanded the English squadron lying before Erie, withdrew from his position

* After an engraving in the *Analectic Mag.* (Dec., 1813), vol. ii., made by Edwin from Waldo's picture. The portrait by J. W. Jarvis has been engraved by I. B. Forrest, and in Cooper's *Naval Hist.* (London, 1839), vol. i., by S. Freeman. The original is in the New York City Hall (Lossing, pp. 521, 527). Stuart's picture is owned by O. H. Perry of Lowell, Mass.

There is a profile likeness on the medal given by Congress for his victory on Lake Erie, Sept. 10, 1813. It is figured by Lossing, p. 535, and by Loubat, no. 32.

for two days, thereby enabling Perry to get the brigs over the bar. From that time he had the superiority in force on the lake.

On the 14th of September, when the American ships were lying at anchor in Put-in-Bay, the British squadron was sighted outside, and Perry advanced to meet them. By a shift of wind he obtained the weather-gauge. His tactical arrangement was what is known as "the oblique attack" in column ahead, the enemy being at anchor, and the advancing column being directed towards the head of the enemy's line. The wind was light, and the "Lawrence," Perry's flagship, which led the advance, was for a long time exposed to a severe fire, without receiving much support from the vessels in the rear. The protracted engagement which the "Lawrence" sustained, almost alone, resulted in the killing or wounding of nearly every man on board, and the complete disabling of her battery.

At this juncture Perry lowered his boat, left his flagship, and went on board the "Niagara," which was still fresh, sending Captain Elliott of the "Niagara" to bring up the schooners in the rear. He re-formed his ships in line abreast, and, the breeze freshening, he advanced rapidly, and broke the enemy's line at several points. The two principal British ships were caught while attempting to wear, and, being unable to withstand this fresh attack, surrendered. The others followed their example. Two of the smaller vessels, which attempted to escape, were pursued and brought back, and Perry was able to announce to General Harrison a complete victory.

Immediately upon the receipt of Perry's famous despatch, General Harrison prepared to move against Malden, which for more than a year had been the strategic centre of British operations in the Northwest. The captured vessels were used as transports, and the troops sailed across the lake. The cavalry regiment from Kentucky, under Colonel Richard M. Johnson, marched around by land. General Proctor, foreseeing the attack, abandoned the fort at Malden and fled up the River Thames. Thither he was pursued by Johnson's cavalry, and on the 5th of October, near Moravian Town, Harrison, with the main body of his army, came up with the enemy, composed, as usual, of British and Indians, the latter under Tecumseh. The battle which followed was a decisive victory. Proctor escaped by flight, but Tecumseh was killed, and all of the enemy who remained on the field surrendered. The supremacy thus established on Lake Erie and throughout the Northwest continued unbroken to the close of the war.

During the summer of 1813, the Creek Indians, occupying Southwestern Georgia and a large part of Alabama, became restless and hostile, having been incited to disturbance by the influence of Tecumseh. Two parties soon developed among these Indians: the Georgians, or Upper Creeks, as they were called, adhering to the whites; while the Lower Creeks, living in the country about the Coosa and Tallapoosa rivers, were bent on war. In August, a party of the latter, led by a chief named Weathersford, surprised and took Fort Mims, near the Alabama River, and massacred a large num-

ber of settlers who had taken refuge in the fort. Four expeditions were immediately set on foot, from West and from East Tennessee, from Georgia, and from Mississippi, to attack the hostile Indians. The four columns of invasion entered Alabama from different points, and, during a campaign lasting from October to December, they were generally successful, especially that from West Tennessee, which was commanded by General Andrew Jackson. Owing to the want of unity among the different commands, the work was not fully accomplished, and a considerable portion of the militia returned home. The war, as far as it went, was one of extermination, the whites giving no quarter, and great numbers of Indians were slaughtered in the successive encounters.

In January, 1814, fighting was renewed, and the Georgians and Tennesseans, with reduced forces, barely held their own. In March, Jackson, who was about this time appointed a major-general, received large reinforcements, consisting of regulars and Tennessee militia, as well as friendly Indians. Towards the end of the month, he resolved to stake everything on a final encounter, and on the 27th attacked the main body of Creeks, in a strongly fortified position at the Horse Shoe, or bend of the Tallapoosa. The enemy's rear, protected by the river, was assailed by the volunteers and the Indian allies, while the works in front were carried by an assault of the regulars. The battle of Tohopeka, as it was called, lasted for five hours with great fury, and resulted in a complete victory for Jackson. As in the previous campaign, the Indians were put to death even after the battle was over. Soon after, a treaty of peace was signed, by which the hostile Creeks lost the greater part of their territory.

The opening event of the campaign of 1814 was a second futile expedition, under Wilkinson, into Canada, which proceeded only as far as the British outposts at La Colle, and terminated in a failure unparalleled even in the events of the two preceding years, for ludicrous feebleness and inefficiency. Wilkinson was soon after relieved.

The general officers who had hitherto attempted the conduct of the war on the northern frontier, and who had only displayed various degrees and phases of incompetency, had now retired from the scene of active campaigning, and the men who were appointed to succeed them were fortunately real soldiers. Colonel George Izard of South Carolina, who had served as an engineer officer in the French army, was appointed major-general, with the command of the army near Lake Champlain. Izard hardly fulfilled the hopes raised by his appointment, owing largely to his dissatisfaction at finding the condition of his army so far below the standard to which his European experience had accustomed him; but at least he committed no conspicuous blunders. The force on the Niagara frontier was entrusted to another new major-general, Jacob Brown, who, although not a trained soldier at the start, had become one during the war, and whose quick eye and prompt decision, aided by a genius for command and organ-

ization, had rewarded him with success in the two operations for which he had already obtained distinction, the defence of Ogdensburg and of Sackett's Harbor. Brown was fortunate in the assistance of three brigade commanders, Winfield Scott, Edmund P. Gaines, and E. W. Ripley ; the first two trained officers of merit, — Scott, indeed, being a man of very uncommon merit, — and the third making up in sound judgment what he lacked in experience. All were men of resolution and unmistakable gallantry, and the subordinate officers included several of great promise. The want of discipline hitherto shown in the ranks was corrected by the establishment of a camp of instruction under Scott, which raised the little army to a degree of excellence hitherto unknown on the frontier.

During the winter, large ships had been built on Lake Ontario by both sides ; but the enemy, more favorably situated for procuring supplies, succeeded in getting ready first. For the time, no coöperation could be expected from Commodore Chauncey, and early in July General Brown started alone on his projected invasion, with between three and four thousand men, in three brigades : the regulars under Scott and Ripley, and the volunteers under Porter. Fort Erie, held by a small garrison, surrendered without a blow. After an advance of a few miles, on the 5th of July, the enemy was encountered, under General Riall, in a secure position behind the Chippewa River. Riall advanced from his position and crossed the river to meet a demonstration made by the volunteer brigade ; but, as the latter fell back, Scott made an impetuous charge, which drove the enemy across the river again, and inflicted a heavy loss. Riall then immediately retreated to Lake Ontario, uncovering the Niagara frontier on the Canada side, with the exception of Fort George.

Brown remained here three weeks, vainly endeavoring to get supplies and aid from the fleet. At the end of that time a large body of men, under General Drummond, had come to Riall's assistance, and the combined force advanced to the Niagara. Late on the afternoon of the 25th, Scott, leading the American advance, fell in with the enemy, strongly posted on an eminence at Lundy's Lane, near the falls, with a battery in position. In approaching this position, Scott suffered severe loss ; but a regiment which he had sent, under Major Jesup, to turn the enemy's left penetrated to the rear and captured a number of prisoners, among whom was General Riall. Soon after dark, Brown came up with the main army, and Colonel James Miller, being ordered to storm the enemy's battery, carried it by assault in a charge of great gallantry. The hilltop which Miller had carried was held by Ripley, supported by Porter and Jesup, against three determined assaults of the enemy's whole force, greatly superior in numbers. During these attacks, Scott, with the remains of his brigade, took the assailants in flank, and the latter finally desisted and left the Americans in position. Brown and Scott were both wounded, and Ripley, who was left in command, being unable to bring off the captured guns, retired to the camp without them, and the enemy was thus enabled to recover them.


The superiority of the British force made it prudent for the army to return to Fort Erie, of which Gaines was ordered to take command. The fort was warmly attacked by Drummond on the 15th of August, but Gaines repelled his assaults successfully, and Drummond, after having lost nearly one fourth of his troops, gave up the attempt and began a regular investment. Matters thus remained for a month, the besiegers constantly advancing their lines and erecting strong works. At length, Brown, who had in the mean while recovered from his wounds and resumed the command, conceived the audacious plan of raising the siege by a sortie. On the 17th of September he carried out the plan with brilliant success. The enemy's advance works were surprised, carried, and blown up before the main army could reach the ground, and Brown withdrew to the fort, taking with him a large number of prisoners. Drummond thereupon abandoned the siege and drew off his forces beyond the Chippewa.

All that had been gained in the summer campaign was lost by Izard in the fall. This officer, who had come from Plattsburg some time before with 4,000 of his best troops, took the place of Brown and his depleted army. Although superior to Drummond in force, Izard delayed action until the enemy had retreated from his exposed position; then, without striking a blow, he destroyed Fort Erie and withdrew to the New York side. This was the last movement of importance on the Niagara frontier.

The "Essex," under Captain David Porter, having set out in the autumn of 1812 for a cruise in the Pacific with the "Constitution" and "Hornet," but having failed to meet her consorts on the coast of Brazil, as had been intended, proceeded on her cruise alone. This cruise lasted eighteen months, during which the "Essex" was cut off from communication with the United States, and depended on her prizes for supplies. At this time the Pacific was filled with American and English whalers, the former of which were unarmed, while the latter, being commissioned as privateers, carried small but formidable batteries. The enemy had no naval vessels in that quarter. Had the "Essex" not made her cruise, the English privateers would undoubtedly have destroyed the American whaling trade in the Pacific. As it was, the "Essex" not only prevented this result, but inflicted a like injury upon the enemy.

In the course of the cruise, Porter captured thirteen fine vessels, a few of which were sent to make the best of their way to the United States, while the remainder were fitted out as cruisers, forming a squadron under Porter's command. Considerable time was spent during the autumn of 1813 at the Marquesas Islands, where Porter took an active part in the wars of the native tribes. Returning, finally, to Valparaiso with his ship and her tender, the "Essex Junior" (one of the captured prizes), Porter met the enemy's frigate "Phœbe" and the sloop "Cherub," commanded by Captain Hillyar. A battle ensued on the 28th of March, 1814, in which, after a resistance almost unparalleled for stubbornness and tenacity, the "Essex" was defeated and destroyed.

In the year 1814 occurred several minor actions. The sloop "Peacock," under Captain Warrington, captured the enemy's brig "Epervier," off the coast of Florida, in April. The "Wasp," a new sloop-of-war, which had been named after the first "Wasp," the captor of the "Frolic," cruised to the English Channel, where she destroyed several prizes. Her first battle was with the sloop "Reindeer," which she captured and burned. Early in September the "Wasp" had another action with the sloop "Avon," which was defeated, and which sank soon after the action. After this engagement, a despatch was received from the "Wasp" by a prize which she had subsequently captured, but this was the last that was ever heard of her.




FORT OSWEGO, 1798.*

By this time the English fleet on the coast of America had been so largely reinforced that it was able to maintain an effective blockade of all the principal ports of the United States, and very few American cruisers were able to get to sea, and these only with the utmost difficulty. Privateers were still actively cruising in great numbers, and their prizes during the war amounted, altogether, to over 1,400. About 300 more were taken by vessels of the navy. Considering the disparity in naval force between the two belligerents, this result is remarkable.

In the spring of 1814, the government of Great Britain, which, as far as it had exerted itself in the war at all, had made it hitherto a defensive war, was in a position to pursue an aggressive policy, its armies being no longer required, since the abdication of Napoleon, for operations on the Continent. Detachments of veteran troops were sent to America, and invasions were

* From a print in *Description of the Genesee Country*, Albany, 1798.


planned from Canada and at points on the seaboard. Late in the spring, Sir James L. Yeo, with a British squadron, was cruising on Lake Ontario, and descending upon Oswego, captured the fort and the stores and provisions that were contained in it. The first of the armies of invasion, numbering about 12,000 men, was commanded by Sir George Prevost, and starting from Montreal, crossed the frontier early in September. The withdrawal of Izard with 4,000 of his picked troops to the Niagara, left the west



COMMODORE MACDONOUGH.*

shore of Lake Champlain guarded only by a small force at Plattsburg under General Alexander Macomb, which was presently increased somewhat by militia from New York and Vermont. The advance of the British was supported by a fleet on the lake, consisting of the frigate "Confiance," carrying a heavy battery of thirty long 24-pounders, the brig "Linnet," and the sloops "Chubb" and "Finch." To oppose this fleet, a force had been created by Commodore Macdonough, consisting of the flagship "Saratoga," the brig

* After Stuart's picture, owned by his descendants, and now hanging in the Century Club, N. Y., whence, through the interposition of Dr. Edward Eggleston, permission was kindly granted by Mr. A. R. Macdonough to make a negative.



FORT CHAMBLY.

“Eagle,” the schooner “Ticonderoga,” and the sloop “Preble.” Each squadron had also a flotilla of gunboats. The two forces on the lake were nearly matched, although the heavy battery of the “Confiance” gave whatever advantage there was to the enemy.

Macdonough had arranged his squadron in a line heading north, — the “Eagle” leading, next to her the “Saratoga,” and the “Ticonderoga” and the “Preble” astern of the flagship. In this order the ships lay at anchor in Plattsburg Bay, awaiting the arrival of the enemy. Careful preparations had been made beforehand to wind or turn the “Saratoga”



THOMAS MACDONOUGH.*

in case her engaged broadside should become disabled. On the 11th of September the English fleet, under Commodore Downie, appeared in sight, and, rounding Cumberland Head, advanced to the attack. Prevost's army had already arrived before Plattsburg, but remained inactive, awaiting the issue of the naval battle. Macdonough's position was well chosen, and he was enabled to inflict serious loss upon the enemy as the latter advanced. Finally Downie came to anchor, and opened fire. The mortality on both sides was great, the water being smooth and the guns fired at point-blank

NOTE TO OPPOSITE CUT. — Fac-simile of a plate in Bouchette's *Brit. Dominions in No. Amer.* (London, 1832). This Canadian fort was built by M. de Chambly before the English conquest, and was strongly garrisoned during the war, 1812-14, and made a rendezvous in the last year for a force of over 6,000 men. Cf. the woodcuts in P. Stansbury's *Pedestrian Tour in No. America* (N. Y., 1822), p. 228; and in Cassell's *United States*, ii. 468.

* After a print in the *Analectic Magazine*, vii. 201, engraved by Gimbrede, after a painting by J. W. Jarvis. (Cf. Lossing's *War of 1812*, pp. 856, 879.) There is another engraving by J. B. Forrest in the *National Portrait Gallery*, vol. i.; and engraved by Freeman, it is given in Cooper's *Naval Hist.* (London), vol. ii. A medal likeness is given in Loubat, no. 35, and in Lossing, p. 878. The title-page of the *Analectic Mag.*, July-Dec., 1818, has a vignette, showing Com. Macdonough's farmhouse on Cumberland Bay, Lake Champlain, and in the distance the American forts, Plattsburg, and the camp of Sir George Prevost. It has been reproduced in Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 879.

range. The "Preble" was driven from her position by the enemy. On the other hand, the "Finch" was disabled by the "Ticonderoga" and drifted ashore, and the "Chubb" was captured. The fight continued between the "Ticonderoga" and the enemy's gunboats at the rear, and between the two flagships at the head of the line. The "Ticonderoga," gallantly defended by Captain Cassin, finally succeeded in driving off the gunboats. The "Saratoga," when her starboard guns were gradually disabled, succeeded, by the help of the appliances previously prepared, in turning and bringing a fresh broadside to bear. This attack proved to be too much for the "Confiance," whose captain, Downie, had already fallen, and she surrendered, the other vessels of the enemy's force sharing her fate.

Sir George Prevost, seeing the result of the battle in the bay, made only a feeble demonstration against Plattsburg, and presently retreated to Canada.

The second of the armies of invasion of 1814 was commanded by General Ross, and was an excellent force, although not numerically large. Its objective point was the Chesapeake, and it was accompanied by a powerful fleet under Vice-Admiral Sir Alexander Cochrane, who had now replaced Sir John Warren. Rear-Admiral Cockburn remained as second in command, his knowledge of the bay and of the people around it, gained during his previous service, being of great value to the expedition. The troops arrived about the middle of August. For two months past Admiral Cockburn had been scouring the bay, and had effected landings at nearly every important inlet, where he destroyed such stores as he could reach, the small militia detachments in the neighborhood generally falling back at his approach.

Upon the arrival of the troops, the fleet proceeded up the Patuxent River, where General Ross and his army landed, with Admiral Cockburn, to march against Washington. Intimations of the projected attack had been received by the government in June,¹ and early in July preliminary preparations were made for defence. A tenth military district was created, composed of Maryland, the District of Columbia, and the adjacent counties of Virginia, and General William H. Winder, a Baltimore lawyer who had seen some service in Canada the year before, when he had been taken prisoner, was appointed to the command. His force consisted of a very small body — numbering perhaps 500 — of regular troops, and the district militia of about 2,000 men. The Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia militia was subject to call, but Armstrong regarded an attack upon Washington as improbable, and the government funds being then exceedingly low, he had postponed the summons. A month, which the militia might have passed in training, had their officers been competent to train them, was thus lost, and the call, which was only issued towards the end of July, when the Brit-

¹ From Gallatin and Bayard, *Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.* i. 524.

ish fleet had arrived in the bay, came so late that only the Maryland troops reached the ground before the invasion was over. A flotilla of gunboats, under Commodore Joshua Barney, a famous officer of the Revolutionary navy, lying at the time in the upper Patuxent, was destroyed at the enemy's approach, and Barney joined Winder with 500 seamen, the only body that offered any resistance to the enemy.

The expeditionary force under Ross and Cockburn, for it could hardly be called an army, composed of about 4,500 men, without cavalry, and with only such artillery as the seamen could haul, marched from the landing to the neighborhood of Washington. The expedition, from a military standpoint, was a rash venture, and had the defence been conducted with any judgment whatever, would have ended in overwhelming disaster. The experience of Cockburn, however, with the militia on Chesapeake Bay had led him to gauge accurately the probabilities of opposition,



JOSHUA BARNEY.*


and the British advanced for five days into the heart of an enemy's country, away from their base of supplies, heavily laden, in a severe climate, through a country favorable for incessant attack, without meeting the slightest resistance. On the 24th of August they arrived at Bladensburg, on the eastern branch of the Potomac.

The engagement that took place at this point, known as the battle of Bladensburg, was a battle only in name. By the arrival of the Maryland militia the night before, Winder's army had mounted up to 6,000 men, at a low estimate, with some cavalry, and a large number of guns from the Navy Yard, a force quite double that of the enemy, with the additional advantage of position and the neighborhood of a base. The British troops were worn out with their march, and hardly in a condition to resist a vigorous attack, even from an inferior force. They had entered on a hazardous undertaking, and a slight repulse would have resulted in a disastrous retreat, with the ultimate destruction of their force.

The victory of the enemy under these apparently hopeless circumstances was due to the incapacity of the military authorities and to the demoralization

* From the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1839, vol. iv., following a drawing by W. G. Armstrong, after a miniature by Isabey. Cf. Lossing, 930. A likeness by Wood is in Mrs. Barney's *Biog. Mem. of Barney*.

zation of the militia. The latter defect might have been corrected if time had been taken for the purpose; but for the former, which tended still further to destroy the confidence of the men, there was no remedy. The President, as commander-in-chief of the army, was on the field, together with Monroe, the Secretary of State, Armstrong, the Secretary of War, and other members of the cabinet; and while General Winder was ostensibly in command, the civil functionaries took a hand in directing details, and orders were given and countermanded by amateurs, with the enemy in sight, until the army presented a spectacle of rare confusion. As the enemy advanced, the militia stampeded, carrying with them the President and the officials. Barney's artillery held its ground, and inflicted considerable loss; indeed, almost the only collision between opposing forces in the battle was the artillery fight of the sailors. The latter, however, being



FORT MCHENRY AND THE ENTRANCE TO BALTIMORE HARBOR.*

unsupported, were presently outflanked on both sides, and they also fled. The Americans passed through Washington, and that part of the force which remained together, comprising 2,000 or more men, occupied Georgetown.

The enemy took possession of the city and burnt the Capitol, the Executive Mansion, the Treasury, and the state and war departments, with such part of their contents as had not been removed. The pecuniary loss from the destruction of these buildings, for which the burning of the parliament house at York furnished some sort of justification, was considerable, but it was as nothing compared with the irreparable loss of records which were consumed by the fire. A wholesale destruction of property at the Navy Yard, including several ships on the stocks, was begun by the Americans and finished by the British. Ross only remained a night and a day at

* After a print in the *Analectic Magazine*, Oct., 1818. Cf. cut in Gay's *U. S.*, iv. 223; and in Lossing, 954, where are other views of neighboring localities. Cf. the view in *The Naval Temple* (Boston, 1816), and the fac-simile in Preble's *Amer. Flag*, 2d ed., p. 724.

Washington, and withdrawing deliberately, took up his line of march to the Patuxent and rejoined the fleet. No special precautions were taken on the return march, nor were any needed, for the retreating enemy was suffered to go on his way without molestation. While the retreat was in progress a detachment of the enemy's fleet, under Captain Gordon, which had moved up the Potomac, attacked Fort Washington, which was immediately abandoned, and, appearing before Alexandria, captured all the vessels in the port and an immense quantity of merchandise. The prizes and stores were then carried safely down the river.

The immediate result of this episode, the culmination of all the military disasters of the war, was the enforced resignation of Secretary Armstrong, who was not, however, the only person to blame for it.

Early in September, the British squadron made an attempt upon Baltimore, but the advance of the ships was checked by the naval defences and by Fort McHenry, which held out successfully against bombardment. The army which had landed at North Point met with considerable loss in a series of skirmishes, General Ross being among the killed. The strength of the defences and the large number of militia which had been called out led the enemy to abandon the attempt; and after an ineffectual boat expedition, the fleet sailed away from the Patapsco, and the greater part of it soon after left the bay.

Other detachments had already made incursions at points along the coast, especially in Maine, but none of them assumed the importance of Ross's daring raid upon Washington; while an attack of four sloops-of-war under Captain Percy in the "Hermes," on Fort Bowyer, at the entrance of Mobile Bay, was met by the determined resistance of Major Lawrence, the officer in command, and ended in the destruction of the "Hermes" and the repulse of the assailants.¹

In December, the British undertook the invasion of Louisiana, the most important offensive movement made, thus far, during the war. A large fleet appeared off Lake Borgne, with 10,000 veteran troops, commanded by General Keane, and afterwards by General Sir E. Pakenham. The army was moved through the bayous to the left bank of the Mississippi, below New Orleans. Here it was met by General Jackson, who, upon his return from a short campaign in Florida, had assumed the command at New Orleans, and had with great difficulty formed an army out of local militia, levies hastily raised in Kentucky and Tennessee, the free negroes of Louisiana, and the Baratavia outlaws, under their chief Lafitte. He also obtained material assistance from a small naval force, which, from its position on the river, was able to assail the enemy in flank.

On the 23d of December, Jackson made a night attack upon the enemy's advance position on the river, where General Keane was in command. The attack, though vigorous, produced no decisive result, and Jackson withdrew

¹ For Jackson's general order narrating the incidents of this conflict, see *Am. St. Pap., Indian Affairs*, i. 860.

to a well-chosen position between the swamp and the river. Here he intrenched himself. A demonstration made by the enemy on the 28th was successfully repulsed, and after ten days of further preparation the final attack was made, January 8, 1815, Pakenham leading the main assault, and Colonel Thornton at the same time attacking a small work which had been thrown up on the opposite side of the river. The latter movement was successful, but the main column, advancing to storm Jackson's position, after



COM. CHARLES STEWART.*

capturing a small detached work on his right, was twice thrown back in confusion. General Pakenham was killed and General Gibbs mortally wounded; and General Lambert, who succeeded to the command, finding that the protracted struggle was of no avail, retreated after the loss of over 2,000 killed and wounded. The Americans, according to Jackson's official report, lost sixty-two. The British army fell back to Lake Borgne, where it reëmbarked, and the expedition was abandoned.

In the mean time the American commissioners at Ghent had agreed upon a treaty of peace, which was immediately ratified by the British govern-

* From an engraving in the *Analectic Mag.* (Dec., 1815), vol. vi., made by Goodman after a picture by Wood. There is a picture in Independence Hall. The medal with profile likeness, given to him for his capture of the "Cyane" and "Levant" in the "Constitution," is in Loubat, no. 48; in Frost's *Book of the Commodores*; and in Lossing, 986, who also gives a likeness taken in 1864 (p. 987). Cf. *Democratic Rev.*, xxviii. 449.

ment, and in February peace was declared in America. The whole country was so thoroughly tired of the contest that it was ready for peace at almost any price. The finances were in a desperate condition, and although, under the alarm caused by the recent invasions, great numbers of militia had been organized and armed, the military administration was in a state of worse confusion than ever, and the exposed States were generally taking their own measures for protection, without much reference to the Federal government, which was powerless to help them.

The navy, which had covered itself with credit during the war, was now in a high state of efficiency, and ready for successful employment in any quarter. Several naval engagements had taken place after the commissioners had concluded their negotiations at Ghent. The "President" was captured just outside of New York, by the blockading squadron, on January 15th. In February, the "Constitution," under Stewart, in one of the prettiest actions of the war, took the "Cyane" and the "Levant," the latter being afterwards recaptured; the "Hornet," Captain James Biddle, took the "Penguin" in March; and, last of all, the "Peacock," Captain Warrington, took the East India Company's sloop "Nautilus" in June.

Before the return of these vessels, the government resolved to send a squadron to the Mediterranean, where the Dey of Algiers, taking advantage of the withdrawal of United States cruisers, had resumed his old trade of piracy. The new ships, constructed in the latter part of the war, were rapidly completed and equipped, and in May Commodore Decatur, with a powerful squadron of eleven ships, sailed for the Mediterranean. The Algerines, supposing that the naval power of the United States had been crushed by the war with England, had no expectation of meeting an enemy. Before they could learn of his setting out, Decatur had surprised and captured two of their cruisers at sea, and, suddenly



COM. JAMES BIDDLE.*

* From an engraving in the *Analectic Mag.* (Nov., 1815), vol. vi., made by Gimbrede after a painting by Wood. Thos. Sully's picture of Biddle is owned by Craig Biddle, Esq., of Philad. (*Philad. Loan Exhib. Catal.*, no. 32). There is a profile likeness on the medal (Loubat, no. 49; Frost's *Commodores*; Lossing, 991, who reproduces also, p. 990, another portrait) given to him for the capture of the "Penguin" in the "Hornet."

appearing before the city, he frightened the Dey into setting free his American prisoners without ransom, and signing a treaty abolishing the tribute.¹ Indemnity was next recovered from Tunis and Tripoli for violations of their neutrality during the war, in permitting the capture of American vessels within the territorial waters. The effect of Decatur's presence was increased by the arrival soon after of a new fleet under Commodore Bainbridge, whose flagship, the "Independence," 74, was the first American line-of-battle ship in the Mediterranean. Since that time there have been no serious difficulties with the Barbary powers.

The United States now entered upon a long period of peace, which, during thirty years, was only broken by Indian campaigns and by operations against pirates. The army now numbered about 10,000 men. The first of the Indian wars occurred in 1817-18, and was occasioned by outrages alleged to have been committed by the Seminoles upon settlers on the borders of Florida, which was still a Spanish possession. General Jackson took the field at the head of an army of regulars, friendly Creeks, and volunteers from Georgia and Tennessee. The "war" was a mere foray into Florida, little resistance being made by the Seminoles, who were the ostensible object of attack; while considerable disturbance was caused by Jackson's highhanded proceedings in seizing the Spanish posts of St. Mark's and Pensacola, and in executing two English subjects who were accused of aiding and inciting the Indians.

During the years 1821-1825, the navy was actively employed in the suppression of piracy in the West Indies, the squadrons being commanded successively by Henley, Biddle, Porter, and Warrington. The service was arduous and difficult, but it was carried out successfully, and, after four years of determined resistance, the gangs of pirates which infested the coasts of Cuba and the neighboring islands were completely broken up.

In 1832, the Sacs and Foxes, led by their restless chief Black Hawk, at this time sixty-five years old, crossed the Mississippi to recover the lands formerly held by them east of the river. General Scott was to have conducted the campaign against them, but before his arrival they were twice defeated, — first by Colonel Dodge, and finally and completely at Bad Axe, early in August, by General Henry Atkinson. Black Hawk soon after surrendered.

On May 9th, 1832, a treaty was signed at Payne's Landing, Fla., by Colonel Gadsden, on the part of the United States, and by the chiefs of the Seminoles, in which the latter consented, upon certain conditions, to a removal to lands west of the Mississippi. Two years elapsed before the treaty was ratified, and the delay had an unfavorable effect; so much so that when preparations were at last made for removal a large number of the chiefs refused to go. The year 1835 was spent in a series of fruitless negotiations, during which occasional outrages, committed by both whites

¹ *Ann. of Cong., 1st sess. 14th Cong., 1475.*

and Indians, increased the bad feeling. At the end of the year the Seminoles divided into two hostile parties, and the chiefs adhering to the treaty, with their followers, were obliged to take refuge near Fort Brooke, while the others, influenced chiefly by the violent half-breed Osceola or Powell, resorted to arms.

Notwithstanding the imminence of the danger and the knowledge of the facts possessed by the government at Washington, very little preparation had been made for hostilities against the Indians. The garrisons of Fort King near the Ocklawaha, and of Fort Brooke at Tampa Bay, between which the enemy lay in the almost inaccessible swamps of the Withlacoochee, comprised altogether less than 450 men. With a part of these, General Clinch, commanding at Fort King, contemplated making an attack, and he sent to Fort Brooke for such men as could be spared. A detachment of 110 men, under Major Dade, was sent to join him; but on the 28th of December, four days after setting out, it was surrounded by the Seminoles, and, after a long struggle, was totally destroyed, only three men escaping with their lives. Three days later, General Clinch's force defeated a detachment of the Indians on the Withlacoochee, after which it withdrew to Fort Drane.

The territory of the United States was at this time divided into two military departments, the eastern under General Scott, and the western under General Gaines; and the present scene of hostilities lay about the dividing line between the two commands. Upon the news of Dade's massacre, and of the Indian raids upon the settlements south of St. Augustine, General Gaines, who was then in Louisiana, got together a body of regulars and volunteers, sailed to Tampa, and, after landing at Fort Brooke, marched to Fort King. Learning that General Scott had been ordered from Washington to take command, and had already arrived in Florida, Gaines, after a short incursion into the Indian territory, withdrew to his department, and soon after Scott took the field with a considerable and well-organized army, the right wing under General Clinch, the centre under Colonel Lindsay, and the left under General Eustis, all of whom advanced in March and April, 1836. No great results followed from this campaign.

In June, 1836, Governor Call took command of the forces in Florida, and in November he defeated the Seminoles on the Withlacoochee River. He was soon after relieved by General Thomas S. Jesup. In the winter campaign of 1836-37, the Indians were driven from their territory about the Withlacoochee, and forced to take refuge in Southern Florida. Negotiations now took place, and in March the chiefs signed a capitulation and agreed to emigrate. The agreement was not carried out; but in October General Jesup succeeded, by a stratagem, in making Osceola a prisoner. The chief was put in confinement, and soon afterwards died, but the war did not come to an end.

In May, 1838, Jesup was relieved by General Taylor, who five months before had defeated the Indians in the battle of Okechobee, on December

25th, 1837. The war now went on for several years in a desultory manner ; General Armistead relieving Taylor, and being in turn superseded by General Worth. This last change was in 1841. After an active campaign, in which Worth and his forces penetrated the swamps where the Seminoles had taken refuge, the fragments that still held out were persuaded to surrender, and were removed from Florida to the West. The war came to an end in 1842, after having cost many lives and a large sum of money.

The next war of the United States was that with Mexico. The causes of the war were intimately connected with the internal politics of the United States. Negotiations had for some time been pending in reference to the Texan question and to certain claims of American citizens against Mexico, the last flicker of which was the ineffectual mission of Slidell in 1845-46. The annexation of Texas, occurring in the summer of 1845, transferred to the United States a dispute between Texas and Mexico, in reference to their common frontier and to the ownership of a strip of territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, which each claimed. The occupation of this territory in March, 1846, by the forces of the United States, under General Taylor, was the ostensible ground of war, the first offensive movement on the part of the Mexicans being the passage of the Rio Grande by General Arista.

After throwing up a work opposite Matamoras, called Fort Brown, Taylor marched with the main body of his troops to protect his depot at Point Isabel, which was threatened by the enemy. During his absence, a protracted attack was made on Fort Brown, which held out with difficulty, until, on the 8th of May, the assailants were drawn off by the return of General Taylor. The latter, with about 2,000 men, on the 8th and 9th, engaged Arista's greatly superior force in the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma. In the first day's fight the Americans, through the efficiency of their artillery, held their ground and beat off the enemy, inflicting a heavy loss. On the second day, Arista, who had retired to intrenchments previously thrown up at Resaca de la Palma, although in a strong position, was completely routed by the Americans, his batteries being captured by a gallant charge of dragoons under Captain Charles May. The pursuit of the Mexicans extended to the river, and the victory was complete. On the 18th, the American forces crossed the Rio Grande and occupied Matamoras.

The army was now delayed for some time, waiting for reinforcements, supplies, and means of transportation. This delay was of inestimable value to the enemy, enabling him to assemble a new army, an advantage which he could not have obtained had Taylor been able to follow up his first blows. The President's call for 50,000 volunteers received a prompt answer, and as they arrived on the ground they were taken in hand by the very capable officers of the regular army, and trained for war. In the war of 1812, military operations had failed almost uniformly through the rawness,

not so much of the troops as of the generals. The Mexican war showed few mistakes, because the officers were well trained, and as a necessary consequence the troops were in a short time well trained also. The war of 1812 on the American side was a war of amateurs ; that with Mexico was a war of professional soldiers and strategists.

Towards the close of August General Taylor began his advance, the three divisions of his army being commanded by Generals Worth, Twiggs, and Butler. On the 20th of September, Taylor reached the neighborhood of Monterey, a strongly fortified city, defended by a large force under General Ampudia. In the battle, which lasted three days, September 21-23, with severe fighting, the enemy's batteries were successfully stormed one by one, and on the 24th Ampudia surrendered. By the terms of the capitulation, which were unusually lenient, the city was to be delivered up, but the Mexican troops, with most of their arms, were allowed to retire.

During the autumn a movement was undertaken against Chihuahua by a separate force, called the army of the centre, under General Wool. It failed to accomplish its object, and was finally united to the force under General Taylor, the latter having been much weakened by detaching troops to take part in Scott's campaign from Vera Cruz. In January, 1847, Taylor had advanced to Agua Nueva, but presently, on the approach of the enemy, fell back to Angostura, near Buena Vista. After having taken up a strong position, with less than 5,000 men, he was attacked on the 22d of February by General Santa Anna, with a force estimated at four times his own. The fight on this day was little more than a skirmish. On the 23d, Santa Anna attacked the Americans with his whole force. The battle lasted from early morning until dark, with varying fortunes. On both sides it was fought with great bravery and obstinacy, the Mexicans, after each repulse, returning resolutely to the attack. At the close of the day, Santa Anna retired, and the Americans were left in possession, not only of the field but of the district. The loss in the battle was heavy, being estimated at 700 on the American side, and on the Mexican at 2,500, in addition to 3,000 who were reported missing, but who had in fact deserted. The battle of Buena Vista closed the operations of Taylor's campaign, the invasion being now directed upon a new line from Vera Cruz.

In the mean time, other operations, conducted on a small scale, but momentous in their results, had been taking place in a different quarter. In addition to the army of occupation under General Taylor, and the army of the centre under General Wool, a third force, known as the army of the west, composed of about 1,800 men, chiefly Missouri volunteers, had been placed under the command of Colonel (afterwards General) S. W. Kearny, to operate against New Mexico and California. After a march of 900 miles through the deserts, lasting nearly two months, Kearny's force reached Santa Fé on the 18th of August, 1846. At this point the command was divided. Colonel Price remained in command in New Mexico. General Kearny took up his march to California ; and three months later, in De-

cember, a force of 1,000 or more men, under Colonel Doniphan, invaded Chihuahua. After a protracted winter campaign in the enemy's country, in the course of which he gained two victories, at Brazito and at the river Sacramento, Doniphan, on the 2d of March, 1847, entered the city of Chihuahua, the capital of the province. Having completed his conquest, he communicated with General Taylor, and received orders to join Wool at Saltillo. From this point his command proceeded to Matamoras, where it embarked for home.

General Kearny had set out for California with 100 dragoons. His force was reduced somewhat on the march, and near his journey's end, in an engagement at San Pasqual, it was nearly cut off. A detachment from the fleet on the coast was sent inland to its rescue, and the remains of the force arrived safely at San Diego.

Long before Kearny's arrival possession had been taken of the principal ports in California. In June, 1846, Commodore Sloat, commanding the Pacific squadron, learned at Mazatlan of the passage of the Rio Grande. Under the orders which he had received to "employ his force to the best advantage," he at once sailed for Monterey (Cal.) and seized the town, while Commander Montgomery took a similar step at Yerba Buena, or San Francisco. Captain Frémont, an engineer officer in command of a surveying party, after raising the flag at points in the interior, joined forces with the fleet at Monterey. Late in July, Commodore Stockton, an energetic and brilliant officer, relieved Commodore Sloat, and organizing a naval brigade, he marched upon Los Angeles, the capital of California. The Mexican forces fled at his approach, and he took possession of Los Angeles. California was then declared a territory of the United States, a constitution was drawn up, and Frémont was appointed governor.

In September, during Stockton's absence at the North, a rising of the Mexicans took place in the interior, and after driving out the garrison they recovered possession of Los Angeles. Laying siege to San Pedro, they were presently repulsed by the commodore on his return, and the latter set about more elaborate preparations for a second attack on the capital. About this time (December, 1846) General Kearny arrived, but his coming added only sixty men to the commodore's force of five hundred seamen and marines. Towards the end of the month the expedition set out under Stockton's command, and in two well-fought battles, at San Gabriel and the Mesa River, on January 8 and 9, 1847, the enemy was totally defeated. For the second and last time California was conquered. Soon after, detachments of troops, sent around by sea, arrived, and were detailed for garrison duty at the scattered posts. The important result of these operations was the cession of a territory of over 600,000 square miles to the United States at the close of the war.

After Stockton's second expedition, the fleet, now commanded by Commodore Shubrick, was engaged only in detached enterprises along the coast, the most important of which was the capture of Mazatlan. On the east

coast, the naval forces under Commodore David Conner, and later under Commodore M. C. Perry, maintained an extensive blockade, and took possession one by one of the ports on or near the coast, — Tampico, Tabasco, Alvarado, and Tuspan. One of the most important services rendered by the navy was its co-operation in the reduction of Vera Cruz, after landing the army which was to march from that point to the Mexican capital.

General Scott, who was to command the new movement, arrived off Vera Cruz early in March, 1847, with a force of 12,000 men. The disembarkation was effected on the 9th, and for the next ten days the army was employed in erecting batteries and completing its line of investment. In addition to the siege-guns and mortars, one battery was thrown up, in which were mounted the heavy guns from the ships-of-war. It was planted within seven hundred yards of the city wall and manned by the navy, and it did more execution than all the other batteries put together. General Morales having refused to comply with Scott's demand for a surrender, the bombardment opened on the 22d. It continued for four days, doing great injury to the city and its inhabitants. On the 29th the city surrendered, together with the castle of San Juan d'Ulloa, situated on a reef to the northward.

While Scott was bombarding Vera Cruz, a revolution at the Mexican capital had made Santa Anna president of the republic. Bestirring himself to raise money and troops, the new president was able shortly after to concentrate an army of 12,000 men at the almost inaccessible pass of Cerro Gordo, which lay between Vera Cruz and the City of Mexico. General Scott, arriving with his troops before Cerro Gordo, found the enemy's position too strong to be carried in front, and with great labor cut a road around the mountain. On the 17th of April he had reached the Jalapa road and obtained an advantageous position, and the next morning he attacked Santa Anna's rear with great fury. A difficult and impetuous advance of a part of Twiggs's division, under Colonel Harney, resulted in carrying the tower of Cerro Gordo, the key to the enemy's position. On the Mexican right, General Pillow's division made an attack under a withering fire from the enemy, and, though driven back, finally succeeded in compelling the surrender of General Vega with 3,000 men. Upon the fall of Cerro Gordo and the capture of Vega, Santa Anna found it necessary to make good his retreat. Less than a month later the American army occupied the city of Puebla.

General Scott remained at Puebla during June and July, awaiting reinforcements and drilling them as they arrived. On the 7th of August he set out for the capital, which was now defended by about 30,000 troops. A series of encounters took place on the 19th, and on the next day three battles were fought, at Contreras, Churubusco, and San Antonio. They were in reality parts of one general engagement. The troops on both sides fought with stubbornness and bravery, but in the end the Mexicans were completely routed, and the pursuit of the flying enemy reached almost to the gates of the capital.

A commissioner, Nicholas P. Trist, having been previously appointed to negotiate with the Mexicans, an armistice was now agreed upon, to begin on the 23d of August. The armistice, from a strategic point of view, was a mistake. The advantage of the overwhelming victories of the 19th and 20th was in great part lost, and the Mexicans were enabled to recover from the demoralization which had followed their defeat. The position of the American army, in the heart of the enemy's country, where it might be cut off from reinforcements and supplies, was full of danger, and the fortifications which barred the way to the capital, Molino del Rey, Casa Mata, and Chapultepec, were exceedingly formidable.

On the 7th of September the armistice came to an end. The negotiations had failed, and General Scott prepared to move on the remaining works. A reconnoissance was made on that day, and on the 8th Scott attacked the enemy. The army of Santa Anna was drawn up with its right resting on Casa Mata, and its left on Molino del Rey. Both these positions were carried by assault, and the Mexicans, after severe loss, were defeated and driven off the field.

The next two days were occupied in preparing for the final assault upon Chapultepec. A careful disposition was made of the troops, batteries were planted within range, and on the 12th they opened a destructive fire. On the 13th a simultaneous assault was made from both sides, the troops storming the fortress with great bravery and dash, and the works were carried, the enemy flying in confusion. The army followed them along the two causeways of Belen and San Cosmé, fighting its way to the gates of the city. Here the struggle continued till after nightfall, the enemy making a desperate defence.

Early the next morning, a deputation of the city council waited upon General Scott, asking for terms of capitulation. These were refused, and the divisions of Worth and Quitman entered the capital. Street fighting was kept up for two days longer, but by the 16th the Americans had secure possession of the city. Negotiations were now renewed, and the occupation of the territory, meanwhile, continued. The principal towns were garrisoned, and taxes and duties collected by the United States. Occasional encounters took place at various points, but the warfare was chiefly of a guerrilla character. Towards the close of the war General Scott was superseded by General Butler. But the work had been already completed. On the 2d of February, 1848, the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed, by which California and New Mexico were ceded to the United States, and ratifications were exchanged in the following spring. The skill and daring of the officers, and the discipline, endurance, and courage of the men, during the war with Mexico, were as noticeable as the absence of these qualities during the war of 1812.

CRITICAL ESSAY ON THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

I. GENERAL WORKS. — The principal repository of original authorities in print is, of course, the Congressional series of documents. The regularly numbered documents begin with the 2d session of the 13th Congress (1813) in the House, and the 1st session of the 14th (1815) in the Senate. Prior to this date the publications were made without much order or sequence, and it is now almost impossible to tell what the full series comprises.¹ These early documents, with others of a later period, have been in great part reprinted, by order of Congress, in the *American State Papers*,² some of which are *Indian Affairs*, two vols., to March 3, 1827; *Military Affairs*, seven vols., to 1838; and *Naval Affairs*, four vols., to 1836. The documents were selected and edited by the secretary of the Senate and clerk of the House, and comprise every variety of reports, returns, registers, proceedings of courts of inquiry and courts-martial, reports of Congressional committees, despatches, and correspondence.³

The MS. archives of the War Department (Secretary's office) begin in 1800. The correspondence is in two series, letters sent and letters received. The abruptness in the commencement of the correspondence is explained in the first document in the series of letters sent. This is a letter of Nov. 10, 1800, from Acting Secretary Dexter, directing the preparation of a new seal for the department, and it begins with these words: "On Saturday evening last, my office, with all the records, papers, &c., was consumed by fire."⁴ From the date of the fire the correspondence proceeds without break. It has no classification, but the arrangement is generally chronological. The letters received are in loose files, with indexes. The letters sent are copies written in volumes, and therefore much more easy of access for purposes of investigation. Upon the establishment of the differ-

¹ [The readiest key to them is Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*. — ED.]

² [See *ante*, p. 294. — ED.]

³ The series on *Indian Affairs* gives in detail the documentary history of the dealings of the United States with the Indians to 1828. Of the volumes on *Military Affairs*, the first contains considerable material relating to the War of 1812, especially the campaign of the Northern army in 1813, and the capture of Washington. It also comprises all the documents relating to the First Seminole War. A vast quantity of papers on the Second Seminole War will be found in vols. vi. and vii. The other volumes relate almost wholly to administrative matters, — the organization and discipline of the army, the military academy, fortifications, ordnance, armories, and militia.

The four volumes on *Naval Affairs* are also chiefly useful as a history of naval administration. Much space is given to the record of unimportant courts-martial. Brief reports are published from commanding officers in many of the engagements of 1812-15, though by no means all. The proof-reading is more accurate than in the private publications of despatches, and the lives of many leading officers, which should therefore be verified by the *State Papers*, for names and dates, when practicable. The first volume contains Fulton's scarce pamphlet on the torpedo. The Pirates' war is partly covered in

vols. i. and ii. Vols. iii. and iv. relate almost wholly to the routine business of the navy.

Owing to the intimate relation between the two subjects, many papers referring to the war-history will be found in the early volumes of the series on *Foreign Relations*, which throw light on the subject of French spoliations and the hostilities of 1798, difficulties with the Barbary powers, and the negotiations which preceded and terminated the war of 1812.

Reference has been made on another page to the several official publications of the proceedings of Congress, which include many of the documents also given in the *State Papers*; and the collections of treaties referred to in the following chapter necessarily contain provisions as to the mode of carrying on war, especially in reference to contraband, blockade, privateering, maritime capture, and to dealings with the Barbary States, France, and Great Britain, and the student of war-history will find many important points touched upon therein.

Niles's Register (75 vols.) is an indispensable record of current events, from its first publication in September, 1811, to its close, July, 1849. It is especially full in relation to naval and military affairs, and the student must have it constantly before him, but sometimes give scrutiny to its accompanying comments.

⁴ See *Report* of committee of the House of Rep., on the causes of the fire, in *Amer. State Papers, Misc.*, i. 247.

ent staff-offices, the correspondence relating to their special branches was transferred to them, and has so remained. The more important reports on military operations were published in Congressional documents, and afterwards in the *American State Papers*, but a large mass of material is to be found in the Secretary's office of the War Department and in its dependencies, much of which has never been made the subject of thorough and critical examination.

The MS. archives of the Navy Department fortunately escaped a later and similar peril. The burning of the department by the British in 1814 involved no loss of records, as Secretary Jones reports (*Am. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, i. 320) that all the papers and effects, except the furniture of the office, were preserved. The fire in the War Office in 1800 had, however, destroyed many papers connected with the administration of the navy during the period prior to the establishment of the Navy Department in 1798. Fragments of these papers, including letters of Secretary James McHenry on subjects connected with the new frigates, may be seen, with their charred edges, in the library of the Navy Department. They have only the interest of relics. From 1798 to 1805 the archives are scanty, but after the latter date they have been carefully preserved. They are arranged in classes, according to a simple and easily understood system, and, having been bound in volumes and fully indexed, are readily accessible. In fact, there are few series of early archives in Washington in so satisfactory a condition for the student as those of the Navy Department. As in the War Department, the correspondence is arranged in two groups, letters received and letters sent. Of the letters received during the period 1789-1850, the most important series is that known as "Captains' letters," in 350 volumes, beginning in 1805. Of nearly equal interest are the "Masters' Commandant letters," 1804-1837, and the "Commanders' letters," 1838-1850, making 92 volumes in all. In addition to the above, a series of 390 volumes of "Officers' letters" begins in 1802. A comprehensive class is that of "Miscellaneous letters," 426 volumes, beginning in 1794. As the business of the department increased, and work was distributed more systematically among its offices, new series were begun. Thus the reports of the African squadron date from 1819, Marine Corps letters from 1828, and Executive letters from 1843. Communications from the Board of Navy Commissioners form a series from 1827 to 1842, when the board was abolished and its place taken by the bureaus, whose correspondence begins at this time. Classified reports from cruising stations, including the Brazil, Mediterranean, Pacific, East and West Indian, and Home squadrons begin in the years 1844-46, and Navy-yard reports about 1848.

The "Letters sent," as might be expected, are much less numerous, comprising for the period about 170 volumes of all classes. The most important of these, as far as naval operations are concerned, are the 60 volumes of *Instructions to officers of ships of war*, and 30 volumes of "General letters." The instructions to commanders of gunboats, 1803-8, are contained in a separate volume. A single volume, for 1803, is devoted to the Barbary powers. The volumes of instructions, together with those known as "Captains' letters," "Masters' Commandant and Commanders' letters," and "Officers' letters," are indispensable to the student of the naval wars, and the naval history of the United States cannot be adequately written without a careful examination of them. The examination must be supplemented by the study of the records of the Office of Detail, and of the court-martial records contained in the office of the judge-advocate-general.

Hildreth, as the leading comprehensive historian for a long period, gives in his *History of the United States* a reasonably full and correct synopsis of military and naval events down to 1820, though nothing more. His judgments upon the incompetent military leaders in the war of 1812 are severe, though not too severe. He has an evident desire to be fair, though with Federalist leanings, which crop out even in criticism of matters purely military. On the whole, his book, so far as it goes, is accurate and just.¹

¹ [Lossing, beginning with the troubles with France, comes down to the close of the war of 1812. Schouler comes down to 1831. McMaster has made a bare beginning. Gay's *Pop. Hist.*

A full and detailed statement of legislative and executive measures affecting the War Department¹ and its various branches, including the adjutant-general's and inspector-general's departments, the corps of engineers and of topographical engineers, the ordnance, the judge-advocate-general's, quartermaster's, subsistence, pay, and medical departments, will be found in T. H. S. Hamersly's *Complete Army and Navy Register, 1776-1887* (N. Y., 1888), pp. 215-381. The book is roughly made up, with irregular paging, and the passage referred to will be found in what may be called the second part. It makes no pretensions to a narrative treatment, but is rather a full collection of notes upon the statutory and administrative history of the army. The paper on the organization and administration of the War Department proper, although printed by Hamersly as original matter, was prepared by William A. De Caidry, of the subsistence department, as a part of the report of the board on behalf of the United States Executive Departments at the International Exhibition of 1876. The same paper, as well as that on the Corps of Engineers, by Lt.-Col. Thomas L. Casey, was published in the appendix to the *Report of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Army*, commonly known as the Burnside Report (45th Cong., 3d Sess., Senate Rep. no. 555, Dec. 12, 1878), an invaluable storehouse of materials on the subject of army administration and organization. The *Compilation of Official Documents illustrative of the Organization of the Army of the United States, from 1789 to 1876* (Washington, 1876) was made for the use of the Board for the Reorganization of the Army, Sept. 1, 1876. It is a reprint of various reports and papers, some of which may be found in the series of Congressional documents, or in the *Amer. State Papers, Mil. Affairs*. Unofficial papers are also included, and tabular abstracts of force at various periods are especially useful.²

The above works have a quasi-official character. No good history of the army has been written. Such a work, based on official authorities, with critical discussions from a professional standpoint, is much needed. The ground is partly covered by a work of great value in a hitherto unexplored field of research, Lieut. William E. Birkhimer's *Historical Sketch of the organization, administration, matériel and tactics of the Artillery, U. S. Army* (Washington, 1884), pp. vii and 406. Indefatigable industry, a clear and concise style, and a thorough technical familiarity with the subject give the author an unusual grasp and certainty in handling the obscure material out of which he has constructed a most satisfactory work. Another important work is Col. A. G. Brackett's *History of the U. S. Cavalry from the formation of the government* (N. Y., 1865). Equal commendation cannot be extended to L. D. Ingersoll's *History of the War Department* (Wash., 1879), a sketchy and imperfect book.

The beginnings of the navy (1794) were made under the auspices of the War Department.³

Of unofficial histories of the naval service, the *History of the United States Navy*, by James Fenimore Cooper, has long had the field to itself. It is written in the somewhat pompous style of the period (1839), and although it has a strong fascination as a sea-story, its historical value has been somewhat overrated. Cooper's naval officers have all been cast in the same mould of heroic type and proportions. They are classic and statuesque,

U. S. covers the whole period of the present chapter. There are no other general histories worth considering. — ED.]

¹ Established Aug. 7, 1789 (*Statutes at Large*, i. 49).

² Cf. William A. Gordon's *Compilation of Registers of the Army of the U. S., 1815-1837. Appended a list of officers on whom brevets were conferred for services during the war with Great Britain* (Washington, 1837).

³ [Washington recommended further action in 1796 (*Statesman's Manual*, i.; Benton's *De-*

bates). John Adams failed (1797) to secure the support he hoped for (Morse's *John Adams*, 279; Adams's *Works*, index). In 1797, the launching of the "United States," "Constitution," and "Constellation" was a decided step (Upham's *Pickering*, iii. 155; McMaster, ii. 323, 384, 431). The creation of the Navy Department, under the act of April 30, 1798, showed the final triumph of a Federalist measure. The action of the government can be traced through the index (pp. 1332-1333) of Poore's *Descriptive Catal.* — ED.]

but scarcely human, and there is little or nothing to differentiate them. As James, the leading English authority, sees everything from the British standpoint, Cooper sees everything from the American; but while James is violent and scurrilous, Cooper is always dignified, and on the whole rather patronizing to the enemy. His one-sidedness never shows itself in abuse, but occasionally in passing over an inconvenient episode either in silence or with only a general and cursory allusion. In the statement of essential details he is often unsatisfactory, and he relies too frequently upon the recollection of traditions current in his day in the service. He does not appear to have made a thorough study of the records except in so far as they had appeared in print. Considering that his book was subsequent to James, and that it was clearly designed to present the American side, it is remarkably inadequate as an answer to the charges of the British historian.

The *United States Naval Chronicle*, by Charles W. Goldsborough, vol. i. (Washington, 1824), although entirely devoid of literary construction, is the most useful book of reference on the navy during the period of the first four presidential terms. The author had exceptional facilities for obtaining authentic information, having been attached to the Navy Department forty-four years, — as its first chief clerk from 1798 to 1815, as secretary of the Board of Navy Commissioners from 1815 to 1842, and finally as chief of the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing. Although the volume designated vol. i. was published in 1824, and the author remained in office until his death in 1843, he never carried out his intention of giving a second volume to the press, — a fact much to be regretted, as his documentary materials were the original archives of the department, and no other man had so great a familiarity with every detail of its operations. The narrative, if the name can be applied to Goldsborough's scrappy and disjointed statement of events, is brought down to the conclusion of the treaty with Tripoli, and is followed by a series of valuable notes upon the different branches of naval organization, including gunboats, docks, marine railways, disputes concerning rank, and the hospital and pension funds.

Lieut. (afterwards Rear-Admiral) Geo. F. Emmons's *Navy of the United States from the Commencement, 1775 to 1853* (Washington, 1853), is a statistical work, compiled from sources in the Navy Department. It consists wholly of tables, showing the ships in the navy at various periods, their prizes, and the essential facts about their construction. It also gives lists of privateers during the wars of the Revolution and of 1812, with captures made during the latter. It is a valuable compilation, but it can only be safely used with a discriminating eye, as it has occasional, and in some cases very glaring, typographical errors, — a serious fault in any work, but especially serious in a statistical work.

Thomas Clark's *Naval History of the United States from the Commencement of the Revolutionary War to the present time, January 3, 1814*, 2d ed.,¹ was the first book which attempted to treat the subject as a whole, and is a very creditable work for the period. The accounts of operations, however, based largely on newspaper statements, must be taken with caution. The narrative is confined to the first volume. The second and perhaps more valuable volume comprises the statutory history of the navy, administrative regulations, statistical matters, and prize-lists.

A brief but important *History of the U. S. Marine Corps* (Boston, 1875), by M. Almy Aldrich, from documents compiled by Capt. Richard S. Collum, U. S. M. C., is a work of labor and research, and is the only book on the subject.²

¹ [The original edition was called *Sketches of the Naval History of the United States* (Philad., 1813). — ED.]

² A large collection of pamphlets and tracts on different branches of naval administration and legislation is to be found in the Navy Department library. Minor works of value are: *History of the U. S. Navy Yard at Gosport, Va.* (Wash., 1874), by Comr. E. P. Lull, U. S. N.; *Centennial History of the U. S. Navy Yard at Portsmouth,*

N. H. (Portsmouth, 1876), by W. E. H. Fentress. The only considerable account of the Charleston Navy Yard is that by Admiral Preble in the *Memorial History of Boston*. The earlier navy lists are to be found in the *American State Papers, Naval Affs.* A *Complete List of the American Navy* was published at Boston in 1813. An official Register was published at Washington in 1814, by order of the Senate. The regular series of *Naval registers*, published by order of the

II. WORKS RELATING TO SPECIAL PERIODS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL HISTORY, 1789-1850. — Respecting the first Algerine difficulty (prior to 1795) the *Am. St. Pap.*,

Secretary of the Navy, begins with that of Aug. 1, 1815. No register was published in 1816, but from 1817 the issues were made regularly. The library of the Navy Department contains one of the very few complete sets in existence. In 1848, Mechlin and Winder's *General Register of the navy and marine corps since 1798* was published at Washington. The latest edition of Hamersly's *Complete general Navy Register, 1776-1887*, was published at New York in 1888.

A large number of books on the navy may be dismissed with a brief mention, few of them being of any historical value. Among them are: *The pictorial history of the American Navy* (N. Y., 1845), and the *Book of the navy* (N. Y., 1842), both by John Frost; Barber Badger's *Naval Temple* (Boston, 1816), which was popular enough to pass through later editions before, with slight variations, it was re-issued (Boston, 1831, 1837; Concord, N. H., 1848) as *American Naval Battles; Memoirs of the generals, commodores, and other commanders in the army and navy* (Philad., 1848), by Thomas Wyatt; *The Army and Navy of America* (Philad., 1845), by Jacob K. Neff; *The American Navy* (Philad., 1856), by Charles J. Peterson; *Biography of the principal American military and naval heroes* (N. Y., 1817) (2 vols.), by Thomas Wilson; *A compilation of biographical sketches of distinguished officers in the American Navy* (Newburyport, 1814), by Benjamin Folsom; *American naval biography* (Providence, 1815), by Isaac Bailey; *Biographical sketches of distinguished American naval heroes* (Hartford, 1823), by S. P. Waldo.

Of perhaps greater importance than the so-called histories are the numerous works on naval biography. As the principal biographies relating to important periods are referred to fully under special heads, they need only be mentioned here. These include Sabine's *Life of Edward Preble* (Bost., 1847); Porter's *Memoir of Commo. David Porter* (Albany, 1875); Mackenzie's *Lives of Perry* (N. Y., 1841) and *Decatur* (Bost., 1846); Harris's *Life of Commo. Bainbridge* (Philad., 1837); Jarvis's *Life of Elliott* (Philad., 1835); Mary Barney's *Memoir of Commo. Barney* (Boston, 1832); *Life of Commo. Stockton* (N. Y., 1856); Cooper's *Lives of distinguished American naval officers* (Auburn, N. Y., 1846; Philad., 1846, — originally contributed to *Graham's Magazine*); and Griffith's *M. C. Perry* (Boston, 1887). All of these memoirs are based on personal papers. Harris used Bainbridge's journals and correspondence. Mrs. Barney's narrative is largely based on her husband's notes and journals. Mrs. Decatur gave her husband's papers to Mackenzie. Col. C. C. Jones's *Commo. Josiah Tattnall* (Savannah, 1878) uses MS. notes left by Tattnall.

The *Autobiography of Commodore Charles Morris* (Annapolis, 1880) is unique. It is the only narrative published by a naval officer of the older period, giving in his own words the story of his own life. It begins with Morris's entry into the service in 1799, and ends in 1840. During nearly the whole period Morris was actively employed, and in many important episodes he bore a prominent part. Nearly every stage of naval development for forty years is therefore covered by the book: the reorganization of the navy under the Peace Establishment Act in Jefferson's first administration; the Tripolitan war, during which Morris served under Commodore Preble, and took part in the most important operations against the city; the impressment and embargo period; the war of 1812, in which he served as first lieutenant of the "Constitution" and as commander of the "Adams"; and the period of development subsequent to the war, during a large part of which he was a navy commissioner. The author's style is marked by freshness and vigor, as well as by simplicity and modesty; his memory is retentive, his judgment sound. He is devoid of all affectation and pretence, and his book is a trustworthy guide in matters of fact as well as of opinion, while it offers a graphic and interesting picture of life in the service during the period. [*The Autobiography of Morris* was edited by Professor Soley, and published in the *Proceedings of the U. S. Naval Institute*, and separately at Boston. — Ed.]

Other naval memoirs, covering the less eventful portions of the period 1789-1850, but valuable as throwing a strong light upon the navy and naval life, are: *Notes and commentaries during a voyage to Brazil and China, in the year 1848* (Richmond, 1854), by W. S. W. Ruschenberger, a surgeon in the navy; *Voyage round the world, including an embassy to Muscat and Siam in 1835, 1836, and 1837* (Philad., 1838), and *Three Years in the Pacific* (Philad., 1834), by the same author; *Sketches of foreign travel and life at sea* (Boston, 1842, 2 v.), by Rev. Charles Rockwell, chaplain in the navy; *Sketches of naval life* (New Haven, 1829, 2 v.), by "a civilian" [Chaplain George Jones]; *Shores of the Mediterranean* (N. Y., 1846, 2 v.), by Francis Schroeder, secretary to the commodore commanding the squadron; *Visit to the South Seas in the U. S. Ship Vincennes* (N. Y., 1831, 2 v.), by Chaplain C. S. Stewart; *The Flagship* (N. Y., 1840, 2 v.), by Chaplain Fitch W. Taylor; *Deck and Port* (N. Y., 1850), by Chaplain Walter Colton; *Two years and a half in the Navy* (Philad., 1832, 2 vols.), by E. C. Wines; *Maritime scraps, or scenes in the Frigate United States during a cruise in the*

For. Rel. (i. 100-108, 116, 129, 136, 288-300, 413-423), are of special importance. Jefferson's *Report to Congress on the Mediterranean trade* (*For. Rel.*, i. 104) is an interesting and valuable document. Consult also Goldsborough's *Naval Chronicle*.¹

On the hostilities with France, the principal authority is Goldsborough, *Naval Chronicle*, supplemented by Emmons's *Statistical History*. See also *Am. St. Papers, Naval Aff.*, vol. i., especially p. 71. The papers connected with foreign relations, in the same collection, vol. i. and vol. ii. *For. Rel.*, are of course to be examined in reference to spoliations and other causes of complaint and negotiation on one side or the other.

The naval memoirs covering this period are of no great assistance to the student. The most important is the *Memoir of Commodore David Porter* (Albany, 1875, pp. 14-42), by Admiral David D. Porter. The little *Life of Silas Talbot*, by Henry T. Tuckerman (New York, 1850), deals, though in a very slight and cursory manner (pp. 115-134), with Talbot's operations in the West Indies during the campaign. References to the cruise of 1800 may be found in an anonymous *Biographical sketch and services of Commodore Charles Stewart* (Philadelphia, 1838).

For a French view of the actions in the West Indies, see O. Troude, *Batailles navales de la France*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1867). The actions of 1799 and 1800 are considered in vol. 3. Troude's figures are very inaccurate.

As to the character of the hostilities with France, and especially as to whether they constituted a war or not, see the very able and learned opinion delivered by Judge John Davis in *Gray, Administrator, v. U. S.* (French spoliation cases), 21 *Court of Claims Rep.* 367-375.

For the Tripolitan war (1801-5), the *Am. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, i. 122, 127, 133 (the last is Preble's full report), and *For. Rel.* ii. 359, 360 (Dale's instructions and despatches), 461, 695-725 (proceedings of fleet under Commodores Barron and Rodgers and campaign of Gen. Eaton), are of the first importance.² The petition of Hamet Pasha to Congress and the correspondence thereon are given in *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, iii. 26. For Eaton's expedition, see Charles Prentiss's *Life of Gen. Wm. Eaton* (Brookfield, 1813), and C. C.

Mediterranean (Boston, 1838), by "a man-of-war's-man" [H. Rivers]; *Journal of an African cruiser* (N. Y., 1845), by "an officer of the U. S. Navy" [Horatio Bridge], ed. by Nathaniel Hawthorne; *Four years in a government exploring expedition* (N. Y., 1852), by Lieut. Geo. M. Colvocoresses; the early part of the *Memoir of John A. Dahlgren, Rear-Admiral U. S. N.* (Boston, 1882), by Madeline V. Dahlgren; H. M. Brackenridge's *Voyage to South America in the frigate Congress* (London, 1820, 2 v.).

Similar works in military biography or autobiography may be referred to with advantage. Most of these are mentioned in this summary in connection with the special episodes of which they treat. Such are the memoirs of Generals Scott and Wilkinson, and the lives of Eaton, Wayne, Wm. Hull, Pike, and Jackson for the earlier period, and those of Grant, Lee, Kearny, Harrison, Taylor and A. S. Johnston for the later. Of a more general character are the following: *Fifty years' observation of men and events, civil and military*, by Gen. E. D. Keyes, N. Y., 1884; Gen. Geo. W. Cullum's *Biographical Register of the officers and graduates of the U. S. Military Academy* (N. Y., 1879, 3 v.); C. K. Gardner's *Dictionary of all officers who have served in the Army, 1789-1853*, 2d ed. (N. Y., 1860); Gen. R.

B. Marcy's *Thirty years of army life on the border* (N. Y., 1866), and *Border reminiscences* (N. Y., 1872); *Memoirs of John Adams Dix*, by Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix (N. Y., 1883). Much interesting reminiscence of army and navy officers is to be found in the *Autobiography of Charles Biddle* (Philad., 1883).

¹ On the general history of the relations of the United States with the Barbary powers, see the admirable monograph on "the Piratical Barbary powers," in chapter 4 of Eugene Schuyler's *American Diplomacy* (N. Y., 1886). [The movements respecting the confinement of Americans in bondage by the powers can be traced through Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*. Cf. J. W. Stephens's *Hist. and Geog. Acc. of Algiers, containing detail of events relative to American captives*, 2d ed. (Brooklyn, 1800); Benton's *Debates*, i. 475; Parson's *Jefferson*, ch. 63. The government finally bought an unstable immunity through treaties (*Statutes at Large*, viii.; *St. Pap., For. Rel.*, ii. 18, 123, etc.) — ED.]

² [Preble's *Reports*, and O'Brien's letter accompanying Jefferson's *Messages* of December 31, 1804, February 20, and April 14, 1805. They are also with the medal voted to Preble (*Naval Aff.*, i. 282), given in Loubat's *Medallie History*, i. 137]. — ED.]

Felton's *Life of William Eaton*, in Sparks's *Lib. of Am. Biog.*, 1st ser. vol. ix. The latter was based partly upon Prentiss's book, but chiefly upon Eaton's original papers and journals.¹ In addition to the narrative of the Derne expedition, the book contains much historical matter upon the relations of the United States with the Barbary powers.² Preble's campaign is discussed in a paper entitled *Operations of the Mediterranean Squadron under Commo. Preble*, by J. R. Soley, published in the *Proceedings of the U. S. Naval Institute*, vol. v. no. 4. The paper is accompanied by a reproduction of the original map of the harbor, showing the position of the vessels in action, by Midshipman De Krafft, who was serving on board the "Siren." With the article is printed Preble's private journal before Tripoli, which was found among his papers, and covers the period from July 24 to Aug. 22, 1804. This journal was also contributed by Admiral Preble to the *Mag. Amer. Hist.* (iii. 182).

The naval biographies take an important place among authorities on the Tripolitan war. The admirable *Life of Edward Preble*, by Lorenzo Sabine, in Sparks's *Lib. of Am. Biog.*, 2d ser., vol. xii., is an invaluable book, by far the largest part of which is taken up with a full and satisfactory examination of Preble's Tripoli campaign.³ Another excellent memoir, which deals in part with the same subject, and which has the advantage of coming from a professional hand, is Comr. A. S. Mackenzie's *Life of Stephen Decatur*, in vol. ii. of the same series. These two books go very far towards covering the ground during the period of Preble's operations.⁴

A third naval memoir is *The Life and services of Commodore William Bainbridge, U. S. N.*, by Thomas Harris, M.D. Dr. Harris was a surgeon in the navy, and was the physician and intimate personal friend of Commodore Bainbridge. Besides the advantages of frequent conversation and constant personal intercourse, he had at his disposal the commodore's private journals and correspondence. The book is, however, a disappointment. Although Bainbridge's correspondence was said to be extensive, few of his letters are reproduced, and the book is chiefly made up of a narrative whose accuracy the reader has no means of testing. Dr. Harris never quotes an authority for his statements; and though his story is interesting, and may be true, there is no way of distinguishing truth from fiction, or from mere gossip and after-dinner reminiscence. Another and shorter memoir of Bainbridge is to be found in Cooper's *Lives of Distinguished American naval officers* (Auburn, N. Y., 1846), vol. i. The same volume contains lives of Preble and Somers. A notice of Dale is published in vol. ii. of the work. Although Cooper's biographies are brief, they have considerable merit.

Lieutenant Porter was actively engaged during the Tripolitan war in the squadron of Commodore R. V. Morris, and later in that of Commodore Preble; he was first lieutenant of the "Philadelphia" when she ran ashore and was captured by the Tripolitans in October, 1803. After this event, the officers of the "Philadelphia" were for eighteen months prisoners in Tripoli. This period of the war is covered by chapters 4 and 5 of Admiral Porter's *Memoir of Commodore Porter*.⁵

¹ [His despatch about Derne is given in Dawson, ii. 56. Cf. J. T. Headley in *Harper's Mag.*, xxi. 496. Eaton died June 1, 1811. There are references to his consulship at Tunis in Poore's *Desc. Catal.*, p. 1280. — ED.]

² Other valuable books covering the general ground are *Travels in England, France, Spain, and the Barbary States*, by M. M. Noah, consul at Tunis, N. Y., 1819; *History and present condition of Tripoli*, by Robert Greenhow, Richmond, 1835, originally published in the *Southern Literary Messenger*; and Schuyler's *American Diplomacy*, already referred to.

³ [Sabine at a later day presented many of

Preble's papers, with letters of Bainbridge and others, to the Mass. Hist. Soc. (*Proc.*, iii. 84). For portraits of Preble, see Lossing, pp. 120, 123; *Amer. Journal of Numismatics*, v. 49, and other records of national medals. There is also the account of Preble by Cooper in *Graham's Mag.*, Jan., 1845, included in Cooper's *Lives*, etc.; and some details in Gould's *Portland, past and present*. — ED.]

⁴ S. P. Waldo's *Life and Character of Stephen Decatur* (Middletown, Conn., 1821) is a book of no value.

⁵ [There is a contemporary estimate in Stephen C. Blyth's *Hist. of the War between the U. S.*

For the difficulty with Morocco in 1803, see *Am. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, i. 115; *For. Rel.*, ii. 591; and the despatches printed in J. R. Soley's *Operations of the Mediterranean Squadron*, published by the Naval Institute.

The question of the causes of the war of 1812 has been covered in other chapters of the present volume,¹ with all the details of diplomatic correspondence with England respecting the impressment of American seamen and commercial restrictions. The account of the impressment of men from the sloop-of-war "Baltimore" in 1798 is given in Goldsborough's *Naval Chronicle*, and with valuable additional documents in a scarce pamphlet (1825) by Capt. Isaac Phillips, preserved in Harvard College library.² The all-important authority on the naval aspects of the affair of the "Chesapeake" and "Leopard," in 1807, is the *Proceedings of the general court-martial convened for the trial of Commo. James Barron, Capt. Charles Gordon, Mr. William Hook, and Capt. John Hall, of the U. S. S. Chesapeake, in the month of January, 1808* ([Wash.], 1822). The detailed evidence is given in all the trials, the reports of which were published by order of the department. See also *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, iii. 6-24, 183 *et seq.*, where will be found a part of the diplomatic correspondence on the subject.³

For the war of 1812, one of the most valuable and comprehensive collections of official despatches on the American side is John Brannan's *Official letters of the military and naval officers of the United States during the War with Great Britain* (Wash., 1823). The papers are printed verbatim, without comment, and comprise all the more important reports.⁴ Details of correspondence must be looked for elsewhere.

A rather full collection of documents in very convenient shape, with running comments of no special value, is contained in *The War. Being a faithful record of the transactions of the war between the United States of America and their territories, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the dependencies thereof*. This publication was a weekly journal, published in a small quarto form by S. Woodworth & Co., N. Y., the first issue being on Saturday, June 27, 1812. Vol. i. continues regularly through 52 numbers to June 15, 1813. Vol. ii., 52 numbers, June 22, 1813-June 14, 1814. Vol. iii., 12 numbers, to Sept. 6, 1814. At this point the critical condition of military affairs caused the suspension of the paper; but a final number, 13, was published in the year 1817, carrying the documentary record to the close of the war. A large proportion, if not all, of these documents are to be found in *Niles's Register*, but in a less convenient form.

Another important volume of documents is the *Collection of the official accounts in detail, of all the battles fought by sea and land; between the navy and army of the United States, and the army and navy of Great Britain, during 1812-13-14-15*. By H. A. Fay, late Capt. U. S. Artillery (N. Y., 1817).

An equally valuable collection of reports, Congressional debates, state papers, and war correspondence for 1813 and 1814 will be found in the *Historical Register of the United States*, 4 vols., edited by T. H. Palmer (Philadelphia, 1814-1816). Other collections are:

History of the War between the United States and Great Britain, compiled chiefly from public documents, by J. Russell, jr. (Hartford, 1815, 2d ed.).⁵

and *Tripoli* (Salem, 1806). Cf. Cooper, i. ch. 18, 19; Dawson's *Battles* (ii. 35), with references; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, iii. 182.

The episode of the destruction of the "Philadelphia" is covered by the official account of Decatur (Mackenzie's *Decatur*, App. iv.), which, with other papers, is given in *St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, i. 122 (also *Ex. Doc., March 20, 1804*); and also in the pamphlet issued in support of a claim for prize-money, *Documents relative to the claims of Mrs. Decatur* (Georgetown, 1826). — ED.]

¹ Chapters v. and vii.

² *An impartial examination of the case of Capt. Isaac Phillips, compiled from the original Documents and Records, with the proceedings upon his application to be restored to his rank in the U. S. Navy* (Baltimore, 1825).

³ Cf. *post*, ch. vii.

⁴ Cf. *Madison's Letters*, iii. 328. [For the Congressional acts of preparation, and for the conduct of the war, see Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 39; and the index to Poore's *Desc. Catal.* Cf. Schouler, ii. 340; Hildreth, vi. 275, 295. — ED.]

⁵ [It contains a list of vessels captured from

The *Am. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, vol. i., containing reports of actions with the "Macedonian," "Frolic," "Java," "Boxer," "Epervier," "Reindeer," "Penguin," and "Cyane" and "Levant," and those on Lakes Erie and Champlain.

The Naval Monument, compiled by Abel Bowen (Boston, [1816]), contains official reports and documents relating to the American naval operations of the war, together with several private letters, extracts from log-books, newspaper cuttings, and miscellaneous matter. Many of these are not conveniently to be found elsewhere in print. Inaccurate proof-reading and copying have led to a number of serious typographical errors, against which the student must be on his guard.¹

The *Naval Chronicle*, published in London by Joyce Gold, appeared in semi-annual volumes, from Jan., 1799, to Dec., 1818, making forty volumes in all. Much information of interest will be found scattered through the whole series, but vols. 28-34 are of especial importance in the study of the war of 1812. All the British reports of actions which the admiralty gave out for publication² are to be found here, as well as a series of authentic memoirs of officers of distinction, correspondence and discussions of great value upon naval questions of the day, and a variety of items of naval information from miscellaneous sources.

The narrative histories of the war, on both sides, may now be mentioned:—

Charles J. Ingersoll, the author of an *Historical Sketch of the second war between Great Britain and America*,³ was a member of the House from Philadelphia during the war, and therefore personally familiar with much of the ground covered by his book. He took sides with the war Democrats. Of his book, Hildreth says: "Though not written till more than thirty years after [the war, it] affords, amid many shrewd observations and striking portraits, a perfect though unconscious reflection of the violent prejudices, limited knowledge, absurd expectations, incoherent reasonings, and general confusion of ideas prevalent among the war members,"—that is, from Hildreth's standpoint. Ingersoll has a nervous, vigorous style, and though his book is rambling, it shows power and penetration.

Benson J. Lossing's *Pictorial Field-Book of the War of 1812* (N. Y., 1869). Notwithstanding their "popular" and pictorial character, the great value of Mr. Lossing's books in reference to obscure matters of minute detail is well known to students. The large place given to tradition and anecdote rather enhances than lessens their value, for both tradition and anecdote have an importance for the historian, when they are duly recognized as such. For topographical details Lossing is invaluable, and he gives attention to a multitude of side-points that throw much light on the main subject.⁴

Great Britain during the war. There is a similar list in James Butler's *American Bravery* (Carlisle, 1816), which shows 1,400 captures.—ED.]

¹ Official documents in larger or smaller numbers necessarily make part of such books as Armstrong's *Notices*, the several biographies of leading actors, Coggeshall's *Privateers*, etc.; but their texts usually need verification. Cf. also the *Congressional Reporter, containing the pub. documents and debates, commencing Nov., 1812* (Concord, N. H.); and *The Examiner, containing essays on the most important events; public laws and official documents; Barent Gardenier, editor* (vol. i. beginning Oct. 25, 1813, and vol. iii. ending April, 1815). Poore's *Desc. Catal.* will be of assistance in guiding to the usual documents of Congress.—ED.]

² [Roosevelt (p. 11) says that no despatch of a defeated naval commander was allowed to be

seen by the public subsequent to the first year of the war. The British despatches are, of course, found in *The Gazette* (London), and many were reprinted in *Niles's Register*. The *Papers relating to the War with America*, issued from the Admiralty Office, Feb. 13, 1815, give returns of the British armaments on the lakes, the vessels captured and destroyed by the Americans, returns of Americans taken prisoners, and American vessels captured.—ED.]

³ The first series, covering 1812-13, was issued at Philad. in 1845-49; the second series, for 1814-15, in 1852.

⁴ [The book is in effect a history of the United States from the close of the Revolution to the end of the war in 1815. Dawson (*Hist. Mag.*, Jan., 1870) finds fault with it in his usual captious way. Lossing used some part of his material in *Harper's Mag.* (index, pp. 417, 419).—ED.]

Gen. John Armstrong's *Notices of the War of 1812*, two vols. (N. Y., 1836-40), is a succinct and caustic book, but is too brief to be satisfactory. As the author was Madison's¹ Secretary of War from 1812-14, he had the best opportunity of being familiar with his subject, but as he was deeply involved in personal controversies, especially in reference to his dismissal from office, a large allowance must be made for prejudice. His pungent criticisms of officers are generally correct, though marred occasionally by an ill-natured sarcasm. It must be remembered also that it was in Armstrong's power to remedy many of the defects of the army, and that he failed conspicuously to do so. Nevertheless, his tone is not that of one who wishes to conceal his deficiencies, but of one who has no deficiencies to conceal. In this respect the book is misleading.²

Historical Sketches of the late War between the United States and Great Britain (2d and 3d eds., 1816; 5th, 1818), by John Lewis Thomson, contains much detail, but is of doubtful value. If read at all, it should be read in connection with James's *Military Occurrences* (see *infra*), which consists largely of a running commentary on Thomson, and also on T. O'Connor's *Impartial and correct history of the War* (N. Y., 1815; 4th ed., 1817), and on Dr. S. S. Smith's continuation of Ramsay's *History of the United States* (Phil., 1817).

The pride of Britannia humbled; or the queen of the Ocean unqueen'd, "by the American cock-boats" (N. Y., 1815; new ed., Philad., 1815), is the title of one of Wm. Cobbett's political diatribes, written in his usual pungent and satirical manner. It contains much discussion of land and naval operations. Another volume of Cobbett's on the same subject is *Letters on the late war between the United States and Great Britain* (N. Y., 1815).³

The leading authority for the English side in the naval operations of the war of 1812 is *The Naval History of Great Britain from the Declaration of War by France in 1793, to the Accession of George IV.* By William James, 6 v., new ed., by Capt. Chamier, R. N. (London, 1837).⁴ Vol. vi. treats principally of the naval operations during the American

¹ [The relations of President Madison to the war are explained in Gay's *Madison*, ch. 19. The President had at one time an intention of writing a history of the war (*Madison's Letters*, iii. 57). — Ed.]

² For a criticism on Armstrong, see the preface to Col. S. Van Rensselaer's *Narrative of the affair of Queenstown.*

³ Other books purporting to be general histories of the military and naval events of the war, but of little or no special value, are: *Authentic history of the late war*, etc., by Paris M. Davis (Ithaca, 1829; N. Y., 1836); a rather absurd little *History of the late war* (N. Y., 1832); *History of the American war of 1812* (2d ed., Philad., 1816); *Sketches of the war intended as a faithful history* (Rutland, Vt., 1815) — said to have been written by Gideon Minor Davison; J. Lathrop's little *History of the late war* (Boston, 1815); S. R. Brown's *Authentic History of the second war for independence* (Auburn, 1815, in 2 vols.); J. C. Gilliland's *Hist. of the late War* (Baltimore, 1817); T. Wilson's *Biog. of Mil. and Naval heroes* (N. Y., 1817, 1819); Samuel Perkins's *Hist. of the Polit. and Mil. Events of the late War* (New Haven, 1825, 1835; later continued as *Hist. Sketches of the U. S.*, N. Y., 1830).

Of a much higher character than the above is *The History of the late war between the United States and Great Britain*, by H. M. Bracken-

ridge, a Western lawyer of some note, who was engaged for many years in public life, filling a number of more or less important positions. The book passed through six editions (Baltimore, 1817, 1818; Philad., 1836, 1839, etc.), and was translated into French and Italian.

The above were all written soon after the war. Of more recent books may be mentioned J. T. Headley's *Second war with England* (N. Y., 1853, 2 v.); Robert Tomes's *Battles of America* (N. Y., 1861, vol. ii. 117, etc.); Dawson's *Battles of the U. S.* (N. Y., 1859); and Rossiter Johnson's *War of 1812* (N. Y., 1882). The service of negroes in the war is set forth in George W. Williams's *Hist. of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880.*

⁴ [James in the first instance forwarded from Canada a series of letters which were published in the *Naval Chronicle*, and subsequently as a *Synopsis of naval actions between the ships of his Britannic Majesty and of the U. S.*, and in this form they were reviewed in America in the *Analectic Mag.*, vii. 295. They then became the ground-work of *An Enquiry into the Merits of the Principal Naval Actions between Great Britain and the United States, comprising an Account of All Ships of War reciprocally captured and destroyed since 18th of June, 1812* (Halifax, N. S., 1816). The next year he published *A Full and Correct Account of the Chief Naval Occurrences*

war. The book shows much careful and even minute investigation, but its partisan reasoning is carried to the furthest limit of special pleading. In some instances misstatements are made which can only be characterized as deliberate falsification, and even where facts are correctly stated the author devotes laborious and persistent effort to their misinterpretation. More than this, he habitually indulges in scurrilous abuse of his opponents, and his tone, when speaking of them, is usually that of vehement and heated personal altercation. In dealing with matters exclusively British, James will generally be found a safe guide, but in his volume on the American war he has lost or sunk all sense of fairness or candor, and his bitter hostility to Americans, and especially to American naval officers, has made him rather the advocate of a cause than the impartial annalist of a contest. He appears to have put before himself the single aim of making out that all American officers, with the exception of Lawrence, who was beaten, were cowards, liars, and blackguards. No charges can be too severe, no language too abusive, to describe their conduct. According to James, they never fought when they could run away, they paid no regard to truth in their statements, they treated their prisoners with uniform brutality, they resorted to the basest fraud and trickery to deceive an opponent. It would be hard to find another book in the language which contains such a mass of malevolent misrepresentations of acts and of motives, such petty slurs upon men's characters, such dirty innuendoes, and such coarse and vulgar abuse. Of course the book is a gross libel; but, unfortunately, nearly all the later British writers who deal with this period have been too indolent to go over the researches which James has evidently made, and although not actuated by his spirit of rancor, they accept and follow his statements. The book has therefore come to be regarded in England as the highest authority upon the great naval wars.¹ The only

of the late War between Great Britain and the United States of America; preceded by a cursory Examination of the American Accounts of their Naval Actions fought previous to that Period (London, 1817), and reissuing it in two volumes (London, 1818), he examined in his preface the criticism of his American reviewers in the *Analectic Mag.* (vols. vii. viii.) D. B. Warden, in his *Statistical, Political, and Historical Account of the U. S.*, having provoked him by ignoring his comments on the American statements, he published *Warden refuted* (London, 1819). His more extensive *Naval Hist.* was first published at London in 1822, in five volumes. A second ed. (1826), with additions, was the occasion of a letter, Jan. 9, 1827, to George Canning, in vindication of his position (*Stapleton's Canning*, ii. 340). Since Capt. Chamier edited it there have been later editions (1846, 1857, 1878, 1886). — ED.]

¹ It is so reckoned by Mullinger in *The English Hist. for Students* (London and N. Y., 1881). Among other general works on English naval history, covering the wars with America during the period 1789–1850, or during some part of it, is Capt. Edward P. Brenton's *Naval History of Great Britain*, 2 vols. (London, 1823, 1837). This work shows less of national prejudice than James's book, but it is inadequate in the matter of detail. The war of 1812 will be found treated in vol. ii. pp. 450 to 540. *The history of the British Navy*, by C. D. Yonge, in 3 volumes (London, 1863, 1866), is an agreeable book, of a popular character, but of no especial use to the student. The same may be said of Joseph

Allen's *Battles of the British Navy* (2 volumes, London, 1858). A work of mixed history and biography is Dr. John Campbell's *Naval History of Great Britain, including the history and lives of the British Admirals*, in 8 volumes (London, 1818). Other works covering in part the American wars are the valuable *Naval Chronology of Great Britain, 1803–1816*, in 3 volumes, by J. Ralfe (London, 1820; vol. iii. contains correspondence and documents relating to the war of 1812); *Royal Naval Biography*, by Lieut. John Marshall, R. N., being memoirs of the services of officers of the English navy, 8 vols. (London, 1823 to 1835), and 4 vols. of supplements (London, 1827 to 1830); J. Ralfe's *Naval Biography of Great Britain*, consisting of historical memoirs of those officers who distinguished themselves during the reign of George III, in 4 vols. (London, 1828); W. R. O'Byrne's *Naval biographical dictionary* (London, 1849); *History of the Indian Navy*, by Charles R. Low, 2 v. (London, 1877); *Historical Record of the Royal Marine Forces*, by Lieut. P. H. Nicolas, 2 vols. (London, 1845).

Special biographies of English naval officers, to be consulted for detached operations during this period, are Capt. A. Murray's *Memoir of Admiral Durham* (London, 1846); *Admiral Sir P. B. V. Broke, Bart., a memoir*, by Rev. J. G. Brighton, M. D. (London, 1866); *Memoir of the life of Admiral Sir Edward Codrington*, by Lady Bouchier, 2 vols. (London, 1873.) (Codrington was captain of the fleet in the New Orleans expedition, and took part in the previous operations in Chesapeake bay); *Memorials of Admiral*

systematic attempt to dissect James is that made by Theodore Roosevelt, who has done this work most satisfactorily.

The Naval War of 1812 (N. Y., 1882; 3d ed. 1883), by Theodore Roosevelt, is an exceedingly valuable study of the naval history of the war. Its faults are in arrangement and construction rather than in matter. It is the only work in which a full use has been made of the original documents in the archives of the Navy Department. The author has thus accumulated much in the way of new materials, which are supplemented by full and intelligent discussions. The style of the book would be more satisfactory if the author had spent a little more time in working up his notes into a connected narrative. A tendency is noticeable to diminish the credit generally awarded to certain officers; in one case, that of Perry, quite unjustly. As a whole, the book is exceptionally impartial, and accuracy in statements of fact is one of its marked characteristics. No other published work presents so complete an answer to James's misstatements, which are analyzed and refuted in detail. In painstaking investigation the book is unrivalled in its own field, and to the student of the naval war it is indispensable.¹

The comparative qualities of the French and English navies during the Napoleonic wars are thoroughly discussed in the *Guerres maritimes sous la République et l'Empire* of Admiral E. Jurien de la Gravière, 4th ed. (Paris, 1865). The work has since passed through several editions, and commands the highest respect both in France and England. In vol. ii. chap. 18 are some invaluable comments on the actions between the Americans and English in the war of 1812.² Another very important discussion of the frigate actions is contained in part v. of Gen. Sir Howard Douglas's *Treatise on naval gunnery*, 4th ed. (London, 1855). Although Sir H. Douglas was not a naval officer, he was a most accomplished professional soldier, and his comments on the actions are the judgments of an expert. As might be expected from their authorship, they are absolutely free from the foolish bitterness of tone that disfigures James's works.³ A valuable technical examina-

Lord Gambier, by Georgiana Lady Chatterton, in 2 vols. (London, 1861,) (Lord Gambier was at the head of the commission which negotiated the Treaty of Ghent); *Personal Narrative of events from 1799 to 1815*, by Vice-Admiral William Stanhope Lovell, 2d edition (London, 1879,) (chapters 15 and 16 treat of operations in America, including the expedition to Washington); *Life and Correspondence of Admiral Sir Charles Napier*, by Major-General E. Napier, 2 vols. (London, 1862,) (chap. 4, in vol. i., treats of operations in America); *Autobiographic Memoir of Sir John Barrow, Bart.* (London, 1847.) (Barrow was second secretary to the admiralty during the war of 1812); *Correspondence and Diaries of John Wilson Croker, Secretary to the Admiralty from 1809 to 1830*, edited by Louis J. Jennings, in 3 vols. (London, 1884); *Naval adventures during 35 years Service*, by Lieut. W. Bowers, in 2 vols. (London, 1833); *My youth by sea and land, from 1809 to 1816*, by Charles Loftus, 2 vols. (London, 1876); *Recollections of a naval life*, by Capt. James Scott, R. N., 3 vols. (London, 1834); *Memoir of Adm. Sir H. D. Chads* (Portsea, 1869).

¹ [The Earl of Dononald (*Autobiography of a Seaman*, London, 1860, 2d ed., vol. ii.) in commenting in Parliament on the unexpected British naval defeats, traced them to "the decay and heartless state of the crews compared with the freshness and vigor of the crews of the enemy,"

and Alison speaks of the "extraordinary and unlooked-for triumphs of the Americans at sea." It was James's mission to allay this despondency by magnifying the advantages of the American frigates over the British in weight of metal in the broadside, while the Americans claimed that superior gunnery was the cause of their success. James even asserted that the American victories were due to the large proportion of British seamen in their crews; but the American writers assert that a service by impressment in a British ship did not make an American an Englishman, and Roosevelt examining the matter thinks that not over a twentieth of the American crews could have been British seamen; and he insists that in underrating ships both sides were equally given to such kind of deception. — ED.]

² [M. Ch. Chabaud-Arnault contributed to the *Revue maritime et coloniale* a paper, which was published separately in 1883 as *Étude sur la guerre navale de 1812*. — ED.]

³ [Cf. the papers on the "Naval war of 1812 with the U. S.," by Captain Bedford Pim and Sir E. J. Reed, in *Colburn's United Service Mag.*, Nov. and Dec., 1880; and "The American naval war of 1812, according to the respective histories of William James and J. Fenimore Cooper," by H. Y. Powell, with various fresh particulars from British and American authorities not hitherto collected (*Ibid.*, April and May, 1885). — ED.]

tion of the battles of Lake Erie and Lake Champlain will be found in Comr. J. H. Ward's *Manual of Naval Tactics* (N. Y., 1867). The frigate actions of 1812 are discussed in a paper by J. R. Soley, published in the *Proceedings of the Naval Institute*, vol. vii. no. 3.¹

Of special naval memoirs (American) for the war of 1812, the principal books are Mackenzie's *Life of Decatur*, Harris's *Life of Bainbridge*, Mackenzie's *Life of Perry*, and Porter's *Life of Commodore Porter*, all of which are more fully mentioned elsewhere. In chapter 5 of Griffis's *Matthew Calbraith Perry* is a rather slight account of the cruises in which Perry served during the war. The anonymous *Biographical sketch of Commo. Charles Stewart*, already mentioned, contains brief notices of Stewart's operations in the war of 1812. A sketch of Commo. Hull, by General James Grant Wilson, appears in the *N. Y. Genealogical and Biographical Record* for July, 1880.

Thirty Years from Home (Boston, 1843) is a little book of considerable value, containing the narrative of Samuel Leech, a seaman of the "Macedonian" at the time of her action with the "United States." Leech subsequently deserted, and served in the U. S. navy, and he gives a graphic account of the man-of-war life of the period.

For Fulton's torpedo-work in the war of 1812, see Lt.-Comr. J. S. Barnes's *Submarine Warfare*, N. Y., 1869 (chap. 3); the *Life of Fulton*, by James Renwick, in Sparks's Lib. of Am. Biog., 1st ser., vol. x.; and his own *Torpedo War and Submarine Explosions* (N. Y., 1810). Lives of Fulton have also been written by C. D. Colden (N. Y., 1817) and by J. F. Reigart (Phila., 1856).

Gen. Geo. W. Cullum's volume, *Campaigns of the War of 1812-15 — sketched and criticised* (N. Y., 1879), is a series of notes on military operations by a most accomplished professional critic. It contains also important notes on the history of the corps of engineers, and biographical sketches of prominent engineer officers.

On the English side we have *A full and correct account of the Military Occurrences of the late war between Great Britain and the United States of America*, 2 v. (London, 1818), by William James, which is the companion piece to the *Naval Occurrences*. Its tone is equally offensive, and its comments are of the same scurrilous character. When dealing with the enemies of his country, James is nothing if not vituperative. The war of 1812, with its absurd generals and its farcical strategy, affords a fine opportunity for caustic humor, but James only makes it the occasion of a tirade of vulgar abuse. The value of the book consists chiefly in the official reports and documents which it contains.²

¹ [Cf. Admiral Preble's "Ships of the Nineteenth Century" in the *United Service*, x. 431; and the chapter on "Men, ships, and guns" (ch. iv.) in Griffis's *M. C. Perry*. A detailed specification of the authorities on these frigate actions is given in a note at the end of the present chapter. Admiral Preble compiled, though not officially, a list of United States vessels from 1797 to 1874, of which his interleaved copy belongs to the Mass. Hist. Society. The *Register of the officers and agents* (Washington, 1816, and later eds.) gives "the names, force, and condition of all ships" at the close of the war. Lorenzo Sabine's *Report on the principal fisheries of the American Seas* (Washington, 1853), and the section, "Historical references to the fisheries of New England" in G. Brown Goode's *Fisheries of the U. S.* (Washington, 1887), p. 677, give some incidental information respecting the recourse which the government had to the fishery men, particularly of New England, during the war; but this subject is more completely treated in the histories of the various New England sea-port towns. — ED.]

² [The war also enters into the scope of some of the general histories of England and Europe. Edward Baine's *History of the Wars of the French Revolution* (London, 1817) was reprinted in Baltimore in 1820, with an appendix on the American war, by E. H. Cummins; and again in Philad., 1835, "with notes and a history of the late war between the U. S. and Great Britain," by William Grimshaw, an Irishman domiciled in the United States, and a hack-writer of the time. The events of the war enter into Alison's *Europe, 1789-1815* (Harper's ed., iv. ch. 76); and also into Williams and Stafford's *England's battles by sea and land* (London, 1854). James Grant's *Recent British Battles on land and sea* (London, 1884) studiously avoids giving any account of those during the war, which were British defeats. Richard Trimen's *Regiments of the British Army* (London, 1878) shows the service of the different corps in the war. The *Canadian Antiquarian* (iv. 122) gives the medals awarded to the British commanders. Lourd's *Dress of the British soldier* (London, 1852), pp. 103-4, shows the uniforms. — ED.]

On American privateers during the war of 1812, the leading work is Capt. George Coggeshall's *History of the American Privateers*, 2d ed. (N. Y., 1856; 3d ed., 1861). Coggeshall commanded two privateers, the "David Porter" and the "Leo," during the war. His experience in these vessels is given in detail. Other accounts are derived from such sources as the author had at ready command, chiefly newspapers. He occasionally gives original documents, and upon some points he appears to have had assistance from officers of the government. The book is not, however, either an exact or an exhaustive study. See also Clark, *Naval History, passim*; *American naval battles*, pp. 224-243; Capt. S. C. Reid's experience at Fayal (Sept. 26, 1814) as detailed in the *Collection of sundry publications and other documents, in relation to the attack made during the late war upon the private armed brig "General Armstrong"* [Anon.]¹ N. Y., 1833; *Biographical memoir of Joshua Barney*, ed. by Mary Barney (Boston, 1832), chap. 17, for the "Rossie's" cruise. In general, the historical materials for the history of the privateers are of the scantiest character.²

On the manner in which the war was conducted by the British, see the correspondence between Mr. Monroe and Vice-Admiral Cochrane in the *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, iii. 693; also *Mil. Aff.*, i. 339-381. The latter document³ was reprinted, with some unimportant addenda, as a separate book, entitled *Barbarities of the Enemy* (Troy, N. Y., 1813, and Worcester, Mass., 1814). An account of the burning of Havre de Grace, written by Jared Sparks, who was an eye-witness of the event, is given in the *No. Amer. Rev.* v. 157. On the treatment of prisoners, see *For. Rel.* iii. 630, 726. An exhaustive inquiry into the Dartmoor prison massacre, April 6, 1815, with the testimony in full, is given in *For. Rel.* iv. 19-56. See also, for Dartmoor experiences, *The Prisoner's Memoirs* (N. Y., 1852), compiled by a "Prisoner in England" [Charles Andrews]; a *Journal of a Young Man of Massachusetts, late a surgeon on board an American privateer* [Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse], 2d ed. (Boston, Lexington, Ky., and Milledgeville, Ga., 1816).⁴

On the forces employed, see a return of the third auditor in *Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.*,

¹ [Cf. *International Law. The case of the private armed brig of war, "Gen. Armstrong," containing letters and documents referring to the history of the claim* (N. Y., 1857). It was claimed that the defence of the brig detained the British vessels carrying aid to Pakenham at New Orleans, and that such delay rendered it possible for Jackson to gain his victory. — ED.]

² [There is some grouping of details in Dawson, ii. 137, 189, 209, 264, 396; Ingersoll's *Second War*, 2d ser. ch. 1; *Democratic Review*, xl. 523; *Harper's Mag.*, xxix. 596; but the best source of such data is in the local histories of seaboard cities and the towns, chiefly in New England. Cf. D. H. Hurd's *Essex County, Mass.* (Philad., 1888); Babson's *Gloucester, Mass.*; Gould's *Portland, Me.*, 432, 443; *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, ii. 57; Col. Higginson on the old Salem sea-captains in *Harper's Mag.*, Sept., 1886. In the war of 1793-1815 the English government issued 10,000 letters of marque; yet England lost 11,000 merchant vessels, and captured only 1,000 of the enemy's privateers. (C. B. Norman's *Corsairs of France*, London, 1887, p. vii., with much information in the appendices.) The Blue-book, *Further Papers relating to the war with America* (London, 1815), shows the concern of the British merchants over the capture of their vessels in the channels by American privateers. On privateering in the

past, see J. K. Laughton's *Studies in Naval Hist.* (London, 1887). See also, an address on the *Privateersmen of Newport*, by Wm. P. Sheffield (Newport, 1883). — ED.]

³ [A Report of a Committee of Congress relating to the spirit and manner in which the war has been waged by the enemy (Washington, 1813). There was a *Narrative of suffering*, etc. of a missionary, M. Smith, as a prisoner in Canada, which passed through various editions, and served to embitter the feelings of the Americans. Cf. Field's *Indian Bibliog.*, no. 1454. For Indian massacres see A. J. Ebell in *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. p. 1. — ED.]

⁴ [Both Andrews and Waterhouse give plans of Dartmoor prison. Cf. Lossing, p. 1068. Cf. *A Green Hand's First Cruise, with a residence of five months in Dartmoor* (Boston, 1841); Ingersoll's *Second War*, 2d ser. ch. 1; and references in *Pool's Index*, p. 333. There are various clues in Poore's *Desc. Catal.* to action in Congress; and particularly the *Message of the President of the U. S., transmitting a report of the Secretary of State . . . of the number of impressed American seamen confined in Dartmoor prison, the number surrendered, given up, or taken on board British vessels captured during the late war, together with their places of residence* (Washington, 1816). — ED.]

vi. 927, stating in detail the number of officers and soldiers of the organized militia, and volunteers from the several States and Territories, in service during the war.¹

III. SPECIAL EPISODES OF THE WAR.—The British military records of the war, as to the campaigns on the Canadian borders, have for the most part been transferred, of late, from Halifax to Ottawa, though T. B. Akins's *List of Documents in the government offices at Halifax* (p. 24) shows that some are still left at Halifax. The War Office in London contained in 1872, when Brymner, the Dominion archivist, examined them, four volumes of letter-books pertaining to the war in Canada.²

Sir George Prevost's conduct of the war met with severe criticism in some letters published at the time in Montreal under the signature of "Veritas," which elicited a reply in *The Canadian Inspector* (Montreal, 1815). The accusations of "Veritas" were adopted in the *Quarterly Review*, 1822 (xxvii. 405), which led to an elaborate vindication of the Canadian governor in *Some Account of the Public Life of the late Lieutenant-General, Sir Geo. Prevost, particularly of his services in the Canadas* (London, 1823). An indispensable work on Brock's campaigns is Ferdinand Brock Tupper's scarce *Family Records; containing Memoirs of Maj.-Gen. Sir Isaac Brock, Lt. E. W. Tupper, R. N., . . . with the Life of Te-Cum-Seh* (Guernsey, 1835).

There is a professional view of the campaigns in Sir James Carmichael-Smyth's *Précis of the Wars in Canada*, 2d ed., edited by his son (London, 1862), pp. 133-194.

The Canadian press has given us various monographs. The earliest of importance is Robert Christie's *Memoirs of the Administrations of the Colonial Government of Lower Canada, by Sir James H. Craig and Sir George Prevost, 1807-1815, Comprehending the military and naval operations in the Canadas* (Quebec, 1818).³

The latest considerable account is W. F. Coffin's *1812,—the war and its moral, a Canadian Chronicle* (Montreal, 1864). The author was an officer of the war, and brings his narrative only to the close of 1813. He mentions among the MSS. used by him a memoir of Prevost and a journal of Gen. Simcoe.⁴

On the American side, beside the general histories, we have Edw. D. Mansfield's *Life of Gen. Winfield Scott* (N. Y., 1846), of which pp. 33-150 cover Scott's participation in the Northern campaigns. The *Memoirs of Lt.-General Scott, written by himself* (New York, 1864), did not add to the general's reputation. The Northern campaigns in the war

¹ [Cf. *Report*, Dec. 12, 1836, *Ex. Doc.*, no. 20, 24th Cong., 2d session. William Jay gives a table of the killed and wounded in the *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 2d ser., vol. ii. There is a statement of the expenses of the war in Adams's *Gallatin*, vol. iii. App.—ED.]

² [James says (*Mil. occurrences*, p. xxiii.) that an official account of every military action has appeared in *The Gazette* (a set in the Boston Public Library), and he copies them, with some of the American accounts, in his appendix; but the accounts of naval defeats were not published after 1813, forcing the *Annual Register* to depend on the American reports "in numerous cases," as James says, rendering them, in his judgment, inaccurate. The *Montreal Herald*, 1811-1814, is sometimes the repository of such accounts.—ED.]

³ [Others are: David Thompson's *Hist. of the late war between Great Britain and the United States* (Niagara, Canada, 1832); Major John Richardson's *War of 1812, operations of the right division of the Canadian army* (1842), left a fragment of 182 pp. Richardson was an officer

under Proctor, taken prisoner at the battle of the Thames. Gilbert Auchinleck's papers originally published in the *Anglo-American Magazine*, and then separately as *Hist. of the War between Great Britain and the United States* (Toronto, 1855, 1862), take extreme views of the American narratives, and defend the Indian allies of the British from charges of cruelty.—ED.]

⁴ [There are some personal details in H. J. Morgan's *Celebrated Canadians*; in the *Biog. of the Hon. W. H. Merritt, of Lincoln, district of Niagara* (St. Catharines, 1875), by J. P. Merritt. There are lesser accounts of the war in Ryer-son's *Loyalists* (vol. ii.); in Bryce's *Canada* (pp. 310-326); and in some local histories, like Robert Sellar's *County of Huntingdon* (Huntingdon, Quebec, 1888).

There are a few French and French Canadian records. The most considerable of the general works are Garneau's *Histoire du Canada* and Bibaud's *Histoire du Canada*. For the special service of some of the Indian allies we have Maurault's *Histoire des Abénakis* (1866).—ED.]

of 1812, in which Scott took part, are treated in chapters 5 to 12. For Izard's operations, see his *Official correspondence with the department of war relative to the military operations of the American army under [his] command on the northern frontier of the U. S. in 1814 and 1815* (Phila., 1816).¹

On the campaigns of the Northern armies in 1812-13, including the operations of Dearborn, Lewis, Winder and Chandler, Wilkinson, Hampton and McClure, see the documents transmitted to Congress, with the report of the Secretary of War of Jan. 25, 1814, on the causes of the failure of the army on the Northern frontier (*Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.*, i. 439-488).² The campaign of General Stephen van Rensselaer on the Niagara frontier (October, 1812) was severely criticised by Armstrong, *Notices of the War*, chap. 4, which led to the publication of an answer, entitled *Narrative of the affair of Queenstown* (N. Y., 1836), by Col. Solomon van Rensselaer, who commanded the attack.³ The *Memoirs of my own times* (Philad., 1816), by Gen. James Wilkinson, make a very tedious book, but one which is necessary to the student from its array of documents. Vol. i. chapters 13-16, treats of the Northern campaigns, and vol. iii. is devoted wholly to the Wilkinson court-martial. The *Life of Zebulon Montgomery Pike*, by Henry Whiting, in Sparks's *Lib. of Am. Biog.*, 2d ser. vol. v., chapters 5 and 6, relates to the campaign on Lake Ontario and the capture of York, where Gen. Pike was killed. See also F. B. Hough's *History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties*, N. Y. (Albany, 1853), and *History of Jefferson County* (N. Y., 1854).

Respecting the campaigns (1812-1814) in the Northwest, there are, beside the treatment in the general histories, several special accounts, serving to complete the story, like the contemporary compilations of R. B. McAfee⁴ and Samuel R. Brown,⁵ the journals of Adam Walker⁶ and Lt.-Col. Eleazer D. Wood,⁷ and the later compilations of Flint and others.⁸

The surrender of Detroit and Michigan by General William Hull has been the subject

¹ [A portrait of General Izard, engraved from a painting by Otis (1817), with a paper by G. E. Manigault on his military career, is given in *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, June, 1888. — ED.]

² [These papers accompanied a *Message from the President* [Feb. 2, 1814], transmitting letter from Secretary of War, with *sundry Docs.*; in obedience to resolution of 31st Dec. last, requesting such information as may tend to explain causes of Failure of Arms of U. S. on Northern Frontier. It was also printed at the same time at New York and at Albany. Cf. Gen. Geo. M'Clure's *Causes of the destruction of towns on the Niagara Frontier and failure of the Campaign of 1813* (Bath, N. Y., 1817); W. H. Winder's *Statement of Occurrences on the Niagara Frontier in 1812* (Washington, 1829); and a paper on Gen. Chandler in the *Maine Hist. Soc. Coll.*, ix. 183. The papers of Governor Daniel D. Tompkins, preserved in the State Library at Albany, throw light on the warfare on the N. Y. borders. Cf. Memoir of Tompkins in *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1844, p. 121. Sparks (MSS. xxxiii. 433) quotes from a MS. life of Gen. Dearborn by his son. Cf. Daniel Goodwin's *Dearborns*. Ingersoll is very severe on him. — ED.]

³ [Cf. documents in Mrs. Bonney's *Legacy of Hist. Gleanings*, i. ch. 12. — ED.]

⁴ [*Hist. of the late War in the Western Country* (Lexington, 1816). Cf. Field, *Ind. Bibliog.*,

no. 964; P. O. Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 738. M'Afee had assistance from Harrison, Shelby, and Croghan, and he used the journal of Col. Wood. — ED.]

⁵ [*Views of the Campaigns of the Northwestern Army* (Troy, 1814; Philad., 1815; Burlington, Vt., 1815). Cf. Thomson's *Bibl. Ohio*, no. 128. — ED.]

⁶ [*Journal of two campaigns of the Fourth Reg. of U. S. Infantry in the Michigan and Indiana territories, under Col. John P. Boyd and Lt.-Col. James Miller, 1811-1812* (Keene, N. H., 1816). Walker was a drummer. Cf. Thomson, no. 1173; Field, no. 1619; Brinley, iii. 4526. — ED.]

⁷ Included in ch. 10 of Gen. Cullum's *Campaigns of the War of 1812-1815*.

⁸ [Timothy Flint's *Indian Wars of the West* (Cincinnati, 1833), a somewhat confused book; Albach's *Annals of the West*; Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, ch. 2, with some official correspondence; and sundry monographic papers in the *Western Reserve Hist. Soc. Tracts* (nos. 3-7, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 28, 36, 51, etc.); *Michigan Pioneer Coll.*, viii.; and *Mag. West. History*, Feb., 1885; and others.

Chief among the biographical material are the lives of *Harrison* (referred to elsewhere), of *Gen. Leslie Coombs* (N. Y., 1852; Washington, 1855), and *Smith's Lewis Cass*. — ED.]

of conflicting opinions. The first reports to their respective governments of Hull and Brock are in the usual documentary repositories.¹ The failure of Van Horne at Brownstown and Miller at Maguaga, to preserve Hull's communications,² was the immediate cause of the surrender, which was made without consultation with his officers, for humane considerations, as Hull claimed, but evincing unsoldierly conduct, as the decision of the court-martial determined. The judges decided him worthy of death; but he was pardoned by the President, by reason of his services in the Revolutionary War. His defenders aver that his good name was sacrificed to a political exigency which demanded a victim. There are two editions of his trial,³ and Hull himself published at the same time the text of his defence.⁴ It is alleged by his defenders that the government withheld from him for some years the necessary papers, but ten years later he retold the whole story in his *Memoirs of the Campaign of the Northwestern Army in 1812* (Boston, 1824). In this he reflected on Gen. Henry Dearborn, who had been expected to co-operate with him, but had made an armistice with Prevost without including Hull in the terms of it. A son of Dearborn repelled Hull's charges.⁵ The fullest defence of Hull has been made by his kindred, his daughter and grandson,⁶ whose views have been reflected by some later writers;⁷ but the more common, as well as more correct opinion seems to be, that Hull failed to manifest what is demanded of a soldier in such circumstances.⁸

¹ [Cf. *Ann. Register*, 1812; Dawson, ii. 110; *Michigan Pioneer Coll.*, vii. 122. For maps of the Detroit River, see Lossing, p. 266; *Harper's Mag.*, xxvi. 732; for early plans of the post, one of 1796 in Sheldon's *Early Hist. of Michigan* (cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xi. 160), and one in Darby's *Tour from New York to Detroit in 1813* (N. Y., 1819); for early views of the town, one of 1796 in Farmer's *Detroit*, 367; one of 1811 in Roberts's *City of the Straits*, 60; one of 1815 in Gay, iv. 185. — ED.]

² [Cf. James Dalliba's *Nar. of the Battle of Brownstown, Aug. 9, 1812* (N. Y., 1816); *Michigan Pioneer Coll.*, vi. 466; Dawson, ii. 98, with references; and Fay's *Collection*. Also see Samuel Williams's *Exped. of Capt. Henry Brush with supplies for Gen. Hull, 1812* (Cincinnati, 1870, — Ohio Valley Series, no. 7, originally in the *Ladies Repository*, 1854). By Hull's orders, the post at Chicago, Fort Dearborn, which had been erected in 1803, was evacuated, and the attack on the retreating garrison followed. Cf. *The Dearborns*, by Daniel Goodwin, jr. (Chicago, 1884, — Chicago Hist. Soc. Proc.); Albach's *Annals*, 865; John Wentworth in no. 16, *Fergus Hist. Series*, with other papers in the same publication; J. G. Wilson in *U. S. Service Mag.*, Oct., 1865, p. 320, vol. iv., and *Hist. Mag.*, vi. 108; A. T. Andreas's *Hist. of Chicago* (Chicago, 1884-86), in three vols.; W. H. Hurlbut's *Chicago Antiquities*; Wm. Barrows' *United States of Yesterday*, etc., ch. 5, from *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, April, 1885, p. 360; Dawson, ii. 103. Early plans and views will be found in Hurlbut, 189; Andreas, i. 79, 81, 113; Lossing, 303, 308, 313. On the surprise at Michillimackinac, July 17, 1812, see Dawson, ii. 88, and Lieut. D. H. Kelton's *Annals of Fort Mackinac* (Chicago, 1882), a collection of scraps, of varying interest and importance. A map of the island is given (p. 81), and sketches of the early blockhouses. — ED.]

³ *Trial of Brig.-Gen. William Hull for treason, cowardice, neglect of duty and unofficer-like conduct, with the sentence of the Court and remission thereof by the President of the U. S.* (Boston, 1814); and another *Report of the trial, etc.*, taken by Lieut.-Col. Forbes (N. Y., 1814).

⁴ *Defence of Brigadier-General W. Hull, delivered before the General Court Martial, of which Major-General Dearborn was President, at Albany, March, 1814. With an Address to the Citizens of the United States, written by himself. To which are prefixed the charges against Gen. Hull as specified by the Government* (Boston, 1814).


⁵ *Defence of Gen. Henry Dearborn against the attack of Gen. William Hull, by H. A. S. Dearborn* (Boston, 1824). A MS. defence of Dearborn is also in the Wisconsin Hist. Soc. library. Hull's *Memoirs* elicited other animadversions in Capt. Josiah Snelling's *Remarks* (Detroit, 1825).

⁶ *Revolutionary services and civil life of Gen. Hull, by his daughter, Mrs. Maria Campbell, together with the history of the Campaign of 1812 and surrender of the post of Detroit, by his grandson, James Freeman Clarke* (N. Y., 1848). [Dr. Clarke, in his *Memorial and Biog. Sketches* (Boston, 1878), in briefly reviewing the matter, holds that "public opinion has long since reversed this sentence." Another grandson, Samuel C. Clarke, resented the imputation of an earlier physical infirmity, which had been referred to as the real cause of Hull's conduct (*N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, 1855, p. 41; 1857, p. 13). — ED.]

⁷ [Lossing, in his *War of 1812*, sets forth the extenuating circumstances, and more specifically defends Hull in *Hull's Surrender of Detroit* (Philad., 1875), reprinted, with additions, from *Potter's Amer. Monthly*, Aug., 1875. Cf. Johnston's *Yale in the Revolution*, p. 281. — ED.]

⁸ Cf. Armstrong's *Notices*, i. 15-51. We get the different phases of the antagonism to Hull in W. L. G. Smith's *Life and Times of Lewis*

The surrender of Detroit in August, 1812, was followed during the rest of that year by a series of conflicts with the Indians.¹ These embarrassments caused delay in an attempt



FORT MEIGS.*

Cass (N. Y., 1856), ch. 6,—Cass having been a colonel of Ohio troops in the garrison; and in an anonymous *Life of Cass* (Philad., 1848); in James Foster's *Capitulation, or a history of the exped. conducted by Wm. Hull, by an Ohio Volunteer* (Chillicothe, 1812); and in Wm. Stanley Hatch's *Chapter of the history of the war of 1812 in the north-west; embracing the surrender of the northwestern army and fort at Detroit, Aug. 16, 1812; with a description and biographical sketch of Tecumseh* (Cincinnati, 1872). Hatch was the acting assistant quartermaster-general of the army, and his journal, brief as it is, reflects the opinions that prevailed in the army. [The sarcasm of the hour is shown in *The War of the Gulls* (N. Y., 1812), ascribed to Jacob Bigelow and Nathan Hale, of Boston.

Of the later writers, Ingersoll takes the adverse view. Hildreth (vi. 337) says it is "not easy to find fault with the sentence." Gay (iv. 185) thinks the soldier was overcome by humane

considerations. James V. Campbell's *Political History of Michigan* is decidedly adverse to Hull. Judge T. M. Cooley (*Michigan*, ch. 9) says "the judgment of the country has not acquitted Hull of fault." Farmer, *Detroit and Michigan*, ch. 42, reviews the subject with pronounced hostility.—ED.]

¹ [Chief among them, the siege of Fort Wayne, Sept. 1-12 (Dawson, ii. 125; *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. 152); Capt. Zachary Taylor's defence of Fort Harrison, on the Wabash, Sept. 4th (Dawson, ii. 127; *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. 147); Fort Madison, on the Mississippi, Sept. 5-8 (Dawson, ii. 133); the battle of the Peninsula, in the Western Reserve, Sept. 29th (A. G. Riddle in *Mig. West. Hist.*, i. 398; and by Col. Whittlesey in *Ibid.* vii. 322; *Fireland's Pioneer*, i., May, 1859); and later affairs (Dawson, ii. 182). The lives of Harrison and Lossing's *War of 1812* supplement these.—ED.]


* [Fac-simile of a cut in Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 528, after surveys made July 19, 1813, by Lieut. Joseph H. Larwill. Howe uses in his description the MS. journal of Lieut. Larwill, and cites the account of the siege by the Rev. A. M. Lorraine, published in the *Ladies' Repository*, March, 1845; and the British account in the *London New Monthly Mag.*, Dec., 1826.

There is a plan of the works on a larger scale in Lossing (484), and (p. 488) a plan of the final stages of the

to recover Detroit. In the winter a distressing experience was suffered on the Raisin River, which barred the approach to Detroit, and at whose mouth, near the debouchment of the Detroit River, Frenchtown was situated. Gen. Winchester, who had been superseded in the chief command by Harrison, pushed on to Frenchtown, where, on Jan. 18, 1813, a fight took place, followed by a massacre up the river, Jan. 22. Regarding these transactions we have both contemporary and compiled accounts.¹

Harrison's defence of Fort Meigs (April 28–May 9) and Croghan's later defence of Fort Stephenson (August 2) are conspicuous episodes of this year (1813).

The victory of Perry on Lake Erie gave Harrison water-transportation, and in September (1813) Harrison advanced to recapture Detroit and push into Canada, and the decisive conflict was the battle of the Thames, Oct. 5.²



FORT STEPHENSON.*

¹ The chief accounts by participants are the following: Elias Darnall's *Journal*; containing an accurate and interesting account of the hardships, sufferings, battles, defeat and captivity of those heroic Kentucky Volunteers and Regulars, commanded by General Winchester, in the years 1812–13, also, two narratives by men [Timothy Mallary and John Davenport] that were wounded in the battles on the River Raisin, and taken captive by the Indians (Paris, Ky., 1813; Shelbyville, Ky., 1814; Philad., 1854). Cf. Thomson, nos. 309–311. William Atherton's *Narrative of the sufferings and defeat of the northwestern army under Gen. Winchester* (Frankfort, Ky., 1842). Cf. Thomson, no. 47. McAfee attacked Winchester for his conduct, and he was defended in *Historic Details having relation to the campaign of the N. W. army under Generals Harrison and Winchester, 1812–1813* (Lexington, Ky., 1818).

There are various documents in the App. of Armstrong's *Notices*, and some details in the *Life of Leslie Coombs*, and in the account of Gen. W. O. Butler appended to the *Life of Cass* (Philad., 1848). Details of the massacre make part of the government report, which was printed as *Barbarities of the Enemy*.

[Of the later accounts, there is one by Thomas P. Dudley in the *Western Reserve Hist. Soc. Tracts*, no. 1 (Cleveland, 1870), and in *Hist. Mag.* xix. 28; one in Dawson, ii. 191, 194; and on account of the body of Kentucky troops engaged, there is more or less in the histories of Kentucky by Collins (i. 299), and in Ranck's *Lexington, Ky.*, ch. 37. Lossing gives local and topographical matter, with a plan (*War of 1812*, 358; *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. 156, 157). — ED.]

² [The English general Proctor was seconded by Tecumseh with his Indians. That chieftain's

siege. Cf. Cullum, p. 110. Lossing, who gives a good account of the siege, groups his authorities in a note (p. 489). Dawson (ii. 221) collates them in footnotes. Capt. Leslie Coombs's official report to Gen. Green Clay of the defeat of Col. Wm. Dudley's command, a part of the relieving force, was printed at Cincinnati (1869, — see Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 254). There is a diary by J. Bonner in the *West. Reserve Hist. Soc. Tracts*, no. 49, — see also no. 23. Loubat (*Medal. Hist.*, 255) gives Harrison's report and an engraving of the medal given to Harrison. Cf. Atwater's *Ohio*; Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*; Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, 163, with plans; Thomas Christian's *Campaign of 1813 on the Ohio frontier*, appended to C. C. Baldwin's *Relics of the Moundbuilders* (1874). — ED.]

* [Fac-simile of a cut in Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 448, where is also a large plan of the neighboring ground. The plan originally appeared from the official drawing in the *Portfolio* (vol. v.), March, 1815; later in Thomson's *Hist. Sketches of the late War*. Cf. Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, 185, and Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 503, and for site, p. 507. Cf. *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. 296; Cullum, p. 116.

The river runs parallel to the easterly end of the fort, with low ground between. The main attack was on the north side, and the assaulting column approached the angle near the well. K, K, K, wicker-gates. E E E, storehouses. D, hospital. F, commissary's storehouse. A, block-house, attacked by cannon. H, main gate. G, magazine. The figures 1, 2, 3, 4 mark respectively the line of pickets, embankment, dry ditch, and glacis.

Beside the general histories, see, for the attack on the fort, Atwater's *Ohio*; Elisha Whittlesey's *Defence of Fort Stephenson* (Toledo, 1858); Everett's *Hist. Sandusky County* (1882), p. 113; Dawson's *Battles*, ii. 260; *Proceedings at the unveiling of the Soldiers' Monument on the Site of Fort Stephenson*, 1885 (Fremont, O., 1885), with portraits of Maj. Geo. Croghan, and plan of the siege, and an engraving of the medal struck by Congress for Croghan, which last is also given by Loubat (*Medallic Hist. U. S.*, no. lvi., — with Croghan's report) and by Lossing, p. 505. — ED.]

The two great naval conflicts on the lakes were decisive of the military campaigns. Perry's on Lake Erie (1813) rendered Harrison's possible; and Macdonough's on Lake Champlain (1814) sent Prevost back beyond the borders. The two need to be studied.

The battle of Lake Erie has given rise to more extensive controversy than any other naval engagement of the war. The dispute turns on the question whether Capt. J. D. Elliott, commanding the "Niagara," did his duty in supporting the flagship and engaging the enemy. In his report of the battle,¹ Perry commended Elliott, and in a letter, written a few days later, he spoke of his subordinate's conduct with warm approval. The finding of the court-martial on Capt. Barclay, the English commodore in the action, having referred unfavorably to the part taken by the "Niagara," Elliott asked for a court of inquiry, which made a somewhat ambiguous report. Subsequently (Aug. 8, 1818), Perry preferred charges against Elliott, but no action was taken on them by the department. Perry, when leaving for his last cruise, left with Decatur a collection of illustrative documents, which Mrs. Decatur, after Decatur's death, and without the knowledge of Perry's friends, published as *Documents relative to the difference between Com. Perry and Capt. Elliott* (Washington, 1821; Boston, 1834). This elicited a defence of Elliott in a *Review of a pamphlet*, etc. (Boston, 1834), which gives minutes of the court of inquiry, April 24, 1815. The controversy was renewed in a *Biographical notice of Commo. Jesse D. Elliott* (Philad., 1835) by a "citizen of New York," a name assumed by the author, Russell Jarvis, who had evidently received the materials for his book from Elliott himself, embracing, among others, the papers and diagrams of the appendix. In 1839, Cooper's *Naval History* was published, and soon after, several sharp attacks were made upon the author in various magazines, aiming to show that Cooper had been unfair to Perry in his account of the battle. One of these articles, appearing in the *Commercial Advertiser*, and written by Wm. A. Duer, was made the ground of a libel suit brought by Cooper against the editor, which was one of the *causes célèbres* of the day, and which resulted in a victory for Cooper.² In the midst of the controversy appeared Comr Alexander Slidell Mackenzie's *Life of Perry*,³ in which Elliott is bitterly attacked. A lecture by Tristram Burges before the Rhode Island Historical Society, published in 1839 (Providence and Boston) under the title of *Battle of Lake Erie, with notices of Commo. Elliott's conduct in that engagement*, is another and not very valuable contribution to the

speech at the British council of war, September 18th, at Amherstburg, is given in Lt. Francis Hall's *Travels in Canada*, etc. (2d ed., Lond., 1819). Tecumseh was killed, and there has been a controversy as to the slayer (*Hist. Mag.*, July, 1866; x. 204; *Wisconsin Hist. Coll.*, iv. 369). Of the battle, Lossing (554, 561; *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. 304) gives one of the best accounts and a plan. Cf. Ingersoll, ch. 6; Dawson, ii. 291; Cullum, 119, for a professional view; *Wisconsin Hist. Soc. Coll.*, iii.; and Loubat, no. 52, for the medal given to Gov. Isaac Shelby, of the Kentucky volunteers. Beside the lives of Harrison, see the *Biog. Sketch of Col. R. M. Johnson* (N. Y., 1843), supposed to be by Asahel Langworthy.—Ed.]

¹ [Perry's official despatches are in *Am. St. Papers, Nav. Aff.*, i. 295; Dawson, ii. (who gives also that of Barclay, the British commander); Albach's *Annals*, 902; *Ann. Reg.*, 1813, p. 187; *Niles's Reg.*, v. 60; Loubat's *Medallic Hist.*, 178. There are various British documents in the blue-

book: *Papers relating to the war with America* (London, 1815). Lossing (p. 530) gives a facsimile of Perry's famous despatch to Harrison and a cut of Perry's "Don't give up the ship" flag (p. 519), and says he used the log-book of the "Lawrence." The original flag is at the Naval Academy.—ED.]

² A very able and interesting account of the controversy is given in Lounsbury's *Cooper*, Boston, 1883 (*American Men of Letters*), pp. 208-230.

³ [There are other memoirs, by John M. Niles (Hartford, 1820, 1821), and by C. P. Dwyer (Cleveland, 1860). Irving published an account of Perry not long after the victory, in the *Analectic Mag.* (also in Irving's *Spanish Papers*, ii.). There are various titles on Perry in J. R. Bartlett's *Bibliog. of Rhode Island*, that State, as the birthplace of Perry and of many of his seamen, claiming particular honor for the victory. Cf. the histories of Rhode Island, Mason's *Newport*, p. 302.—ED.]

literature of the controversy on what may be called the anti-Elliott side.¹ In 1843, Cooper outlined his views in an account of Perry printed in *Graham's Mag.* (May and June), and later he published at Cooperstown an important review of the whole question in a pamphlet on *The Battle of Lake Erie; or, Answers to Messrs. Burges, Duer, and Mackenzie*. See also his memoir of Perry in vol. ii. of *Lives of distinguished American naval officers* (Auburn, N. Y., 1846).

The *Speech of Commodore J. D. Elliott, delivered in Hagerstown, Md., Nov. 14, 1843* (Philadelphia, 1844), is in the nature of an autobiography, and is a much more extensive work than the title would indicate. It treats the battle of Lake Erie from Elliott's standpoint, and is accompanied by a number of official documents.²

There are other contemporary witnesses who have left their views on record, like Dr. Usher Parsons, a surgeon on board the flagship,³ and various commemorative and elucidatory accounts, sometimes bringing out fresh material.⁴

As respects the victory of Commodore Macdonough and General Macomb at Plattsburg, there is no such dispute as attended the battle of Lake Erie; and we have both official⁵ and other contemporary accounts, upon which the later writers have had little difficulty in forming their narratives.⁶

¹ [There is some useful material in the appendix: Perry's despatches; extracts from the log-book of the "Lawrence;" Barclay's account; his trial; Perry's charges against Elliott. — ED.]

² [Of the later writers, Ward (*Naval Tactics*, 76) thinks Elliott's explanations are not satisfactory. Dawson inclines to the Elliott side. Lossing avoids the controversy. Roosevelt does not take so high a view of Perry's conduct of the battle as is usual. — ED.]

³ [Parsons's letter to a son of Perry is given by Burges. He answered Cooper in an address on the *Battle of Lake Erie* (Providence, 1853), and made a speech at Put-in-bay in 1858 (*N. E. Hist. and Gen. Reg.*, 1859, p. 171), and contributed some sketches of the officers in the battle (*Ibid.*, Jan. 1863, and separately at Albany). He also told what finally became of Perry's ships (*U. S. Service Mag.*, ii. 464).

There are some contemporary notices of the battle in *The Portfolio and Political Register*; in *Views on Lake Erie* (N. Y., 1814) and *Views of the Campaign* (Philad., 1815), both by S. R. Brown, who saw the action from the shore; and in the *Travels and Adventures* (Palmyra, N. Y., 1831) of David C. Bunnell, who was a drummer on board the "Lawrence." — ED.]

⁴ [George H. Calvert's *Oration* (Providence, 1854); E. Cooke's *Address at Put-in-bay, Sept. 10, 1858* (Sandusky, 1858); R. P. Spalding's *Oration at laying the corner stone of a monument* (Sandusky, 1859); *Inauguration of the Perry statue at Cleveland, Sept. 10, 1860* (Cleveland, 1861), with a paper on the battle by George Bancroft, and an address by Parsons. An address by Wm. P. Sheffield at the unveiling of a statue of Perry at Newport, Sept. 10, 1885, is in the *Bay State Monthly*, iii. 321.

To select a few American later accounts: — Ingersoll, ch. 4; Roosevelt (p. 256), who relies much on Lossing (*War of 1812*, and *Harper's*

Mag., xxvii. 298); Dawson (ii.), who collates authorities; M'Affee; Knapp's *Maumee Valley*; Egle's *Penna.*, 706. On the English side, James (*Naval Occurrences*), who gives the record of Barclay's trial, and in his *Naval Hist.* (vi. 109); Brenton (ii. 502). The U. S. government gave medals to both Perry and Elliott (Lossing, 535; Loubat, no. 33).

As to plans of the battle, Elliott gave in his *Address* a copy of that used before the court of inquiry, and calls one given Burges a "false diagram;" Cooper gives one in *Graham's Mag.*, May, 1843; there are others in the *Naval Monument*, and in Niles's *Perry*. Lossing (pp. 522, 529) shows three stages of the fight according to diagrams furnished by Stephen Champlin of the "Scorpion," and Roosevelt copies them. — ED.]

⁵ On the American side: *Am. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, iii. 309; *Senate Docs., 13th Cong.*, Oct. 4 and 6, 1814; Loubat (pp. 191, 234). On the English side: Capt. Pring's despatch to Sir James L. Yeo; *Annual Reg.*, 1814, p. 213. [Other illustrative matter on the English side is Lee's letter in *Niles's Register*, viii.; and the account in James, vi. 217; the criticism of Carmichael-Smyth's *Précis*, p. 188. Trimen's *British Army* shows the following regiments to have been present: 3d, 5th, 13th, 27th, 58th, and 76th foot.

There is an account of an eye-witness in the *Mémoires of the Hist. Society of Montreal (Bataille navale du Lac Champlain en 1814)*, by Sir E. P. Tache. — ED.]

⁶ [A sketch by Cooper was printed in *Putnam's Mag.*, Jan., 1869. Roosevelt (p. 375) considers it the great battle of the war. Lossing embodies details from participants. Dawson (ii. 378) collates the authorities.

Cooper (vol. ii.) gives four diagrams, and Ward (*Naval Tactics*, p. 107) copies them. There are other plans in Lossing, 860, 871;

Capt. David Porter's *Journal of a cruise made to the Pacific Ocean* (Philad., 1815), 2 v., is the all-important, and it might almost be added all-sufficient, work on the remarkable voyage of the frigate "Essex." It extends to the most minute details, and is written by the principal participant in the events narrated. Its style is satisfactory, and its matter is accurate. The 2d edition (N. Y., 1822) contains a preface, in which Capt. Porter answers a spiteful attack made upon him in the *Quarterly Review* (xiii. 352).

Some very interesting material in reference to this cruise, also furnished by an eye-witness, is to be found in the *Life of D. G. Farragut* (N. Y., 1879), by Loyal Farragut. Adm. Farragut was a midshipman on board the "Essex," and the account in the *Life* (chaps. 3, 4, and 5) is taken from his journal. The very important services of Commo. Porter during the war of 1812 are also treated at length in Admiral Porter's *Memoir*, pp. 88 - 262. The narrative of the cruise of the "Essex" is based chiefly on Commo. Porter's *Journal of a cruise*.¹

On the battle of Bladensburg and the capture of Washington (Aug. 19-25, 1814) the most important document is the *Report* of the committee appointed to investigate the causes and particulars of the invasion.² The misadventures of the day forced the resignation of General Armstrong as Secretary of War, and led to a controversy.³

The earliest carefully studied monograph on the subject is E. D. Ingraham's *Sketch of the Events which preceded the capture of Washington* (Philad., 1849), in which Armstrong is blamed and Winder exonerated, and an extensive appendix supplies the documentary proofs. An attempt to justify the militia,⁴ and to throw the responsibility of the

Palmer's *Lake Champlain*, 219, 230; *Naval Monument*.

Congress awarded four medals to Macdonough, Capt. Robert Henley, and Lieut. Stephen Cassin, of the fleet, and to Macomb of the army. All are figured in Loubat and Lossing. A contemporary picture is given in Lossing (p. 873), and even in the German periodical *Columbus*, Hamburg, 1828, vol. i. There are local addresses by Skinner (1835) and Moore (1843). Cf. Palmer's *Lake Champlain*; *Harper's Mag.*, vii. 208; xxix. 147. There is a *Memoir of Alexander Macomb* by G. H. Richard (N. Y., 1833), and a portrait of him in the *Nat. Port. Gallery* (N. Y., 1834). Cf. Lossing, 859; Mrs. Lamb's *N. Y.*, ii. ch. 15, 16. — ED.]

¹ [The final capture of the "Essex" within shore limits, near Valparaiso, by the English frigate "Phœbe" and her consort, was to be expected, in spite of the immunity properly to be secured by a neutral port; but the breach of Capt. Hilyar's word to Porter given at a time when Porter had him at a disadvantage is an action amenable to other laws. Hilyar's report is in the *Annual Register*, 1814, p. 179. Cf. James, vi. 151; and Douglas's *Naval Gunnery*, p. 108, on the futility of the "Essex's" carronades. Irving's sketch is copied from the *Analectic Mag.* into his *Spanish Papers*, ii.; Dawson (ii. 330) collates the authorities; and Lossing (p. 721) and Roosevelt (p. 297) follow the cruise. Cf. Benton's *Thirty Years* (ii. ch. 118), and *Harper's Mag.* xix. (by Robert Tomes).

The earlier history of the "Essex" is told in Admiral Preble's "First Cruise of the Essex" (Salem, 1870, in *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, x.), when

she was commanded by Edward Preble. (Cf. *Harper's Mag.*, Aug., 1859.) Admiral Preble's own copy of his paper, with MS. additions, is in Mass. Hist. Soc. library. — ED.]

² It was made by R. M. Johnson, chairman, Nov. 29, 1814, and was published at Washington, 1814. Geo. W. Campbell made also a report, Jan. 2, 1815. (Cf. *Am. St. Papers, Mil. Affairs*, i. 524-599.) A statement in reference to the burning of the navy-yard is in *Ibid.*, *Nav. Aff.*, i. 360. (Cf. *Hist. Reg.*, iv.) Gen. Winder's narrative presented to the committee of investigation, as well as General Stansbury's report, are given by Williams also. [Monroe, then Secretary of State, wrote out a statement, which is in Gilman's *Monroe* (p. 119). There are some other semi-official and contemporary views in A. J. Dallas's *Exposition of the character of the war* (*Life of Dallas*, 362); in Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 8, with documents; and some experiences in the *Memoirs and letters of Dolly Madison* (ch. 8). — ED.]

³ Cf. Armstrong's *Notices*, with documents, including Col. Allen McClane's journal, and his letter (*Niles's Reg.* vii. 6; Ingraham's *War Dept.*, 67); T. L. M'Kenney's *Narrative of the causes which led to Gen. Armstrong's resignation*; Kosciusko Armstrong's *Review of the Narrative*, etc. (N. Y., 1846); a *Reply* by K. Armstrong (N. Y., 1847); K. Armstrong's *Examination of M'Kenney's Reply* (N. Y., 1847). *An Enquiry respecting the Capture of Washington by Spectator* (February, 1816) is thought to be by Armstrong himself.

⁴ Kennedy's *Wirt*, i. ch. 21, gives a picture of militia service in this region at this time.

defeat upon the cabinet, and particularly upon Gen. Armstrong, was made at a late day by John S. Williams, who was brigade-major under Gen. Smith, in his *Hist. of the Invasion and Capture of Washington and of the Events which preceded and followed* (N. Y., 1857).¹ A professional view of the campaign is given by Gen. Cullum in his *Campaigns of 1812-15* (ch. 8).²

On the English side, beyond the official accounts (*Annual Reg.*, 1814, pp. 183, 219), there are accounts by participants, the best of which is the *Campaigns of the British Army at Washington and New Orleans. By the author of the Subaltern* (London, 1821, 4th ed., 1836). The Rev. George Robert Gleig, the author, served in the British army (subsequently chaplain of H. M. Forces), and his narrative of the Washington campaign, based upon his journal, is exceedingly temperate and valuable. Although not without inaccuracies, its tone is judicial, and the author evidently intends to be fair.³

As respects the attack on Baltimore (Sept., 1814), the local histories, like McSherry's *Maryland* (ch. 17) and Scharf's *Baltimore*, supply what the general histories lack. Dawson (ii. 390) collates the authorities and refers to the essential sources.⁴

The war which Tecumseh had stirred up among the divided Creeks first manifested itself in the defeat of the whites at Burnt-Corn Creek (Claiborne's *Sam. Dale*), and shortly afterwards in the massacre of Fort Mims, Aug. 30, 1813, at the juncture of the Alabama and Tombigbee rivers.⁵

¹ [Williams examined the Madison papers which were then in Col. Force's hands, but was not allowed to copy any. In his appendix he gives letters of Richard Rush, who was in Madison's cabinet, and of Major George Peter, who commanded the light corps of the district. — ED.]

² [Cf. also Cullum's paper in the *Papers, Amer. Hist. Assoc.*, ii. 54. A few other references: Gen. Wilkinson's *Memoirs*, i. ch. 16; *Autobiog. of Chas. Biddle* on the effect of the event, p. 350; Dawson, ii. 371; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Jan., 1886, p. 85; *Harper's Mag.*, xxviii. 433; Lossing, 925, etc.]

The naval defence and the service of the sailors at Bladensburg is noted in Roosevelt, p. 317; Mrs. Barney's *Biog. Memoir of Com. Barney*, ch. 17, whose appendix contains Barney's "British Official Account set right," as printed in the *Nat. Intelligencer*. (Cf. *Niles's Reg.*, vii., Suppl. 159, and John Barney's *Fifty Years of Events*.)

For plans of the Bladensburg fight, the approaches to Washington, and views, see Wilkinson's *Memoirs*, nos. 16, 17, whose maps are the basis of those in James's *Military Occurrences*; Ingraham's *Sketch* for a map of the campaign; Cullum's *Campaigns of the War*, ch. 7; Lossing, 929; and a rude plan in a *Narrative of the battle of Bladensburg in a letter to Henry Banning by an officer of Gen. Smith's Staff*. Cf. *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Dec., 1885, p. 612. — ED.]

³ An American edition of the book was published in Philadelphia, 1821, with the title following the original London ed.: *Narrative of the Campaigns of the British army at Washington, Baltimore, and New Orleans; by an officer who served in the expedition*. The American edition contains an appendix, which corrects a

few of Gleig's minor errors. It was reprinted as *A subaltern in America; comprising his narrative of the campaigns, etc.* (Philad., 1833.) [Gleig at the age of ninety again returned to the subject in a letter (*Mag. Amer. Hist.*, May, 1886, p. 508) drawn out by a paper by Horatio King (*Ibid.*, Nov., 1885, p. 438).]

Other accounts are found in the *Memoirs of Admiral Sir George Cockburn*; in *Facts relating to the Capture of Washington, by an officer serving as quartermaster-general* [Gen. Sir De Lacy Evans] (London, 1829); and in the *Memoirs of the life of Sir Edward Codrington, ed. by his daughter, Lady Bouchier* (Lond., 1873). James (vol. vi.) and Brenton (vol. ii.) of course touch the events. Trimen's *British Army* shows that the 4th, 21st, 44th, and 85th foot were present. A letter, Jan. 30, 1815, was sent by John Strachan, of the Loyal and Patriotic Soc. of Upper Canada, to Jefferson, in which the burning of the parliamentary buildings at York was cited against the burning of the buildings at Washington, and pronouncing false the story of finding at York a human scalp over the speaker's chair. This letter was printed in the *Report* of that society (Montreal, 1817), and is copied in the appendix to *Coffin's 1812, the War, etc.* — ED.]

⁴ [Cf. *Am. St. Papers, Mil. Affairs*; *Niles's Register*, vii.; *Analectic Mag.*, xii.; James, *Naval Hist.*, vi. 187; Gleig's *Narrative*, and Sir George Dallas's *Biog. Mem. of Sir Peter Parker, killed while storming the Amer. Camp at Bellair, Aug. 31, 1814* (Lond., 1816). — ED.]

⁵ We have the official accounts in the *State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, i. 845, with plans in Claiborne's *Dale*, Pickett, Lossing, p. 756, and *Harper's Mag.*, xxviii. 603. [Dawson (ii. 269) collates the

The Creek War was short. It started Jackson on his career, and the lives of him by Parton and Eaton — not to name others — give it due prominence.¹ The Georgians under Floyd were at the same time fighting at Auttose, Nov. 29, 1813, and at Calebee, Jan. 27, 1814 (Dawson, ii. 311, 323).² From the side of the Mississippi Territory the war was conducted by Gen. Claiborne.³

The treaty of Fort Jackson, Aug. 10, 1814, closed the conflict, with a large acquisition of lands to the United States, effectually separating the remaining territory of the Indians from Spanish contact.⁴

As respects the Louisiana campaign, perhaps the most important contribution is a work, written in French, by Jackson's chief-engineer, Major A. Lacarrière Latour, translated by H. P. Nugent, and published in Philadelphia in 1816 as *Historical Memoir of the War in West Florida and Louisiana in 1814-15*, accompanied by an atlas of eight maps.⁵ Jackson's despatches will be found in the usual official depositories, and are used in the

authorities. There are personal resources in Claiborne's *Life and Times of General Sam. Dale*, a useful book of a somewhat gossipy and anecdotic character. Pickett's *Alabama*, vol. ii., gives the fullest account, based on documents and an acquaintance with the actors of the time. He had the papers of Gen. Ferdinand L. Claiborne. Parton (*Jackson*, i. ch. 37) gives a rapid sketch. — ED.]

¹ James Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson*, 3 vols. (N. Y., 1860). John Henry Eaton, *Life of Andrew Jackson*, comprising a history of the war in the South (Philad., 1824). The first four chapters, carrying the narrative partly through the Creek War, were written by Major John Reid, U. S. A., who was an eye-witness of the events related. John T. Jenkins, *Life and public services of Gen. Andrew Jackson, with the eulogy delivered by George Bancroft* (N. Y., 1860), and others of minor importance. The *Civil and military history of Andrew Jackson* (N. Y., 1825), by "an American Officer," contains a large number of Jackson's despatches. William G. Sumner's very able analytical study, *Andrew Jackson as a public man* (*American Statesmen*, Boston, 1882), gives the Creek war little more than a passing allusion. [Dawson (ii. 301, 303, 327) groups the authorities on the conflicts of Tallus-hatchee (Nov. 3, 1813), where Gen. Coffee was acting under Jackson's orders; at Talladega, Nov. 9, 1813, with Jackson in command; at Emuckfau Creek, Jan. 22, 1814; at Enitachopco, Jan. 24; and at To-hopeka, or Horseshoe Bend, March 27, 1814. Jackson's report of this last action, which ended the war, was printed in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Jan., 1888, p. 45, with a map, p. 385. Dawson charges Eaton with misrepresenting the facts of the massacre, to help Jackson's political prospects. — ED.]

² [The appendix of Miller's *Bench and Bar of Georgia* (Philad., 1858, vol. i.) consists of a memoir of Gen. David Blackshear, including the correspondence of Governors Irwin, Jackson, Mitchell, Early, and Rabun, and of Maj.-Gen. McIntosh, Brig.-Gen. Floyd, and other officers

in the war of 1813-14, on the frontiers and sea-coast of Georgia. — ED.]

³ Cf. Nathaniel H. Claiborne's *Notes on the War in the South, with sketches of the lives of Montgomery, Jackson, Sevier, Claiborne and others* (Richmond, 1819); J. F. H. Claiborne's *Mississippi*, ch. 27, 28; and his *Sam. Dale*.

⁴ *State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, i. 827; Parton's *Jackson*, ch. 51 and text in App.

The essential sources on the Creek War: — *State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, i. Pickett's *Alabama*, ii., is an important book; Lossing's *War of 1812*, ch. 33 and 34 (also *Harper's Mag.*, xxviii.), and Parton's *Jackson* (using, among unprinted material, MSS. of Coffee, etc., in the Tennessee Hist. Soc.) are the two best later compiled accounts. [Cf. Ingersoll, ch. 10; the *Notes and Sam. Dale* of the Claibornes; the lives of Jackson; of General Sam. Houston and David Crockett; the histories of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi; Monette's *Mississippi Valley*; Drake's *Book of the Indians*; and, for documents, the references in Poore's *Descrip. Catalogue*, under "Creek," p. 1303, and *Poole's Index*. Parton (*Jackson*, i. pp. xiii-xv) notes some of the books on the subject, with comments, and says Trumbull's *Discovery of America* (see Vol. VI. p. 651) contains some early accounts not found elsewhere. — ED.]

⁵ [Roosevelt, who adds a chapter on New Orleans to his *Naval War*, 3d ed., considers Latour "the only trustworthy American contemporary historian" of the campaign. As Edward Livingston acted as aide-de-camp to Jackson, his *Life*, by Hunt (ch. 10), is of interest. M'Affee (*Hist. of the late War in the Western Country*, Lexington, Ky., 1816) derived his knowledge in part from acquaintance with actors in the campaign. Wilkinson (*Memoirs*, i. ch. 12) touches the campaign.

There are easily reached maps of the campaign: In Cullum, pp. 322, 326; in Sir W. H. Cope's *Rifle Brigade* (London, 1877); in the Atlas of Latour, perhaps the best; in Lossing, pp. 1032, 1040, 1044, 1051. Among the Jackson

biographies.¹ Parton says that, of the later accounts, he is more indebted to Alexander Walker's *Jackson and New Orleans* (N. Y., 1856) than to any other. Gen. Cullum gives the campaign a professional examination in his *Campaigns of the War* (ch. 8).²

On the English side we have the official reports of General Keane (Dec. 26, 1814) and of General Lambert (Jan. 10), who succeeded to the command, in R. H. Burgoyne's *Hist. Records of the 93d Sutherland Highlanders* (London, 1883); and in the *Annual Register*, 1815, p. 141.³ Capt. John Henry Cook, of the 43d British Regiment, participating in the attack, published, twenty years later, a *Narrative of events in the South of France and of the attack on New Orleans in 1814-15* (London, 1834).⁴ The narrative of Gleig, the same who was in the Potomac campaign, is equally useful here.⁵

All that need be considered of the war of 1812 on the northwest coast is given in H. H. Bancroft's *Northwest Coast*, i. ch. 10.

papers, recently found in Washington, was a British plan for the capture of New Orleans, indorsed by Jackson, "Picked up on the field of battle" (*Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, Oct., 1882, p. 130). There are various views of localities connected with the campaign in Lossing, pp. 1024-1055 (also cf. *Harper's Mag.*, x., xx., xxx.); Cable's *Creoles of Louisiana* (ch. 26, 27). An interesting bird's-eye view of the battle, drawn by Jackson's chief-engineer Latour, is engraved in Lossing, p. 1047. There was published in Paris, as engraved by Debucourt, a picture of the battle, purporting to have been drawn "on the field and painted by Lacotte, architect and assistant-engineer in the Louisiana army" (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xv. 230). — ED.]

¹ Particularly in the *Civil and mil. History of Andrew Jackson* (N. Y., 1825). [Loubat gives his report, with the medal (no. xlvi.). Eaton and Parton are sufficient; but Sumner's *Life of Jackson* has a chapter (ch. 2) on the war. Dawson (ii. 309) collates the sources.

The portraits of Jackson are very numerous. The most interesting for its connection with this campaign is the miniature by Vallé, a French artist then in New Orleans, which Jackson gave to Edward Livingston, and it is engraved in Hunt's *Livingston*, p. 208. Vanderlyn painted a full-length military figure (1819), which is now in the City Hall, N. Y. It is given entire in Lossing (p. 1020), and but only in Hunt's *Edw. Livingston*, engraved by H. B. Hall, and in Parton. (Cf. *Charleston Year-Book*, 1883, p. 163.) The medallion profile is given in Loubat, plate lv., and Lossing, p. 1052. Sully's picture is in the War Department. There is a drawing by Longacre. (Cf. *Nat. Port. Gallery*, 1834.) A striking rugged head, after a lithograph by La Fosse, is engraved by G. Kruell in Higginson's *Larger History*. Parton also gives the standing figure, in civil dress, by Earl, and a silhouette uncovered full-length. — ED.]

² Of use are the histories of Louisiana by Martin and by Gayarré; of Mississippi by Claiborne (i. 343). [The histories of Kentucky (Colins, i. 309) are jealously concerned with com-

bating charges upon the action of the Kentucky troops on the right bank of the river. Cf. *Letters of Gen. Adair and Gen. Jackson relative to the charge of cowardice made by the latter against the Kentucky troops at New Orleans* (Lexington, Ky., 1816).

Of little importance are Paris M. Davis's *Official and full detail of the great battle of New Orleans* (N. Y., 1836); *An Authentic Narrative of the memorable achievements of the Amer. Army before New Orleans* (N. Y., 1856). The list of titles prefixed to Parton's *Life of Jackson* (pp. xiii., etc.) will guide to other minor helps, and *Poole's Index* (p. 913) gives clues to separate papers in magazines. Cf. Ingersoll, 2d series, ii. ch. 2; and Waring and Cable's "New Orleans," in the *Tenth Census*, p. 37. The interesting story of Jackson's submission to the civil law, when he was fined \$1,000 after the peace was declared, is told by Charles Dimitry in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, May, 1886.

Accounts of the service of Jean Lafitte and the Baratarians smugglers in the defence of New Orleans, after they had refused the offers of the British commanders, are given in Parton's *Jackson*, p. 580; the *Southern Bivouac*, Aug., 1886; by G. W. Cable in *The Century*, April, 1883, and in his *Creoles of Louisiana*; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Oct., 1883, p. 284. Cf. *Poole's Index*, p. 717.

There are commemorative addresses by A. H. Everett (1836) and A. E. Rouquette (1846). — ED.]

³ [Richard Trimen's *Regiments of the British army* (Lond., 1878) shows that there were present: the Rifle Brigade, the 14th Hussars, and the 4th, 7th, 21st, 43d, 44th, 85th, and 93d Foot. — ED.]

⁴ Smith, *Life of Cass*, p. 314, says that a review of this book which appeared in the *Amer. Quarterly Review*, Dec., 1834, was written by Lewis Cass "under the eye of Gen. Jackson." [Cf. J. Leach's *Sketches of the Field Services of the Rifle Brigade* (London, 1838). — ED.]

⁵ A few other books may assist the student: *The Memoirs of Admiral Codrington* (ch. 7); *Recollections of an artillery officer*, by Benson

On the war of 1815 with Algiers, Decatur's reports are given in Mackenzie's *Decatur* (App. viii.), and there are various documents in Bowen's *Naval Temple* (Boston, 1816). The official record is the Congressional documents (cf. Poore's *Desc. Catal.*, under 1815-16) and the *Am. St. Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 748. The final treaty is recounted later.¹

Respecting the first Seminole War (1818), Jackson's despatches are given in the *Civil and Mil. Hist. of Jackson* (N. Y., 1825); and these and other official documents are in the *State Papers, Mil. Aff.*, i. 681-769,² and *Ind. Aff.*, ii. 154. The President's *Messages* of Dec. 2 and 28, 1818, elucidate the origin of the war, and the evidence on which Arbuthnot and Ambrister were executed.³ The question of indirect orders to invade Florida is reduced to a question of veracity between Monroe and Jackson, with the weight of evidence in favor of the former. The question has been examined by Schouler in "Monroe and the Rhea letter" in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Oct., 1884.⁴ J. Q. Adams alone defended Jackson's conduct in the cabinet discussions.⁵ Jackson's defence in an "Exposition" was not printed till Benton inserted it in his *Thirty Years' View*, i. 168. It goes over the whole course of events, as Adams did in his despatch to Erving, in reply to the Spanish complaints. The later writers have emphasized the relations of the war to the interests of slavery.⁶

Earle (Lond., ca. 1830); *Proceedings of the Court-martial upon Lieut.-Col. Mullins of the 44th Infantry* (Lond., 1815). Of course, the general histories touch the story: Brenton, ii. 533; Alison's *Europe*, iv. 479, etc.; the reviews: *Quarterly*, xxxvii. 404; *Edinburgh*, xlv. 368.

¹ [See next chapter. Cooper goes over the war in his second volume. Cf. Ingersoll, 2d ser., ii.; *Analectic Mag.*, vii. 113. — ED.] Col. M. M. Noah was consul of the U. S. at Tunis during the Algerine War, and his *Travels in England, France, Spain, and the Barbary States* gives a minute picture of the condition of the affairs at this time in Northern Africa, and recounts fully the circumstances of Decatur's negotiations at Tunis.

² This is by far the most important authority in reference to the war; it is entitled *Defeat of the Seminole Indians*, and gives all the correspondence and orders. The correspondence in reference to the arrest of Capt. Obed Wright will be found in the same volume, pp. 774-778. Cf. *Niles's Register*, xiv., xv., xvii., xxi. The correspondence of Monroe and Jackson in 1818 is in Parton's *Jackson*, ii. ch. 39. See also President Monroe's communication to the 15th Cong., 1st sess., relative to illegal armaments and the occupation of Amelia Island (*Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, iv. 183).

³ [The trial of Arbuthnot and Ambrister (1818) was published separately as transmitted to the President, and is in the *St. Papers, Mil. Aff.*, i. 721; *Civil and Mil. Hist. of Jackson*, etc.; *Niles's Register*, xv. Cf. Parton's *Jackson*, ii. ch. 36. — ED.]

⁴ [Cf. Schouler's *History*, iii. 83; Parton's *Jackson*, ii. 528; Gay's *U. S.*, iv. 257; Judge Overton's *Vindication of the Seminole War* (Washington, 1819). — ED.]

⁶ [Morse's *J. Q. A.*, 160; and Adams's *Me-*

moirs, anno 1818; Parton's *Jackson*, ii. ch. 39; Schouler's *History*, iii. 74. The cabinet disagreement ultimately produced a quarrel between Jackson and Calhoun, when Crawford caused Jackson to understand that his course had been censured by Calhoun (Von Holst's *Calhoun*, 88-93). Calhoun published in his vindication "to the people of the United States" the *Correspondence between Gen. Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun on the subject of the course of the latter in the deliberations of the Cabinet on the occurrences of the Seminole War* (Washington, 1831). Cf. *Niles's Reg.*, xxxix. 447; xl. 11, 37; Calhoun's *Works*, vol. vi., App.

The proceedings in Congress appear in *The Debates in the Ho. of Rep. on the Seminole War* (Washington, 1819). The speech of Henry Clay (Mallory's *Clay*, i. 365) made a breach between Jackson and Clay (Parton, ii. 535; Schurz's *Clay*, i. 151). Jackson was defended by James Tallmadge, Jr. (*Speech*, N. Y., 1819).

In the House, Jan. 12, 1819, there was a majority *Report* censuring, and a minority commending, Jackson's course.

In the Senate, Lacock made a *Report*, Feb. 2, 1819, accompanied by documents, which censured Jackson (Niles, xvi. 33). It produced *Strictures on Mr. Lacock's Report*, with an app. of the letters of Jackson and Calhoun. — ED.]

⁶ *For. Rel.* iv. 539. Cf. a *Vindication of the measures of the President and his commanding generals, by a Citizen of Tennessee* (Washington, 1819); Eaton's *Jackson*; Sumner's *Jackson*, ch. 3.

[The quality of the contemporary censure is shown in *The letters of Algernon Sidney in defence of civil liberty* (Richmond, 1830, — first printed in the *Richmond Inquirer*, 1818, 1819); Samuel Perkins's *Gen. Jackson's Conduct in the Seminole War* (Brooklyn, Conn., 1828), — a campaign protest against Jackson; but Parton ab-

For the details of the Pirate's War of 1821-1826, we must look to the official correspondence and the lives of those engaged in putting an end to the depredations.¹

In Lieutenant Fitzgerald de Roos's *Personal Narrative of Travels in the U. S.* (London, 1827) will be found some observations on the condition of the navy in 1826. On the affair of Quallah Batoo, 1832, see the *Am. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, iv. 150-158 (Reports and Correspondence); *Voyage of the U. S. Frigate Potomac, under the command of Commodore John Downes*, by J. N. Reynolds, N. Y., 1835 (pp. 88-130). On the protracted labors of the Navy in the suppression of the slave-trade, the all-important work is Comr. (afterwards Rear-Adm.) A. H. Foote's *Africa and the American Flag* (N. Y., 1854).

The general histories are scant upon the war with the Sacs and Foxes, or the Blackhawk War, as it is usually called, and we must depend mainly on the lives of some of the leading participants and the local literature.²

The documents relating to the causes of the second Seminole War (1835-42) are appended to a *Letter from the Sec. of War*, June 6, 1836. The other official material is found in the *Am. St. Pap., Mil. Aff.*, vi. 56-80, 433, 445, 450-783, 788, 992-1002, 1026-1069; vol. vii. 110, 745, 790, 918, 992. The voluminous reports of the courts of inquiry

lows it to be temperate; and for an English view, the *Narrative of a voyage to the Spanish Main on the ship "Two Friends," with an app. containing a detail of the Seminole War, and the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister* (London, 1819), which contains some documentary evidence against Jackson's course. — ED.]

[Cf. Von Holst's *History*, i. 338; Henry Wilson's *Slave Power*, i. ch. 10; and Joshua R. Giddings's *Exiles of Florida, or the crimes committed by our government against the Maroons, who fled from South Carolina and other Slave States, seeking protection under Spanish Laws* (Columbus, O., 1858). — ED.]

¹ See *Am. St. Pap., Nav. Aff.*, i. 787; 804-814 (correspondence, Biddle's command); 822, 1004-1011, 1095, and 1103-1121 (Porter's command). See also *For. Rel.*, v. 343, 428, 471, 490, 589. On the affair of Foxardo, *A. S. P., Nav. Aff.*, ii. 132-440 (Record of proceedings of Court-Martial); *Ibid.* 648-698 (correspondence). The record of the court-martial has also been published separately as *Report of the Trial of Commo. David Porter* (Wash., 1825). Farragut's *Life of Farragut*, ch. xi., and Griffis's *M. C. Perry*, ch. viii., deal with the Pirates' war. See also Aaron Smith's *Atrocities of the Pirates* (London, 1824). The incidents of Porter's command during the Pirates' war are treated in chapters xvii. and xviii. of Admiral Porter's *Life of Commodore Porter*. G. W. Cable in his *Creoles of Louisiana* (ch. 24-28), gives some local details about the "pirates of Barataria."

² John A. Wakefield's *Hist. of the War between the U. S. and the Sac and Fox Nations . . . in 1828, 1831 and 1832* (Jacksonville, Ill., 1834).

A later edition of J. L. Thomson's *History of the War of 1812* was published in Philadelphia, 1873, with a supplement containing chapters on

the Black Hawk War, the Florida War, and the war with Mexico.

For Scott's part in the campaign, see the *Memoirs written by himself*, ch. 18, and E. D. Mansfield's *Life of Gen. Scott* (pp. 197-219). Cf. also William Preston Johnston's *Life of Gen. A. S. Johnston* (N. Y., 1878), ch. 3. There are several lives of the Indian leader: Benj. Drake's *Life of Blackhawk, with sketches of the late Blackhawk War* (Cincinnati, 1838, and other eds., — Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 342); and *Life of Mah-tai-me she-kai-kiak or Black Hawk . . . with an account of the Cause and General History of the late War, etc.* Dictated by himself (Cincinnati, 1833, and Boston, 1834); [J. C. Pilling's *Proof-sheets of a bibliog. of the languages of the No. Am. Indians* (Washington, 1885), no. 391, giving also an ed. of 1845. There is a sketch in McKenney and Hall, ii. 29.

In local histories: Ford's *History of Illinois, 1818-1847* (Chicago, 1854); Albach's *Annals*, 959; and the *Record of Illinois soldiers in the Blackhawk War and Mexican War*, by I. H. Elliott (Springfield, Ill., 1882). The *Catalogue of the library of the Minnesota Hist. Soc.* (St. Paul, 1888), in 2 vols., gives (i. pp. 221) under "Black Hawk" and "Black Hawk War" various references. The subject references of this catalogue are useful on all subjects of Northwestern history.

In serials: E. Backus in *Hist. Mag.*, xxii. 352; I. N. Arnold in the *Fergus Hist. Series*, no. 10; *Mag. West. Hist.*, Nov., 1886; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, May, 1886; *Wisconsin Hist. Soc. Coll.*, ii. 326, 414; *Michigan Pioneer Coll.*, i. 48; v. 152.

Cf. Drake's *Book of the Indians*, v. ch. 8; Dawson's *Battles*, ii. 426; and for a later period, in the Northwest, 1835-1846, S. W. Pond in *Minn. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, iii. 129. — ED.]

on the campaigns of Gen. Scott and Gen. Gaines are in this volume, pp. 125-465; also the correspondence in reference to the withdrawal of Gen. Scott and the appointment of Gen. Jesup, pp. 794-894. The same volume contains Taylor's report of the engagement near the Kissimee River, p. 985.

Certain communications from army officers relative to the campaign will be found in the *Cong. Globe* for April 2, April 8, and June 4, 1836, and in the *Army and Navy Chronicle* for Aug. 11, 1836.

The most important work on this protracted and exhausting struggle is the voluminous *Origin, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War* (N. Y., 1848), by John T. Sprague, Bvt.-Capt. 8th Inf. Capt. Sprague was an officer of the regular army, retiring ultimately as col. of the 7th Inf. after the close of the Civil War. He received a brevet for meritorious conduct in the war of which he writes, and his narrative of the campaigns in which he took part leaves little to be desired. His account of the negotiations with the Seminoles, preceding the war, is full and satisfactory. He prints the most important official documents *in extenso*.

The war in Florida: being an exposition of its causes and an accurate history of the campaigns of Generals Clinch, Gaines, and Scott, by a late staff officer (Baltimore, 1836), is the work of Lieut. Woodbourne Potter, of the Seventh Infantry, who was well acquainted with the history of the early Seminole disturbance, and writes with full detail, and much of the time with the authority of an eye-witness. His book carries the narrative down to Scott's campaign in April, 1836. It is a sound little work, fair and reasonable in its views, and presents all sides of the question. It has a map of the early campaigns. The *Notices of Florida and the Campaigns* (Charleston, 1836), by M. M. Cohen, an officer of the left wing, who commanded the pioneers in Brisbane's regiment, begin with the discovery of Florida in 1497; but the valuable part of the book consists of his journal of the campaign made by the left wing of Scott's army under Gen. Eustis. Another narrative written by an officer in Eustis's division is the anonymous *Sketch of the Seminole War* (Charleston, 1836), by "a lieutenant of the left wing." The conduct of the early campaigns of the war is critically discussed in chapter 20 of Smith's *Life and Times of Lewis Cass*, Cass being at this time at the head of the War Department.¹

In general, for the Mexican War, the all-important authorities are the reports of the Secretaries of War and of the Navy for 1846, 1847 and 1848, with accompanying documents, which are given with great fullness, together with maps.²

¹ As regards special details, a slight reference to naval service in the Florida war will be found in J. W. Revere's *Keel and Saddle* (ch. 1).

[Secretary Poinsett made a *Report*, Sept. 21, 1837, on the number of Indians employed on the side of the whites, and another, Feb. 17, 1840, in defence of the use of bloodhounds.

For the views in Congress, see Benton's *Debates* and his *Thirty Years' View*, ii. ch. 18, 19; Roosevelt's *Benton*, ch. 10; Wilson's *Slave Power*, i. ch. 36; W. L. G. Smith's *Lewis Cass*, ch. 20.

Other references: Capt. James Barr's *Correct and authentic narrative of the Indian War* (N. Y., 1836); *Authentic Narrative of the Seminole War* (Providence, 1836, — Field, no. 60); T. F. Rodenbough's *From everglade to cañon with the 2d dragoons. An authentic account of service in Florida, Mexico, Virginia, and the Indian country, including the personal recollections of prominent officers. With an appendix containing orders, reports and correspondence, military rec-*

ords, etc., 1836-75 (New York, 1875); Drake's *Book of the Indians*, viii. ch. 17, 20, etc.; Williams's *Territory of Florida*; McCall's *Letters from the Frontier*, 293, etc.; Fairbanks's *Florida*, ch. 20-23; Dawson's *Battles*, ii. 439; Von Holst, ii. 295, with references on the cost of the war and the spirit animating its conduct; and on the Seminole leader, *Narrative of Ocoela Nikkan-oochee and his renowned uncle, Ocoela* (London, 1841, Field, 1118); M'Kenney and Hall, ii. 199; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, v. 447.

The leading map of the campaigns is that compiled by Capt. John Mackay and Lieut. J. E. Blake, published by order of the Senate in 1840, which is given on a reduced scale in Drake's *Book of the Indians*, 8th ed., 1841. There are other maps in J. L. Williams's *Territory of Florida* (N. Y., 1837) and his *View of West Florida* (Philad., 1827), and in Cohen's *Notices*, etc. (1836). — Ed.]

² They are grouped together in a two-volume publication, *Messages of the President of the*

On the American side, the best military history of the war is Gen. Roswell S. Ripley's *The War with Mexico* (N. Y., 1849, and London, 1850), in two vols., with plans. As might be expected in a book by a professional soldier, it deals fully with strategic operations, and, except for a certain tendency to underrate the work of the navy, it is a highly satisfactory book.¹ The other general works on the war, with the exception of Mansfield's² among the professional treatments, and Horatio O. Ladd's convenient little *History of the War with Mexico* (N. Y., 1883), giving a fairly good general view, need not be characterized much beyond giving their titles.³ The personal element is an important one in the study of the war, and the dominating influence of the two leading generals, Taylor and Scott, make the telling of their lives, as combined, a history of the war. Of Taylor we have no considerable or well-studied account,⁴ and we must depend upon official and other sources for this part of the war.⁵ Of Scott, we have, beside the life by Mans-

United States, with the Correspondence, therewith communicated, between the Secretary of War and other officers of the Government on the subject of the Mexican War (Washington, 1847-48), which may be supplemented by the *Report of the Sec. of War*, Feb. 26, 1849, on the operations of the U. S. army (31st Cong., 1st sess., Sen. Ex. Doc. 32). The separate papers can be found through Poore's *Desc. Catal.*

¹ [It was not altogether satisfactory, however, to some of his brother officers, and issue was taken with him in certain directions by Isaac I. Stevens, of the army, in his *Campaigns of the Rio Grande and of Mexico, with notices of the work of Maj. Ripley* (N. Y., 1851). — Ed.]

² E. D. Mansfield's *Mexican War, a history of its origin and a detailed account of the victories, etc.* (N. Y., 1849, 1873, etc.). The book is in large part composed of official documents; and its narrative is in effect abridged in his *Life of Scott*.

³ [Brantz Mayer, who had been consul in Mexico, and had already published a book, *Mexico as it was and as it is* (N. Y., 1844; Philad., 1847), which had not pleased the people and the Catholics, published his *History of the War between Mexico and the U. S., with a view of its origin* (Lond. and N. Y., 1848, and other eds.), which is not without rendering justice to the Mexican arms.

There were a number of books issued just at the close of the war, of more value as showing current views than for historical use: W. S. Henry's *Campaign Sketches of the War* (N. Y., 1847); Loring Moody's *Hist. of the Mexican War, showing the relations of the U. S. Gov't to slavery* (Boston, 2d ed., 1848); N. C. Brooks's *Complete Hist. of the Mexican War* (Philad., 1849); C. J. Peterson's *Mil. heroes of the War with Mexico* (Philad.), a specimen of the ready-made book of the hour; John S. Jenkins's *Hist. of the Mexican War* (Auburn, 1851; N. Y., 1859), a politician's affair. George C. Furber, who was a Tennessee cavalryman, and published his experiences in *The Twelve Months' Volunteer* (Cincinnati, 1847, and later eds.), also wrote

a continuation of Philip Young's *Hist. of Mexico*, which includes the period of the war, and offers a good share of the documentary proofs.

Of more special character is Fayette Robinson's *Acc. of the organization of the Army* (Philad. 1848), with sketches of the leading generals. H. H. Bancroft has a note on the losses of the army (*Mexico*, v. 544). The part of the cavalry is recounted in Albert G. Brackett's *Hist. of the U. S. Cavalry, 1789-1863* (N. Y., 1865). W. H. Robarts compiled from official sources his *Mexican War Veterans, a complete roster of the regular and volunteer troops, 1846-1848* (Washington, 1887).

Geo. W. Kendall's *War between the United States and Mexico illustrated, embracing pictorial drawings of all the principal conflicts, by Carl Nebel, with a description of each battle* (N. Y., 1851), may be of interest for costume. There is in the N. Y. Hist. Soc. library ten large volumes of contemporary newspaper scraps, compiled by J. B. Moore.

Cf., for foreign comment, E. L. G. de F. de Bellemarre's "La guerre des États-Unis et du Mexique" in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, xix. 385. — Ed.]

⁴ [Such as they are, we have: *Life and Public Services of Gen. Taylor, by an officer* (N. Y., 1846); Henry Montgomery's *Life of Gen. Taylor*, (Auburn, 20th ed., 1851); *Gen. Taylor and his Staff* (Philad., 1848). The best is *A life of Gen. Zachary Taylor: comprising a narrative of events connected with his professional career, by J. Reese Fry: and authentic incidents of his early years, by Robert T. Conrad* (Philad., 1848). Cf. *Poole's Index*, p. 1287. Portraits of Taylor at the time of the war are, among others, one by James H. Beard in the City Hall at Charleston, S. C. (*Charleston Year-Book*, 1883, p. 164); and one by W. G. Brown in the War Department. Loubat gives on the medals two or three different profile heads. The *Statesman's Manual* has a likeness from a daguerreotype. — Ed.]

⁵ [Among personal narratives: Major George Deas's "Reminiscences of the Campaign on the Rio Grande" in *Hist. Mag.*, xvii. 19, 99, 236, 311.

field, his own *Memoirs*, in which ch. 26-35 are occupied with the story of his campaign, and his narrative is accompanied with some not very pleasant criminations of the President and General Taylor.¹ Of the generals of lesser rank, like Worth, Wool, and Quitman, we have no considerable biographies, unless of the last.²

Portions of De Peyster's *Life of Gen. Philip Kearny*. Samuel C. Reid's *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers* (Philad., 1859). *Journal of the twelve months' Campaign of Gen. Shields' Brigade in Mexico, 1846-47, compiled from notes of Lieutenants J. J. Adams and H. C. Dunbar, by Capt. W. W. Bishop, of the Illinois Volunteers* (St. Louis, 1847). *Sketches of the Campaign in Northern Mexico, 1847, by an officer of the first Ohio volunteers* [Luther Giddings] (N. Y., 1853). Gen. John R. Kenly's *Memoirs of a Maryland Volunteer* (Phila., 1873). The *Encarnacion prisoners, by a prisoner* (Louisville, 1848), gives an account of the march of the Kentucky cavalry from Louisville to the Rio Grande, together with a narrative of the captivity of the American prisoners. There is hasty work in Thomas B. Thorpe's *Our Army on the Rio Grande* (Philad., 1846) and his *Our Army at Monterey* (Philad., 1847). John Bonner makes a popular story of the campaigns in *Harper's Mag.* (xi. 170).

For Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma (May 8, 9, 1846), see H. H. Bancroft's *Mexico* (v. ch. 14), with plan and references, and reports and medals in Loubat, no. lx., and p. 282. The same use of Bancroft (v. ch. 15, and pp. 378, 381) and Loubat (no. lxi., and p. 291) can be made for Monterey (Sept. 19-24); but cf. *Hist. Mag.*, x. 207. Dawson (ii.) uses some MS. journals. We have large special material on Buena Vista (Feb. 22-23, 1847), and Bancroft (v. 420, 433-36) gives a long list of authorities, American and Mexican. Santa Anna's account is translated in Mansfield's *History* (pp. 143-162). Taylor's despatches, beside being in the official depositories, are in Loubat (p. 337), with a view of the medal given to him. James Henry Carleton, the author of *The Battle of Buena Vista* (N. Y., 1848), was a dragoon officer in the fight, and he combines personal observation with a study of the official documents, and enables the student to follow his investigations by his footnotes. Cf. Henry W. Benham's *Recollections of Mexico and the battle of Buena Vista, Feb. 22 and 23, 1847. By an engineer officer, on its twenty-fourth anniversary* [Anon.] (Boston, 1871), republished from *Old and New* for June and July, 1871; letters in Dix's *Gen. Dix* (i. 210); J. W. Gibson's *Letter descriptive of the battle of Buena Vista, written on the ground* (Lawrenceburgh, Ind., 1847); J. H. B. Latrobe's *Three great battles* (Balt., 1863); and references in *Pool's Index*, p. 173. For plans, see a folding plan in the anonymous *Campaign in Mexico* (Philad., 1847), by B. F. Scribner, which follows a draft by Lieut. Green,

of the 15th Infantry; a map in Mansfield; Gay's *Pop. Hist. U. S.*, iv. 374; Bancroft, v. 420; and *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Dec., 1879 (vol. iii.), with an article by Ellen Hardin Walworth. The general histories of the war, of course, have other plans. — ED.]

¹ [For details of Scott's campaign, with full references, see Bancroft's *Mexico* (v. ch. 17, 18, 19, and final references, p. 522). Dawson (ii. 498) is far less full in his collations of authorities. For popular accounts, see John Bonner in *Harper's Mag.*, xi. 311; and T. W. Knox's *Decisive Battles since Waterloo*. There are personal experiences in E. Parker Scammon's paper in *Mag. Am. Hist.*, xiv. p. 562. (Cf. *Hist. Mag.*, Nov., 1873.) Loubat gives the reports and medal (no. lxiii., and p. 305). There is a good deal of personal reminiscence of Gen. Scott in Gen. E. D. Keyes's *Fifty Years Observation of Men and Events* (N. Y., 1885).

A narrative of Scott's campaign from the standpoint of an intelligent private soldier, which derives additional freshness and value from the fact that the author is a foreigner, is the *Autobiography of an English soldier in the United States Army* (N. Y., 1853). It is written by a clear-headed and educated man. Also, as pertaining to Scott's campaign, there is *A conclusive Exculpation of the Marine Corps in Mexico from the Slanderous Allegations* [of John S. Devlin], with the record of the court-martial [of Devlin], by J. G. Reynolds (N. Y., 1853). Devlin's defence appeared in the *Marine Corps in Mexico, setting forth its conduct as established by testimony* (Washington, 1852).

Maps of the battles, beside being in the general histories, and particularly in *The Other Side* and its Spanish original, are in Bancroft (v. 443, 454). Plans of the valley and attack on Mexico are in Bancroft (v. 470, 499); Mansfield; *Le Spectateur militaire*, 2d ser., vol. xlii. A *Map of the Valley of Mexico, with a plan of the defences of the Capital and the line of operations of the U. S. army in Aug. and Sep., 1847. Surveyed and drawn by Smith and Bondcastle, U. S. Top. Engineers*, accompanies a *Report of the Sec. of War*, Jan. 17, 1849, with the reports of the engineers. See map in the present *History*, II. p. 374. Scott's plan of Cerro Gordo is in 30th Cong., 1st sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, i. 256. — ED.]

² J. F. H. Claiborne's *Life and Correspondence of Gen. J. A. Quitman* (1860), in 2 vols. There are two minor accounts of Gen. Wool: Francis Baylies' *Nar. of Maj.-Gen. Wool's Campaign in Mexico* (Albany, 1851). Cf. his "March of the U. S. troops under Gen. Wool from San An-

The best Mexican source on the conduct of the war is the conglomerate *Apuntes para la historia de la guerra entre México y los Estados-Unidos* (Mexico, 1848). There is an English translation by Albert C. Ramsey, colonel of the 11th U. S. Infantry, called *The other side, or notes for the history of the War between Mexico and the United States* (N. Y., 1850), which reproduces the battle-plans of the original.¹

The part performed by the navy on the east coast is well told, though too briefly, by Wm. Elliot Griffis, in his *Matthew Calbraith Perry: A typical naval officer* (Boston, 1887). Mr. Griffis's name is a guarantee of accuracy, and his work shows literary taste and skill. He is an ardent admirer of his subject, but this does not interfere with the fidelity of his work. His material was derived from original sources, and was only obtainable through great labor and painstaking research. The book is especially useful in bringing out the importance of the naval operations, which military writers have an apparently uncontrollable tendency to slight.²

For a vivid picture of naval life in the Mexican war period, there is nothing comparable to *Recollections of a Naval Officer, 1841-1865*, by Capt. William Harwar Parker (N. Y., 1883). It is as entertaining as a romance and as accurate as a photograph. The later half of the book belongs to the Civil War period. Previous to this, Capt. Parker's cruises had extended to nearly every station abroad, including the Mediterranean, the Coast of Africa, Brazil, the Pacific, and the West Indies. His style is anecdotic and racy, but his facts are faithfully presented, his judgments are sound to the core, and his impressions are sharply outlined. During the Mexican war, Capt. Parker, then a midshipman, served in the squadrons of Conner and Perry on the east coast, and took part in all the prominent operations. He was present at the capture of Vera Cruz, taking his tour of duty in the naval battery.³

tonio, Texas, to Saltillo, Mexico, 1846," in the *Amer. Q. Reg.*, July, 1850), and a *Sketch* (N. Y., 1851) reprinted from the *Democratic Review*, Nov., 1851.

Among other biographies may be mentioned: *Personal memoirs of U. S. Grant* (N. Y., 1885), vol. i. ch. 3-13; *Memoirs of Robert E. Lee*, by A. L. Long (N. Y., 1886), ch. 3; *Personal and military history of Philip Kearny*, by J. W. De Peyster (N. Y., 1869), ch. 10 and 11; *Life of W. S. Hancock*, by F. E. Goodrich (Philad., 1886), part ii.; another *Life of Hancock*, by Junkin and Norton (N. Y., 1880), ch. 3 and 4; *Life of Gen. A. S. Johnston*, by Wm. P. Johnston (N. Y., 1878), ch. 9; *Life of Gen. Thomas J. Jackson*, by Sarah N. Randolph (Philad., 1876), ch. 2; Gen. Geo. M. McCall's *Letters from the Frontier* (Philad., 1868).

¹ [H. H. Bancroft, in his *Hist. of Mexico*, vol. v. (p. 362, etc.), gives a more favorable idea of the Mexican side than we get from other American narratives, and Bancroft's footnotes display to us nearly all the important Mexican authorities on the subject. Cf. also his bibliography in his vol. i. He used (v. 553), among other material, a MS. *Invasion de México*, by Bustamante. In extensive notes (pp. 550, 802) he characterizes the leading American and Mexican sources, as well as the general histories of Mexico, some of which cover the period of this war. *Niles's Register* gave translations at the time of some of the Mexican reports of the battles. One of the important Mexican documents, to be taken with

some allowance for the bitterness of rivalry, is the *Apelacion al Buen Criterio de los Nacionales y Estrangeros* (Mexico, 1849), which is Santa Anna's defence against the charge of treachery which had been brought against him. He supports his views by an array of documents (Bancroft's *Mexico*, v. 553). Bancroft (v. 433) also says of José Mana Roa Bárcenas's *Recuerdos de la Invasion Norte-Americana, 1846-1848* (Mexico, 1883), that it is the result of the study of both American and Mexican documents, from which he equally quotes. — ED.]

² Cf. *Operations of the U. S. naval forces, 1846-47* (Washington, 1848) in *Doc. i. of House Ex. Docs., 30th Cong., 2d session*; and *Reports and Despatches [of] the U. S. naval forces during the war with Mexico* (Washington, 1849). Also, the index of Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*.

³ There are some other books of memoirs by naval officers. *El Puchero* (Phila., 1850), by Dr. Richard McSherry, U. S. N., who served as surgeon with the regiment of marines that formed part of Gen. Scott's force from Vera Cruz to Mexico. It is a sensible book, by a careful observer.

The campaign of the army from Vera Cruz to Mexico is treated in the latter part of Raphael Semmes's *Service afloat and ashore during the Mexican War* (Cincinnati, 1851). During this campaign Semmes acted as aide-de-camp to Major-General Worth. That portion of his book which relates specially to the operations of the army was republished under the title of *The*

Concerning the most momentous fruits of the war, the conquest of the North Mexican States and Alta California, the material is extensive. The official documents are of course the basis,¹ and there are various personal experiences among the published books.² H. H. Bancroft's *California* (vol. v. being in reality a history of the conquest)³ is the most abundant source, based on the largest knowledge, with a full statement in notes of all authorities, American and Mexican, essential and even non-essential, including a large amount of manuscript material.⁴

Bancroft's *North Mexican States*, vol. ii., has not at present writing been published, and we miss his guidance. On the conquest of New Mexico, conducted in the main by Gen. S. W. Kearny, with his subsequent march to the Pacific, the material is ample.⁵

campaign of General Scott in the Valley of Mexico (Cincinnati, 1852).

The east-coast operations are also touched in Chaplain Fitch W. Taylor's *The broad pennant: a cruise in the U. S. flagship of the Gulf Squadron* (N. Y., 1848). For the important services of the Mosquito flotilla on the east coast, consult Charles C. Jones's *Life and Services of Commodore Josiah Tattnall*, Savannah, 1878, ch. 6.

¹ [As a whole, they will be found grouped in H. H. Bancroft's *No. Mexican States and California*, in the lists prefixed to the first volume of each; and particularly see *California*, v. pp. 233, 241. Poore's *Desc. Catal.* is another ready key; and many documents are in *Niles's Register*. — ED.]

² Gen. (then Lieut.-Colonel) P. St. George Cooke's *Conquest of New Mexico and California* (N. Y., 1878) covers the infantry march to the Pacific, and the final stages of the conquest there. Walter Colton, a chaplain in the navy, in his *Three Years in California* (N. Y., 1850, 1852) gives an excellent notion of some aspects of the war. He was made Alcalde of Monterey by Stockton. Lieut. Joseph Warren Revere's *Tour of duty in California* (N. Y., 1849) is a gossipy and discursive book, but contains much original testimony, of a useful character, as to Stockton's operations, Revere being a lieutenant in his squadron, and taking an active part in the events of the campaign. The same author's *Keel and Saddle* (Boston, 1872) is a pleasant, chatty book of naval and other experiences, part of which (pp. 42-50) refers to Stockton's campaign. Cf. W. D. Phelps's *Fore and Aft* (Boston, 1871).

³ See his abridged statement, "How California was secured," in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Aug., 1887.

⁴ [Among this last are the papers of Consul T. O. Larkin (Bancroft's *California*, i. p. lviii), who was also in the beginning the secret agent of the United States to effect the transfer of the government of California by peaceful means, whose efforts, it seems apparent, were thwarted by the precipitate conduct of Stockton and Frémont. There has been a good deal of mystery about

the exact terms of his instructions from the government, but the Larkin papers revealed the despatch, which is corroborated by the copy at Washington. Both Bancroft and Royce, the latest writers, and possessing the amplest means of judging, make Larkin the main instrument of the conquest. Royce's *California* (Boston, 1886) is in the "Amer. Commonwealths" series. The author made use of the material in the Bancroft library, and submitted his proofs to Gen. Frémont. There are numerous other general works, but reference need only be made to James Madison Cutts's *Conquest of California and New Mexico* (Philad., 1847), with its app. of official documents; John S. Hittell's *Hist. of San Francisco*, who takes the better developed views; Tut-hill's *Hist. of California*, of the old beliefs; the *Annals of San Francisco*, etc. The Mexican side is presented in a condensed way in the translation, *The other side*, of the leading Mexican account, ch. 26. — ED.]

⁵ Cf. list in Bancroft's *No. Mexican States*, vol. i.; his *California*, i. p. lvii; Poore's *Desc. Catal.*, etc. For Kearny's instructions, see Bancroft's *California*, v. 334. On his march he met Kit Carson (Pettis's *Life of Kit Carson*), who told him of the success of Stockton and Frémont. Emory's *Notes of a mil. reconnoissance from Fort Leavenworth, Mo., to San Diego, Cal.* (Washington, 1848, — 30th Cong., 1st sess., Ho. Ex. Doc. 41), elucidates this march. [Bancroft (v. 337) gives other references, and some (*Ibid.* v. 352-3) on the San Pasqual campaign, fought on the way, in hostile review of which Thos. H. Benton made a speech, July, 1848 (*Cong. Globe*, 1847-48, app. 977; Benton's *Debates*, and *Thirty Years' View*). There are some episodes of the Northern campaign. Bancroft (v. 477) bases his account of the march of the Mormon battalion from Santa Fé to California on Sergt. Daniel Tyler's *Concise Hist. of the Mormon battalion in the Mex. War* (Salt Lake City, 1881).

Kearny left a garrison at Santa Fé under Col. Sterling Price, who put down an insurrection (Dawson, ii. ch. 105; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, October, 1887).

A detachment was sent under Col. Doniphan to join Gen. Wool in an attack on Chihuahua

Meanwhile, what is known as the "Bear Flag insurrection" had taken place in California in anticipation of the declaration of war, and Frémont had ranged his small force on the side of the American insurgents, who justified themselves by a belief, with no considerable foundation, that the Spanish authorities were preparing to expel them, and with the further belief that England would seize the country unless they did, which, in the opinion of Bancroft and Royce, was equally unfounded.¹ Bancroft gives abundant references.²

The conduct of Frémont in precipitating an armed revolt without warrant, and in embarrassing the efforts at a more peaceful acquisition, is set forth, according to such views, both by Bancroft and Royce.³ Royce's masterly marshalling of evidence and cogent reasoning point to the conclusion that Frémont's plan was the result of a family intrigue. The plan was doubtless suggested to Frémont by Senator Benton, but whether on the strength of a private understanding with the Secretary of State does not appear. If so, Buchanan covered his tracks completely. The hypothesis that the State Department intended a demonstration of force, and used Benton as its intermediary with Frémont, is rendered improbable, though not absolutely negated, by the absence of corroborative evidence, and by the incompatibility of the scheme with that embodied in the instructions to Commo. Sloat and Consul Larkin.

Frémont has since published the first volume of his *Memoirs of my Life* (Chicago and New York, 1887), which comes down to the close of hostilities, but does not include the subsequent judicial investigations of his conduct. His narrative embodies his own representations and views, but is not thought by his critics to be determinate upon the mooted points of his exceeding his orders.⁴

Commodore Sloat, the naval commander on the coast, first raised the American flag at Monterey; but he did not favor the revolutionary schemes.⁵ When Sloat left the com-

(Dawson, ii. ch. 104). There are some personal narratives:—Frank S. Edward's *Campaign in New Mexico with Col. Doniphan* (Philad., 1847; London, 1848), with a map of the route, and some official papers in an appendix. The *Journal of Wm. H. Richardson, a private soldier under the command of Col. Doniphan* (N. Y., 1848, 3d ed.). The little *Journal of the Santa Fé Expedition under Col. Doniphan, which left St. Louis in June, 1846, kept by Jacob S. Robinson* (Portsmouth, 1848).—ED.]

The essential review of the whole matter, however, is *Doniphan's Expedition, containing an account of the Conquest of New Mexico; Gen. Kearny's overland Exped. to California; Doniphan's campaign against the Navajos [and] Chihuahua . . . and the operations of Gen. Price at Santa Fé*, by John J. Hughes of the 1st Missouri Cavalry (Cincinnati, 1848, 1850), with maps. He had the advice of leading officers and his own experience.

¹ Bancroft, v. 209.

² *California*, v. ch. 4-8, and references, particularly at p. 187. One of the most important books is *A biog. sketch of the life of Wm. B. Ide* (privately printed, Claremont, N. H., 1880),—a book which claims for Ide the leading influence which was claimed for Frémont. For an estimate of this book, see Royce, 67 *et seq.* Ide was a native of Massachusetts, and he had lived in Vermont and at the West before he joined the train of emigrants to California in 1845, and in

the next year he came into prominence in the Bear Flag affairs, and issued a proclamation as their leader; under which the movement was to secure independence and political equality. Ide had, says Royce, "all our common national conscience; was at heart both kindly and upright, and an idealist of the ardent and abstract type."

³ [The inference from what these writers say seems to be, that Frémont, by the lapse of years in which he has nourished the notion of his pre-eminence in the matter, has reached a stage where his judgment is warped and his memory treacherous. Royce succeeded in getting from him certain statements, that in that writer's judgment indicate this; and Bancroft (v. 189) says, that Frémont often promised, but as often failed to furnish to him a statement.—ED.]

⁴ John Bigelow's *Life of Frémont* (N. Y., 1856) is an excellent book, and gives many of the California documents. [Frémont, in furtherance of his plan, seized horses and supplies from the people, and the demands for payment made by the sufferers on the government, constitute what are known as Frémont's California claims, and the testimony adduced in sustaining these claims constitutes a body of proofs as to the events. Cf. *30th Cong., 1st sess., Sen. Rept., no. 75*; H. H. Bancroft's *California*, v. 462, with references.—ED.]

⁵ Sloat's despatches, *31st Cong., 1st sess., Ho. Ex. Doc. 1.*

mand to Commo. Stockton, it fell into the hands of an officer more ready to join Frémont in his plans, and Stockton made to the government an extensive *Report* in vindication of his conduct.¹ Upon the revolt and final reconquest, there are much the same resources as for the earlier matters.²

James Russell Soley.

¹ Dated Feb. 18, 1848 (*31st Cong., 1st sess. Ho. Ex. Doc., i.*; *Despatches relating to mil. and naval operations in California* (Washington, 1849). Royce is perhaps unduly severe in his strictures on Stockton, and thinks that the latter magnified his own importance. At a later day, when Stockton was a possible candidate for the presidency, there was then written an anonymous *Sketch of the life of Commodore Robert F. Stockton* (N. Y., 1856), chap. 9 to 12. It contains in an appendix Stockton's correspondence with the Navy Department, and with officers in California, and extracts from the defence of Colonel Frémont. Valuable as the work is, it was written as a campaign document, and it abounds too much in unqualified panegyric to be taken without large grains of allowance. An interesting little paper on Commodore Stockton is contained in Josiah Quincy's *Figures of the Past*, Boston, 1883.

Other of the naval operations on the coast appear in the *Official Despatches of Adm. Du Pont* (Wilmington, Del., 1883) and the cruise of the "Cyane" by Du Pont in the *Proc. of the U. S. Naval Inst.*, 1882, p. 419.

² [Beside Bancroft, Royce, Tuthill, Cutts, Cooke, Colton, Revere, and the *Annals of San Francisco*, already referred to, add Edwin Bryant's *What I saw in California* (N. Y., 1848); Hall's *Hist. of San José*, with the references in Bancroft, v. 396. The final quarrels of Stockton and Frémont with Kearny, who wished to assume command on his arrival, and was resisted by both Stockton and Frémont, led to charges against Frémont, and to a court-martial, the report of which is one of the chief sources for the study of events (*30th Cong., 1st sess., Sen. Ex. Doc. no. 33*; Bancroft's *California*, v. 396, 456). Some of the closing events are treated in the *Memoirs of Gen. W. T. Sherman* (N. Y., 1886, 2d ed.), vol. i. ch. 2. — ED.]

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A. THE INDIAN TREATIES AND WARS.— Judge Story (*Commentaries on the Constitution*, vol. i.) elucidates the method of acquiring the Indian title to lands. As regards the Indian right of occupancy, and the relations of guardian and ward between the United States and the Indians, see Marshall's opinion in *Wheaton*, viii. 543; and the opinion in *Peters*, v. p. 1.¹ Various collections of the early treaties of the Federal government with the Indians have been printed.² The Creeks, or Muscogees, were left by Great Britain, after the peace of 1783, to make the best terms they could with the new Republic, and in a treaty at Augusta, in 1783, those Indians agreed to extensive cessions of territory, which were confirmed and enlarged by treaty, made by the State of Georgia with them at Galphinton in 1785, and at Shoulderbone in 1786,³ and this by securing their allegiance to a single State somewhat complicated matters, when later in 1790 they bound themselves to no power but the United States. The cessions of 1783 failed to command the acquiescence of a considerable part of the Creek tribe, and banding under a half-breed chief, Alexander McGillivray, they carried on for some years a desultory strife known as the Oconee War.⁴ The Spaniards, claiming that the Creek Country was theirs by

¹ For the history of legal relations with the Indians, see Kent's *Commentaries*, 2d ed., iii. 376. Cf. George E. Ellis's *Red man and the White man in No. America* (Boston, 1882), ch. 9; *Laws of the Colonial and State governments, relating to Indians and Indian affairs, 1633-1831* (Washington, 1832); and on the connection of the War Department with Indian affairs, Ingersoll's *War Department*.

² *Indian treaties: laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs* (Washington, 1826); *Treaties between the U. S. and Indian Tribes, 1778-1837* (Washington, 1837).

The Indian treaties are in the *Statutes at Large*, vii., and as far as operative at a late day they appear in the *Compilation of all the treaties between the U. S. and Indian tribes, now in force* (Washington, 1873). A summary of the early treaties in the Northwest is in Albach's *Annals of the West*, 522, 623; and in Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, ch. 3. Schoolcraft (*Indian Tribes*, ii. 596) gives a list of Indian land cessions, beginning with 1795.

³ *State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, i. 616.

⁴ Absalom H. Chappell's *Miscellanies of Georgia* (Columbus, Ga.), 1874; and the treaties with the Indians, in

conquest from Great Britain during the Revolutionary War, inveigled M'Gillivray into making a treaty at Pensacola in 1784, by which the Creeks formed an alliance with Spain,¹ under which the war was continued, the most considerable conflict occurring at Jack's Creek in 1787, when they were defeated by Gen. Elijah Clark.²

M'Gillivray and other chiefs went to New York in 1790, when General Knox, as Secretary of War, concluded a treaty, Aug. 7, by which, and in violence of their treaty at Pensacola, they came under the protection of the United States. Certain territories were retroceded to them, but not sufficient to satisfy all the tribe, so that the war still fitfully continued.³ After Spain, by the treaty at San Lorenzo, Oct. 27, 1795,⁴ had come to terms with the United States, yielding to them all claims to the Creek country, the Creeks finally, in June, 1796, ended the war by the treaty of Colraine. Meanwhile General Clark, who had been enlisted by Genet to invade Spanish territory, finding by Genet's downfall that he was left to himself, endeavored, in 1794, with his men to establish a state within the bounds granted to the Creeks; but his rebellion was short-lived.⁵

Col. Benj. Hawkins was the first Indian agent among them,⁶ and prepared an account of their country in 1798-99, which was found among his papers (afterwards in the Georgia Hist. Soc.), and this, edited by Wm. Brown Hodgson, was published by that society in 1848.⁷ In 1786, Jan. 16, there had been a treaty made with the Chickasaws at Hopewell,⁸ which had been opposed by a leading Tennessean, Col. Robertson.⁹

In 1788, the Cherokees had accused the whites, under John Sevier, of intruding upon their lands.¹⁰

Rufus King (June 5, 1794) had reported in the Senate on carrying on offensive operations against the Creeks and Cherokees; but in 1796 a treaty was made at Holston with the Cherokees, in which those Indians subjected themselves to the United States, and in 1798 made further cessions of land to the United States.¹¹

In 1798, the agents of Tennessee recapitulated the history of the successive land-treaties with the Indians in a communication which is given in Putnam's *Middle Tennessee*, p. 550. Georgia was reimbursed in 1827¹² by the United States for her expenses in these Indian wars.

The bounds of the Six Nations at the close of the Revolutionary War is shown in the *Map of part of the State of N. Y., etc., made in 1783-84, by John Aldam and John Wallis*.¹³

At Fort Schuyler, Oct. 22, 1784, the Six Nations, meeting the American commissioners, Oliver Wolcott, Richard Butler, and Arthur Lee, surrendered by treaty their claims to lands west of Pennsylvania.¹⁴

The New York commissioners concluded, meeting usually at Fort Stanwix, sundry treaties in 1788 and 1789, with the Onondagoes, Oneidas, and Cayugas.¹⁵

Washington, in his message of Aug. 7, 1789, had recommended the appointment of a commission to treat with the Indians. In Nov., 1790, Col. Pickering at Tioga Point held a council with the Senecas, and in Dec., 1790, Cornplanter and a party of the Senecas had an interview with the President.¹⁶

The relations of the government, just after the Revolution, with the Indians of the Northwest is well

which Georgia was interested, in Geo. White's *Hist. Coll. of Georgia* (N. Y., 1855); Pickett's *Alabama*, ii. 30.

¹ *State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, i. 278. Cf., for Spanish intrigue, *State Papers*, iv. 89; Sparks's *Washington*, x. 267; *Corresp. of the Rev.*, iv. 272-279; and the *Senate Report*, Aug. 17, 1789, for the relations with the Creeks.

² Chappell; Stevens's *Georgia*; White's *Hist. Coll.*

³ Cf. Putnam's *Middle Tennessee*.

⁴ *Statutes at Large*, viii. 140.

⁵ Chappell, p. 43, controverting Stevens's *Georgia* on the facts. Cf. *St. Pap. Ind. Aff.*, i.

⁶ Cf. acc. in Chappell.

⁷ *Collections*, iii., and separately (Savannah, 1848).

⁸ *Journals of Congress*, iv. 628.

⁹ A. W. Putnam's *Hist. of Middle Tennessee, or life and times of Gen. James Robertson* (Nashville, 1859), ch. 14, 15; Stevens's *Georgia*, ii. 410.

¹⁰ *Journals of Congress*, iv. 859.

¹¹ Stevens, ii. 454; Pickett's *Alabama*, ii. 145; Sumner's *Jackson*, p. 177.

¹² Cf. on the removal of the Cherokees at about this time, Poore's *Descriptive Catal.*; Drake's *Book of the Indians* (iv. ch. 33); Curtis's *Webster*, i. 283; Benton's *Debates*; Jeremiah Ewatts's *Essays on the present crisis in the condition of the Indians* (Boston, 1820), etc.

¹³ Given in F. B. Hough's *Proceedings of the Commissioners of Indian affairs in the State of N. Y.* (Albany, 1861).

¹⁴ *Journals of Congress*, iv. 531; *Amer. St. Papers, Ind. Aff.*, i. 206; F. B. Hough's *Proc. of the Commissioners of Ind. Affairs in N. Y.* (Albany, 1861), vol. i. 64; Stone's *Brant and Red Jacket*; Hubbard's *Red Jacket*, 58.

¹⁵ Hough, i. 198, 241; ii. 307, 428.

¹⁶ *Amer. St. Papers, Ind. Affairs*, i.; Hough, i. 161; Harvey, ch. 16, 17; Upham's *Pickering*, ii. 460; Timothy Alden's *Account of sundry missions* (N. Y., 1827); and J. R. Snowden's *Cornplanter memorial. An historical sketch of Gyant-wa-chia—the Cornplanter, and of the six nations of Indians. Report of Samuel P. Johnson, on the monument at Fennesadaga. Published by order of the legislature of Pennsylvania* (Harrisburg, 1867).


There are more extensive accounts of Red Jacket, the other Seneca chief of this time. The *Life of Red Jacket*, by W. L. Stone, has a good account of Indian conferences and (p. 194) an engraving of the medal given to him by Washington, and always worn by him. The series of Indian medals of the successive Presidents is presented in Loubat's *Medallic Hist. U. S.* (N. Y., 1878).

There are portraits of Red Jacket in the Long Island Hist. Soc.; one by Neagle in the Penna. Hist. Soc.; another in M'Kenney and Hall, i. p. 1; and a sitting figure by S. Eastman in Schoolcraft's *Indian tribes*, iii. 198. Cf. *Harper's Mag.*, xxxii. 323. Some of his speeches were published at the time (Sabin, xvi. 68, 472, etc.).


J. N. Hubbard's *Account of Sa-go-ye-wat-ha, or Red Jacket and his people, 1750-1830* (Albany, 1886), written to reflect a more kindly spirit towards him than Red Jacket's friends felt Stone to have shown, is mainly, however, derived from Stone.

The remains of Red Jacket were reinterred, with ceremony and addresses, in Wood Lawn Cemetery, Buffalo, Oct. 9, 1884. *Buffalo Hist. Soc. Trans.*, iii.; *Mag. West. Hist. Dec.*, 1884; *Hist. Mag.*, v. 73.

Cf. G. S. Conover's *Birth-place of Sa-go-ye-wat-ha or the Indian Red Jacket, the great orator of the Senecas. With a few incidents of his life* (Waterloo, N. Y., 1884); Drake's *Book of the Indians*, v. ch. 6.




NOTE. — A section, somewhat reduced, of the map in Adair's *Hist. of the American Indians* (London, 1776), showing the position of tribes about the close of the American Revolution. There is a map (1791) of the Creek Country in Schoolcraft's *Indian Tribes*, v. 253; one of the war in Southern Alabama (1813-14) in Pickett's *Alabama*, ii.; others are in Lossing, pp. 157, 778.



FORT McINTOSH.*

shown in Jonathan Heart's *Journal*, on the march with his company from Connecticut to Fort Pitt, in Pittsburg, Penn., from the 7th of Sept. to the 12th of Oct., 1783, inclusive. To which is added the Dickinson-



FORT HARMAR.†

* Reduced from the plate in the *Columbian Mag.*, Jan., 1790, where it is said to have been built by Gen. McIntosh in 1779, and to have been recently destroyed, because a garrison at this post (lat. $40^{\circ} 41' 36''$) was no longer necessary.

† After a drawing in 1790 by Joseph Gilman, produced by lithography in the *Amer. Pioneer*, vol. i., Cincinnati, 1844. The fort was built by Maj. Doughty and the United States troops in the autumn of 1785. The building on the left, at the corner of the enclosed garden, is the council-house in which Gen. St. Clair made his treaty with the Indians in 1789. On the point beyond the Muskingum, on the left of the picture, is the site of Marietta. The farm buildings of Col. Isaac Williams are seen on the Virginia shore in the distance. A life of Williams is in *Ibid.* i. 310. Cf. the view of the fort


Harmer correspondence of 1784-5. The whole illustrated with notes and preceded by a biographical sketch of Capt. Harter by C. W. Butterfield (Albany, N. Y., 1885).¹

By a treaty, Jan. 21, 1785, at Fort McIntosh, with the Wyandots, Delawares, Chippewas, and Ottawas, there was reserved to them a region lying between what is now Cleveland and the Maumee River, and bordering on Lake Erie, while their title to all other lands was ceded.²

On Jan. 31, 1786, a treaty was made at the mouth of the Great Miami River with the Shawnees, who acknowledged the rights of the United States to lands acquired from Great Britain by treaty.³

New treaties were made in Jan., 1789, by Gen. St. Clair, at Fort Harmar, with the Six Nations, confirming their bounds on the west line of Pennsylvania; and at the same time with the Wyandots and other tribes, confirming their lands neighboring to Lake Erie, with reservations for the whites.⁴

The first disappointment, in the defeat of Harmar, soon followed. Harmar's despatches (*Am. St. Papers, Ind. Aff.*, i. 104) are misleading, and the main source is the result of the investigations contained in the *Proceedings of a Court of inquiry held at the request of General Josiah Harmar* (Philad., 1791; also in *St. Pap., Mil. Aff.*, i. 20-36). There is another rare report: *Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry held at Fort Washington, Sept. 15, 1791, agreeably to the following order, A Court of inquiry, of which Maj.-Gen. Butler is appointed President, and Colonels Gibson and Darke members, will sit to-morrow at 12 o'clk, at the south east block house, Fort Washington.*⁵




¹ The Indian life is depicted in the travels of Jean Baptiste Perrault. Cf. Schoolcraft's *Indian Tribes*, iii. 351; and in *Ibid.* ii. 33, is an account of the distribution of the tribes.

² Albach's *Annals*, 433.

in *Mag. of West. Hist.*, Nov., 1884, p. 27, with a description; Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, p. 506; and Lossing's *Field Book of the War of 1812*, p. 39.

* After a plan by James McBride, given in Howe's *Hist. Coll. of Ohio*, p. 74. The part A was built by St. Clair in Sept., 1791, at the crossing of the Great Miami. The section B was added in 1792 by Wilkinson. The officers' quarters are at a; the mess-room, b; the magazine, c; the artificers' shop, d; block-houses, e, f, g. The bridge C was a later construction.

† Fac-simile of a plan by John S. Houston in Howe's *Hist. Coll. of Ohio*, p. 133, in connection with narratives of Maj. Jacob Fowler and Mr. M'Dowl, who were present, and from other accounts. — KEY: A, high ground on which the



ST. CLAIR'S DEFEAT.†


³ *Journals*, iv. 627; Albach, 443; Henry Harvey's *Hist. of the Shawnee Indians, 1681-1854* (Cincinnati, 1855), ch. 15.

⁴ Albach, 517; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, ix. 285; Harvey, ch. 15; Hough, vol. i.; *Amer. State Papers, Indian Affairs*, i. 5; *St. Clair Papers*, i. 156, and ii. for letters; Stone's *Brant*, ii. 280.

⁵ For illustrative accounts, see the military journal of Major Ebenezer Denny, edited by W. H. Denny in the *Penna. Hist. Soc. Publ.* vii. pp. 204-498 (and also separately, Philad., 1859), with six plans, including that of the Maumee town destroyed, and a plan of the battle (Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 322). Lossing (*War of 1812*, p. 43) gives a plan and a view of the ground. Irving (*Wash-*

Respecting St. Clair's defeat, in 1791, we have his first despatches (*Am. St. Pap., Ind. Aff., i. 137*), and there is a report and supplemental report of a committee of the House of Representatives (*State Papers, Mil. Affairs, i. 36, 41*). The Report was published separately at the time (Philad., 1792).¹ For Congressional proceedings, see Benton's *Debates, i. 393*. St. Clair, when in Congress, had urged the increase of the army; but the feeling of that body was against an army of regulars, and in favor of militia. Gen. Knox in 1792 brought forward a plan for organizing the militia.²

The British are said to have instigated the Indians to depredations,³ and Judge Campbell describes a British plot to buy up, in 1795, the lower peninsula of Michigan.⁴



FORT GREENVILLE.*

ington, v.) cites the diary of Col. Winthrop Sargent, adj.-general, during the campaign. The *Remarkable Adventures of Jackson Johnnot of Mass.* (Walpole, N. H., 1795) gives a few particulars. It is included in Mctcalf's Collection (Thomson's *Bibl. of Ohio, 652*).

The later compiled accounts, beside the general histories (cf. McMaster, i. 598), are: Albach's *Annals, 547*; C. Cist in the *Cincinnati Miscellany, i. (1845)*; Dawson's *Battles, ii. ch. 1*; H. S. Knapp's *Maumee Valley* (Toledo, 1872); Blanchard's *North West*, with map; Miller's *Cincinnati's Beginnings*; Burnet's *Notes, ch. 4*; Smith's *St. Clair Papers, i. p. 168*; Bryce's *Fort Wayne*; Johnston's *Yale in the Rev. 163*.

¹ The report bore hard on the Secretary of War and the quartermaster, and they laid papers before Congress, Nov. 14, 1792, which induced the House to recommit the report. St. Clair now made some "Observations" on the report, and asked for the publication of all the papers, which the House refused. He accordingly printed them himself as a *Narrative of the manner in which the campaign against the Indians, in the year 1791, was conducted under the command of Major-General St. Clair* (Philadelphia, 1812), giving, beside the reports and his own Observations, various letters appertaining, and extracts from the minutes of the committees (Thomson's *Bibl. of Ohio, no. 1,012*; Field, *Ind. Bibliog. no. 1,349*). St. Clair's papers are now in the State Library at Columbus, Ohio, and the essential parts of them have been published as *The St. Clair Papers*, edited by William Henry Smith, who gives in the first volume a life of St. Clair. Cf. Poore's *Desc. Catal. p. 92*.

Winthrop Sargent's journal of the campaign is given in the *Wormsloe Quartos* (see Vol. V. p. 402, of the present *History*), and in the *Amer. Hist. Record, i. 481*. The diary of Thomas S. Hinde is in the *Amer. Pioneer, ii. 135*, with (p. 150) a statement by B. Van Cleve. Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., iii. 21*, for the diary of an officer.

The news, as it reached Wilkinson in Kentucky, is in the *N. E. Hist. and Gen. Reg., 1867, p. 339*. Gen. Armstrong's comments on St. Clair's management of the battle is in Sparks's *Washington, x. 223*. Cf. Upham's *Pickering, iii. 22*.

militia were encamped at the beginning of the action. B, C, encampment of the main army. D, retreat of the militia in the beginning. E, route of retreat of St. Clair. F, burial-place of Butler and others. H, site of Fort Recovery, built by Wayne. I, spot of unearthing a brass cannon in 1830.

Lossing (*Field-Book, War of 1812, p. 47*) gives a map of more detail, being a fac-simile of a sketch by Winthrop Sargent in his MS. journal of the campaign, which is also given in the *Wormsloe Quarto* ed. of Sargent's journal.

* Fac-simile of a plan in Howe's *Hist. Coll. of Ohio, 142*. Wayne built the fort in Dec., 1793, and remained here till July 28, 1794. The plan was made by James M'Bride, and shows the relations of the outline of the fort to the later town. On Aug. 3, 1795, Wayne made his treaty here. Tecumseh lived on the point bearing his name, 1805-1808.

There are a few details of not much importance in John Brickell's narrative in the *Amer. Pioneer, i. 43*, while he was a prisoner with the enemy; and in two chap-books, Matthew Bunn's *Life and Adventures* and Johnnot's *Adventures* (Thomson, *Bibliog. of Ohio, nos. 136-138*; Sabin, xvi. 69, 374).


For compiled accounts beside the general histories, see Drake's *Book of the Indians*, book v. ch. 4; Dawson's *Battles, ii. ch. 2*; Lossing's *War of 1812, 47*; Albach's *Annals, 571*; Dillon's *Indiana*; Dr. C. R. Gilman in *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Proc., 1847, p. 34*; Stone's *Brant, ii. 309*; *Western Review, iii. 58*. For the subsequent condition of the field, see Knapp's *Maumee Valley, 439*. Cf. Cist's *Cincinnati Miscellany*; Burnet's *Notes, ch. 5, 20*.

² This plan, with the criticisms which it has received, is considered in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc. vi. 364*.

³ See evidence of Washington's belief in it in Sparks's *Washington, x. 434*. Washington, on May 21, 1794, communicated to Congress the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the British minister, respecting accusations against the governor-general of Canada (*St. Papers, For. Rel., i. 461*). Cf. letter of Secretary Randolph, May 22, 1794). There is other testimony in *Amer. State Papers, Ind. Affairs, i. 795*; Stone's *Brant, ii. 271, 366*; Albach's *Annals of the West, 542*; Schouler, i. 267; Madison's notes of conversation with Colonel Beckwith in Madison's *Letters, i. 530*; and, at a later day, Madison's *Message transmitting copies of a correspondence between Mr. Monroe and Mr. Foster, relating to the alleged encouragement by the British government of the Indians to commit depredations on the inhabitants of the United States* [etc.], June 11, 1812. Cf. Poore's *Desc. Catal. pp. 29, 92, 95*. The negotiation with the Indians during this period was entrusted in considerable degree to Col. Pickering (*Life, iii*). Pickering was thoroughly convinced of the British machinations to prevent the settlement of difficulties on the part of the Americans. Among the Pickering papers in the *Mass. Hist. Soc., vols. lix.-lxii*. relate wholly to his labors in negotiating with the Indians.


⁴ *Michigan Pioneer Collections, viii. 406*.

In 1792, Gen. Rufus Putnam made a treaty with the tribes at Vincennes,¹ and in 1793 there was another meeting, of which a "Journal of a treaty" with the Indians of the Northwest, by the commissioners of the U. S.,



PLAN OF FORT DEFIANCE.*

is in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3d ser., v. 109. This concerns a conference held by Benjamin Lincoln, Timothy Pickering, and Beverly Randolph, on the part of the United States. The Indians insisted on making the



PLAN OF FORT ADAMS, 1794.†

¹ Albach, 605; Dillon's *Indiana*, 317.

* Fac-simile of a cut in the *Amer. Pioneer* (Sept., 1843), ii. 387, after a sketch made in 1794. It was begun during Wayne's campaign, on Aug. 9, 1794. — KEY: A, block-house, with port-holes (B) and chimney (C) and door (D). Each bastion had a similar structure. E, E, gateways. F, bank of earth for passing the ditch. G, drawbridge. H, officers' quarters. I, storhouse. K, pickets. L, sunken passage for getting water from the river. M, sand-bar.


See the cuts in Lossing, 330, 333; *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. 154; Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, 87; and Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 144.

† Built by Gen. Wayne on the St. Mary's. Fac-simile of cut in *Amer. Pioneer*, ii. 293.

Ohio the boundary; and accordingly nothing came of the conference.¹ The victory of Wayne, in 1794, solved, for a while at least, most of the Indian difficulties.²

Knox, the Secretary of War, Dec. 30, 1794, recommended in a *Report* the establishment of military posts throughout the Northwest.

The next year (Aug. 3, 1795), Gen. Wayne meeting, at Greenville, with the Northwestern tribes, Wyandots, etc., a treaty was concluded, by which a restitution of prisoners was made and boundaries established.³



REFERENCE.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Lieutenant Massie's bastion. | 11. Rear gateway. |
| 2. Lieutenant Pope's bastion. | 12. Front gateway. |
| 3. Captain Porter's bastion. | 13 and 14. Third sub-legion. |
| 4. Captain Ford's bastion. | 15 and 16. First sub-legion. |
| 5. Head-quarters. | 17 and 18. Second sub-legion. |
| 6. Park of artillery. | 19 and 20. Fourth sub-legion. |
| 7. Second troop of dragoons. | 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28. Picquet guards. |
| 8. First troop of dragoons. | 29. Advance guard. |
| 9. Fourth troop of dragoons. | 30. Rear guard. |
| 10. Third troop of dragoons. | |

GENERAL WAYNE'S DAILY ENCAMPMENT.*

¹ Stone's *Brant*, ii. 340, gives a full account.

² Wayne's official report is in the *Amer. State Pap., Ind. Aff.*, i. 491, with correspondence, and in Dawson's *Battles* (ch. 2), accompanied by a narrative, with minute references. Cf. *Amer. Pioneer*, ii. 388.

H. N. Moore's *Life of Wayne* (Philad., 1845) is founded on papers furnished by Col. Isaac Wayne, the son. Gen. Armstrong prepared the life in Sparks's *Amer. Biography*. J. Watts De Peyster (*Mag. Am. Hist.*, Feb., 1886), in a sketch of Wayne, says the best life is in *The Casket*, 1829-30, published at Philadelphia. (Cf. this *History*, VI. 514.)

Cf. W. A. Brice's *Fort Wayne, Indiana* (Fort Wayne, 1868); the report to Congress, Jan. 10, 1811, on claims of his heirs. There is in Walker's *Athens Co., Ohio*, p. 108, a curious story of the reinterment of Wayne's remains.

There are some journals of the campaign: that of Rev. David Jones, a chaplain, in *Michigan Pioneer Coll.* viii.

392; Lieut. Boyer, July 28-Nov. 2, 1794 (Cincinnati, 1866), and appended to Jacob's *Capt. Cresap*, and also in *Amer. Pioneer*, i. 315, 351; and the account in Brickell's narrative in *Ibid.* i. 43. Cf. Upham's *Pickering*, iii. ch. 4; Stone's *Brant*, ii. 383; Burnet's *Notes*, ch. 6, 7, 8; Jos. Pritt's *Incidents of Border Life* (Chambersburgh, Pa., 1839; Lancaster, Pa., 1841), rearranged, with omissions, as *Mirror of Olden Time Border Life* (Abingdon, Va., 1849); Wither's *Chronicles of Border Warfare*; Albach's *Annals*, 619; Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, 83; *Western Review*, ii. 229; historical notes to Andrew Coffinberry's *Forest Rangers* (Columbus, 1842); Bonney's *Legacy of Hist. Gleanings*, ch. 4; Blanchard's *North West*. The best of the general narratives is in Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 53.


³ Albach, 657; Burnet, ch. 10-12; Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, 355; Harvey, ch. 18, 19.

The later treaties worth mentioning are those at Fort

* Fac-simile of a cut in the *Amer. Pioneer*, July, 1843, of Wayne's encampment at Greenville, — a form of encampment used by him when the ground admitted.

The story of the plot and league formed some years later by Tecumseh, or Tecumtha, is told in Peter D. Clarke's *Origin and Traditional History of the Wyandots, and Tecumseh and his league* (Toronto, 1870) and in Benjamin Drake's *Life of Tecumseh* (Cincinnati, 1841, with later eds.).¹

Harrison's detailed report of the engagement at Tippecanoe is in the *St. Pap., Ind. Aff.*, vol. i., and in Dawson, ii., who compares the accounts. The best narrative is in Lossing, who gathers new information.² This essay may be closed with some general references.³



B. THE FRENCH WAR OF 1798. — The correspondence of Washington relative to his taking command of the provisional army against France, his movements in organizing it, and his wishes to give

Wayne, June 7, 1803; Fort Industry, July 4, 1805; Detroit, Nov. 17, 1807; Brownstown, Mich., Nov. 25, 1808; the Rapids of the Miami, Sept. 29, 1817; St. Mary's, Sept. 17, 1818; Saginaw, Sept. 24, 1819.

There is in Schoolcraft's *Indian Tribes* (v. 708) an estimate of the number of Indians in the Northwest at the breaking out of the war in 1811-12.

¹ Cf. S. G. Drake's *Book of the Indians*, bk. v. ch. 7; Cooley's *Michigan*, 161; Parton's *Jackson*, i. 401; Stone's *Red Jacket*, ch. 9; *Harper's Mag.*, xxvi. Tecumseh's speeches are in Moore's *Amer. Eloquence*, ii. 325.

² Cf. Albach, 839; Marshall's *Kentucky*, 491; Dillon's *Indiana*, 467; Harvey's *Shawnee Indians*, ch. 24; *Harper's Mag.* xxvii. 145; and E. Deming's *Oration* (1835). There is a plan of the battle in Lossing (p. 205), and views of the ground in *Ibid.* 202, 209; and in Gay's *U. S.*, iv. 183.

The lives of Harrison are enumerated in P. O. Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 515. Chief among them are H. Montgomery's (Cleveland, 1852); James Hall's (Philad., 1836); Moses Dawson's (Cincinnati, 1824), with an App. of documents.

³ Beside the comprehensive histories of the United States and of the war, see the histories of the N. W. States, such as Caleb Atwater's *Hist. of Ohio* (2d ed., Cincinnati, 1838); Dillon's *Indiana*, etc.; Farmer's *Kentucky and Michigan*, ch. 40; local histories, like that of *Washington County, Ohio*, ch. 9; Albach's *Annals of the West* (Pittsburg, 1857); Willis De Hass's *Early settlements and Indian wars of West Virginia* (Wheeling, 1851); Samuel L. Metcalf's *Collection of narratives of Indian warfare in the West* (Lexington, Ky., 1821); Charles R. Brown's *Old Northwest Territory, its missions, forts, and trading posts* (Kalamazoo, 1875), a pamphlet, containing a list of such localities with plans, and a general map indicating their position, of which a sketch is given herewith, called "Military Sites of the North West;" Dodge's *Red Men of the Ohio Valley*, a compilation (Springfield, Ohio, 1860); and some papers in the *Mag. West. Hist.* (1885), i. 193, 312. There are a large number of compiled books, — some of the best of which are Drake's *Book of the Indians* and B. B. Thatcher's *Indian Biography* (Harper's Family Library). The story is told in a popular way in C. R. Tuttle's *Border Wars of Two Centuries, 1750-1874* (Chicago, 1874), and in Charles McKnight's *Our Western Border* (Philad., 1876). For biographical material, there is the large work of M'Kenney and Hall, *Hist. of the Indians of No. America* (Philad., 1837), in three vols. Schouler, (i. 151) shows how the Indian question was presented to

* Fac-simile of a cut in Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, p. 319. Wayne, advancing from Roche de Bœuf, met the Indians and drove them under the cover of the guns of Fort Miami, — a post within the U. S. territory still held by the British. Fort Meigs was a later construction. Cf. the plans and details in Lossing's *Field-Book of the War of 1812*, pp. 55, 477; and the view of the ruins of Fort Miami in Lossing, 491, and in *Harper's Mag.*, xxvii. 290. There is a map of the ground in the *N. Y. Mag.* (1794). A manuscript map by Dr. Belknap, showing Wayne's line of march, is in Harvard College library. Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xviii. 18.

rank to his major-generals in the order of Hamilton, C. C. Pinckney, and Knox, while Adams would have reversed the order, but yielded, will be found illustrated.¹

The only active service was on the sea, where the services of the navy were creditable.²



MILITARY SITES OF THE NORTHWEST.

Washington's administration. Cf. Hildreth, iv. 138, 378; Irving's *Washington*, v. ch. 11, 14; McMaster, i. 594; ii. 67. We get the views of a missionary in Schweinitz's *Zeisberger*, ch. 51. On the location of the several tribes at this period, see S. D. Peet in the *Amer. Antiquarian*, i. 85. There is a considerable mass of documentary evidence on the defence of the frontiers in *Penna. Archives*, 2d ser., iv. Cf. Benton's *Debates*, i. 341, 401, 566; the references in Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue* (pp. 1303, 1304); and occasional papers in the *Amer. Pioneer*. The leading bibliographical source is Thomas W. Field's *Essay towards an Indian Bibliography* (N. Y., 1873), who says that W. V. Moore's *Indian Wars of the U. S.* (Philad., 1859), a fair sample of the chap-book order, is really one of John Frost's

productions. The Rev. Jedediah Morse's *Report to the Secretary of War on Indian Affairs* (New Haven, 1822) is the best account we have of the condition of the tribes in the United States after their trials in these wars and in that of 1812 (Field, no. 1098).


¹ Sparks's *Washington*, xi. 242, 246, 254, 257, 261, 263, 289, 293, 303, 304, 327, 346, 360, 374, and appendixes; John Adams's *Works* (vol. i., viii.); Irving's *Washington* (v. 273, 277; Upham's *Pickering*, iii. ch. 11; Pickering's *Review of the Adams-Cunningham Correspondence*, ch. 6; Gibbs's *Administration of Washington*, etc.; Lodge's *Cabot*, 145; Lodge's *Hamilton*, 210; Schouler, i. 406; *Washingtoniana* (1800, 1865).

² See in general the naval histories of Cooper (i. ch. 15,

NOTE. — KEY: 1, Site of Lansing, Michigan. 2, Fort Gratiot. 3, Place of the battle on the River Thames. 4, Detroit. 5, Frenchtown, on the River Raisin. 6, Fort Miamis, later Fort St. Joseph, taken by the Indians in 1763. 7, Mission of St. Joseph. 8, Chicago and Fort Dearborn. 9, Ouiatenor, or Wee Town, on the Wabash, destroyed in 1791 by Gen. Scott. 10, Ponce Passu, Wild Cat Creek. 11, Tippecanoe battle-ground, Nov. 7, 1811. 12, Eel River, Indian village, destroyed by Gen. Wilkinson, 1791. 13, Mississinewa, scene of Indian council in May, 1812; in Dec., 1812, some of the Indian villages hereabouts destroyed by Lt.-Col. Campbell. 14, Little Turtletown. Col. Hardin's unsuccessful attack on the Indians near here, Oct., 1790. 15, La Balme defeated here, 1780, while marching to attack Detroit. 16, Forks of the Wabash. 17, Fort Wayne, built Sept., 1794 (now city of Fort Wayne). Gen. Harmar defeated near by, Oct. 22, 1790. 18, Fort Defiance, built 1794. Fort Winchester was near by (1812). 19, Battle of Fallen Timbers, Wayne's victory, Aug. 20, 1794. 20, Fort Meigs, besieged April-May, 1813. 21, Fort Miami, occupied (1794) by the British. 22, Fort Findlay, built by Col. James Findlay. 23, Fort Ball, on the Sandusky River, named from Col. James V. Ball, of Harrison's cavalry. 24, Fort Seneca. 25, Fort Stephenson, on the Sandusky River, built in 1812. 26, Fort Junadot, built 1754. 27, French trading-post at mouth of Huron River, afterwards a military post

There were, however, threatening complications at the West, and the agency of Wilkinson was prominent in anticipated attacks on New Orleans.¹

On land, however, the quasi war had more political than military bearings.²



GEN. CHAS. COTESWORTH PINCKNEY.*

16), Roosevelt (p. 499, App.), beside Hildreth (v. 270), and McMaster (ii. 519). On the French side, see Edouard Chevalier's *L'Histoire de la marine française sous la première république*, and the sequel, *Sous le Consulat et l'Empire* (Paris, 1886).

The principal engagements were those of "L'Insurgent" (Feb. 9, 1799), and of "La Vengeance" (Feb. 2, 1800) with Com. Truxtun in the "Constellation." Cf. beside, Lossing, *War of 1812*, pp. 103, 104; Dawson, ii. 27, 31, who gives Truxtun's despatches. That respecting "La Vengeance" is also in Sec. Stoddart's *Report, March 20, 1800, Senate Ex. Docs.*, and in Loubat's *Medallie Hist.* (i. 130), with the medal awarded to Truxtun. (Cf. also Los-

sing, 105. There is a portrait in later life in the Long Island Hist. Soc. gallery.) Cf. McMaster, ii. 475, and *Autobiog. of Chas. Biddle*, 278. There are some data respecting the Continental ship "Trumbull" in *Mag. Amer. History*, March, 1885, p. 256; and the capture of "Le Berceau" by Capt. George Little in the "Boston," taken from her log-book, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* xx. 270.

¹ See his *Memoirs*, vol. i. Cf. Gay's *Pop. Hist. U. S.*, iv. 136, 141; and the histories of the Mississippi Valley and Louisiana. There is a paper on "The Quasi War with France" by Lieut. Nathan Sargent in the *United Service*, ix. p. 1.

² For the Federalist views, see Ames's *Works* (vol. i.),

during the French wars. 28, Moravian mission (1804). 29, Moravian mission station (1776) on the Cuyahoga, ten miles above the modern Cleveland. 30, A French station in 1755. 31, Old Shawnee town on the Ohio River. 32, Stockade Fort, built by the French in 1750. 33, Mouth of Embarras River. 34, Vincennes. Council between Harrison and Tecumseh in 1810. 35, Fort Harrison, on the Wabash, built 1811; defended against the Indians by Taylor, Sept., 1812. 36, Site of Indianapolis, on the White River. 37, Principal village of the Delawares on White River, 1810. 38, Falls of the Ohio, at Louisville. 39, Pigeon Roost massacre, 1812. 40, Defeat of Col. Loughrey's party, while marching to join Gen. Clark at the falls of the Ohio. 41, Site of Frankfort, Ky. 42, Lexington, Ky. 43, Boonesborough, Ky., on the Kentucky River. 44, Battlefield of Blue Licks, 1752, on the Licking River. 45, Limestone, now Marysville, Ky. 46, Fort Washington, built 1790, now Cincinnati. 47, Location of Fort Ancient. 48, Fort Hamilton, built 1791, on the Great Miami River. 49, Fort St. Clair, built 1791-2. Capt. John Adair attacked near here by Indians, Nov. 6, 1792. 50, Fort Jefferson, built 1791. 51, Fort Greenville, built 1793. 52, Fort Recovery, built 1793, by Major Henry Burbeck. 53, Fort Adams, on the St. Mary's River. 54, Fort St. Mary's. 55, Fort Piqua. 56, Fort Laramie, built by Wayne in 1799. 57, Fort MacArthur, on the Scioto River. 58, Site of Columbus, Ohio. 59, Battle of Kenawha, Oct. 10, 1774. 60, Fort Gower, erected by Gov. Dunmore, 1774, near the mouth of the Hockhocking River. 61, French Margarets, a French station, 1755. 62, Fort Harmer, at the mouth of the Muskingum River, built 1785-86. 63, Campus Martius, 1791; later Marietta. 64, Massacre of the Moravian Indians on the Tuscarawas River, in 1782. 65, Fort Laurens, built 1788. 66, Dillie's fort, built 1790. 67, Baker's fort, built 1790. 68, Wheeling, Va., founded 1770. 69, Fort Steuben, built 1789. 70, Massacre at Baker's Bottom, in 1774. 71, Fort McIntosh, built 1778-79. 72, Site of Logstown. 73, Fort Duquesne, now Pittsburg. 74, Brownsville, or Redstone Old Fort, on the Monongahela River. 75, Venango Fort, built 1752; destroyed 1763. 76, Fort Le Bœuf, on French Creek; destroyed May, 1763. 77, Presqu'isle, fort destroyed in 1763. This map has been fashioned on one given by Brown in his *Old North West Territory*.

* From the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1839, vol. iv., following a miniature by Malbone. Cf. J. C. Hamilton's *Hamilton*, 1879 ed., vol. vii.; Lossing, 92.

C. JEFFERSON'S GUNBOATS. — For the legislation, see Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*, and Goldsborough's *Naval Chronicle*, 322.¹

D. SINGLE SHIP ACTIONS, 1812-1815. — It was the success of the American navy in most of these conflicts that treated the most surprised, and made for the young country its most creditable record.

CONSTITUTION AND GUERRIERE, Aug. 19, 1812. After the American frigate's skillful escape from the British fleet (Roosevelt, 83; Coggeshall, 9; James, v. 369), she met one of her pursuers, and in a successful fight with her made the first conspicuous success of the war. Professor Soley (*U. S. Naval Inst.*, vii., Oct. 20, 1881) gives a diagram and collates the accounts of the four principal eye-witnesses: Hall's official report (*Naval Monument*; Dawson, ii. 119); Dacre's report (*Ann. Reg.*, 1812, p. 249; *Naval Chronicle*, xxviii. 347; Dawson); account by an officer (*Naval Monument*, 12); Com. Morris's in his *Autobiography*.²

WASP AND FROLIC, Oct. 18, 1812. Cf. Soley; Cooper; Lossing; Roosevelt, 102; Dawson, ii. 168; Loubat, i. 161, with medal of Capt. Jacob Jones; James, v. 389.

UNITED STATES AND MACEDONIAN, Oct. 25, 1812. Soley, giving a plan, compares Decatur's report (*Naval Monument*, 24; *State Papers, Naval Aff.*, i. 280; Mackenzie's *Decatur*, App. v., vi.; Loubat, i. 164; Dawson) with that of Carden, the British commander (Gold's *Naval Chronicle*, xxix. 77; *Ann. Reg.*, 1812, p. 255; Dawson).³

CONSTITUTION AND JAVA, Dec. 29, 1812. Soley gives a plan and examines the official account by Bainbridge (*Naval Monument*, 28, 32; documents accompanying the President's message of Feb. 22, 1813; Dawson, ii. 183) with those of Chad (Gold's *Nav. Chron.* xxix. 346, 403; *Ann. Reg.*, 1812, p. 132; Dawson).⁴

HORNET AND PEACOCK, Feb. 24, 1813. Cf. Cooper; Lossing; Dawson, ii. 206; Loubat, i. 186; Roosevelt, 166; N. E. *Hist. and Gen. Reg.*, Oct. 1874, p. 392; James, vi. 47.

CHESAPEAKE AND SHANNON, June 1, 1813. The official despatch of Lieut. Budd, the surviving officer, is in Brannan's *Official letters*, p. 167. There are documents and other relations of the time in *Niles's Reg.* v.; and in a *Biog. of Lawrence* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1813), and in a lesser *Life of Lawrence* (Hartford, 1814). A statement of the loss on the "Chesapeake" is in *House Ex. Doc. no. 110* (Feb. 24, 1826). Washington Irving prepared at the time a memoir of Lawrence for the *Analectic Mag.*, in which the account of the action was derived from a surviving officer (also in his *Spanish Papers*, ii. 37; cf. *Harper's Mag.* xxiv. 173). The accounts of the conflict as seen from land, and published in the Boston newspapers of June 2 and 3, were reprinted in the *Boston Evening Transcript*, Sept. 15, 1884, including the report of Knox, the pilot, who carried the "Chesapeake" out of the harbor. There were particulars of the fight brought out in the proceedings of the Court of Inquiry, and in the *Trial of Lieut. Cox, April 18, 1814* (Ingersoll, 1812-13, p. 396), when Dr. John Dix, a surgeon in attendance upon Lawrence after he was carried below, reported the directions given to him by the wounded commander, which were slightly changed popularly to "Don't give up the ship." It has been charged that Major Russell of the *Centinel* invented these words (Gillet's *Democracy*, p. 61). Cf. *An account of the funeral honors bestowed on the remains of Capt. Lawrence and Lieut. Ludlow, with the Eulogy by Joseph Story, with documents* (Boston, 1813). The fullest account of the action was prepared by Admiral Geo. H. Preble for the *United Service*, Oct. 1879, with a list of authorities; and the author's interleaved copy of this paper, with additional notes from Sir Provo Wallis, of the British navy, and last survivor of the fight, is in the Mass. Hist. Soc. library. We have Capt. Broke's despatch on the British side, and a *Memoir of Broke*, with a life of him in the *Ann. Register*, 1812, p. 185; and *Naval Chronicle*, vol. xxxii.; beside the accounts in James (vi. 51, with diagram), and in the volume published (5th series) by the *Quebec Literary and Hist. Soc.*⁵

ARGUS AND PELICAN, Aug. 14, 1813. Cf. Cooper; Lossing; Dawson, ii. 266; Roosevelt, 206; James, vi. 81.

and for the opposition of Washington to the views of Jefferson, see Garland's *Randolph* (i. 120). How the aspects of the time struck a young Northerner in Virginia, surrounded by anti-Federalists, will be seen in Channing's *Channing* (Cent. ed. 48). The views of a Northern Republican are seen in T. C. Amory's *James Sullivan* (ii. 68). Cf. Hildreth, v. 221; Barry's *Mass.* iii. 339. The attitude of the different members of Congress can be seen in the *General personal index of the Journals of Congress, First to Eighth Congress, 1789-1805* (Washington, 1885).

¹ Jefferson's *Writings*, v., particularly his letter of January 29, 1805; and his messages (*Statesman's Manual*, i.); Benton's *Debates*; Tucker's *Jefferson*, ii. 175; Randall's *Jefferson*, iii. 125; Garland's *Randolph*, i. 34; Sullivan's *Pub. Men*, 238; Hildreth, v. 539; Schouler, ii. 67, 138; Lator's *Cyclopædia*, ii. 427. There are views of the boats in Lossing's *War of 1812*, 168; a description of them in Wm. Gool'd's *Portsmouth*, 412. A sample of the current ridicule is in Col. Trumbull's *Autobiog.* 246.

² Cf. on the American side: Cooper; Loubat; Lossing; Roosevelt, 89; Coggeshall, 28; *Hist. Mag.*, Jan., 1870, and some reminiscences of Hull in Edmund Quincy's *Josiah Quincy*, 262. On the British side: James, v. 372, with diagram; Brenton, ii. 453, and Douglas's *Naval Gunnery*, 539.

³ Cf. Cooper; Lossing; Roosevelt, 108; Coggeshall, 72; and on the English side, James, v. 395, with a diagram; Douglas, 534.

⁴ Cf. Cooper's *History*; Lossing; Roosevelt, 119, 509; Harris's *Bainbridge*; Cooper in *Graham's Mag.*, Oct., 1842, and *Lives of Naval Officers*; Dennie's *Portfolio*, x. 553; and on the English side, James, v. 409, with diagram; Brenton, ii. 462; Douglas, 548.

⁵ Lossing gives an interesting account, with cuts, and Dawson collates the authorities. Cf. Douglas, 552, who also gives (pp. 78-80) a detailed account of the damage done to each ship; Brenton (ii. 490), who says he got his facts from officers of the British ship.

ENTERPRISE AND BOXER, Sept. 5, 1813. Despatch of Lieut.^e E. R. McCall, and medals to him and Lieut. Wm. Burrows, in Loubat, i. 173.¹

PEACOCK AND EPERVIER, April 29, 1814. Cf. *Am. St. Papers, Naval Aff.*, i. 313, 314; Loubat, i. 198, with medal given to Capt. Lewis Warrington; Cooper; Lossing; Dawson, ii. 338; Roosevelt, 312.

WASP AND REINDEER, June 28, 1814. Cf. *Am. St. Papers, Naval Aff.*, i. 315; Loubat, i. 201, with medal given to Capt. Johnston Blakeley; Cooper; Lossing; Roosevelt, 344; Dawson, ii. 345; James, vi. 161.

WASP AND AVON, Sept. 1, 1814. Cf. Dawson, ii. 377; Lossing, 981; Cooper; Roosevelt, 329.

LOSS OF THE PRESIDENT, Jan. 16, 1815. Decatur's report in Mackenzie's *Decatur*, App. vii.; Dawson, ii. 420; Cooper; Lossing; Roosevelt, 404; James, vi. 239.

CONSTITUTION TAKES THE CYANE AND LEVANT, Feb. 20, 1815. Cf. Loubat, i. 247, for Stewart's report and medal; Cooper; Lossing; Roosevelt, 417; Dawson, ii. 422; *Dem. Rev.* xxviii. 449; *Analectic Mag.* vii. 132; R. W. Gilder, *Hours at Home*, x. 268, 468; James, vi. 249.

HORNET AND PENGUIN, March 23, 1815. Cf. Rept. of Secretary Crowninshield to the Ho. of Rep., Dec. 21, 1815; *Autobiography of Charles Biddle*, App. p. 397; Dawson, ii. 424; Cooper; Lossing; Roosevelt, 429; James, vi. 261.

E. ON THE SEABOARD IN 1812-1815. — Lossing (p. 235) gives a list of the coast forts. Sumner's *East Boston*, p. 738, gives an account of the defensive measures along the coasts of Maine and Massachusetts, to be supplemented by the local histories of the seaboard towns. For the British occupation of Eastport, Me., see Williamson's *Maine*, ch. 26; Lorenzo Sabine in *Hist. Mag.*, April, May, 1870; on the works at Castine, see Lossing, 897; forts at Salem, *Ibid.* 907; defences of Boston, *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iii. 304; of New London, Lossing, 692; *Harper's Mag.*, xxviii. 3; attack at Stonington, James R. Durand's *Life and Adventures* (Rochester, N. Y., 1820); Fort Phoenix at New Haven, Lossing, 913.

For the defences and events about New York city, see *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Nov., 1885, p. 522. Gen. Cullum's *Campaigns of War of 1812-15* gives a plan of the fortifications about the city. Others are given in Lossing, 971, etc.; in Valentine's *Manual of the City of New York*, 1856, 1857, with documents, etc.; and in *Ibid.*, 1859, the proceedings of the Com. of Defence.

The minutes of the Com. of Defence in Philadelphia are in the *Penna. Hist. Soc. Memoirs*, viii.

For the operations of the British fleet in the Chesapeake, see James, vi., and Dawson, ii. 212, 226, 248, 250, 255. For the attack on Craney Island, Dawson, ii. 257; the *Report* to the Virginia legislature on the defence of Craney Island in 1813; Gen. Cullum's *Campaigns*, etc., 273; Lossing, 679, etc.; *Harper's Mag.*, xxviii. 10; *Virginia Hist. Reg.* i. 132.

F. THE NORTHERN FRONTIER, 1812-1814. — Lossing and Dawson, with some personal narratives like Wilkinson's *Memoirs* (i. ch. 13-15), and a few local histories like Johnson's *Erie County* and F. B. Hough's *Jefferson County*, give us most of the detail of this campaign.²

The capture of York (Toronto) was the first considerable success. Lossing (588, etc.) gives a plan. Dawson (ii. 214) collates the authorities.³

For the attack on Sackett's Harbor (May, 1813), see Wilkinson's *Memoirs*; Dennie's *Portfolio* (xiii. 397); and plan and collations in Lossing (613, etc.) and Dawson (ii. 235). Col. Edward Bayne's official report of the attacking party is in *Some Account of Gen. Prevost* (App. p. 61).⁴

Of the disgraceful campaign of Gen. Wade Hampton, conducting the right wing of Wilkinson's army, and his discomfiture near Johnston, on the Chateaugua (Oct. 26, 1813), Lossing (p. 648) gives a good account, and it may be supplemented by Dawson (ii. 298). Cullum (ch. 4) examines the campaign professionally, and gives a map of the region between Lakes Champlain and Ontario, with the route of Hampton. There is also a map of the fight in Wilkinson's *Atlas*, no. 8.⁵

Of the affair at Chrystler's Farm, or Field (Nov., 1813), there are professional accounts in Carmichael-Smyth's *Précis of the Wars in Canada* (p. 160), and in Gen. Cullum's *Campaigns*, etc. (p. 167), who gives a plan (others in Lossing, 655; *Harper's Mag.* xxvii. 755). Trimen's *Brit. Army* shows the 49th and 89th Foot to have been present. Cf. Dawson (ii. 305), and John Parker Boyd's *Documents and facts relating to military events during the late war* (1816) affords some illustrations.

For the affair at the La Colle mill (March 30, 1814) we turn to Wilkinson and Lossing (p. 790) for maps, and to Dawson (ii. 337) for a comparison of authorities.

¹ Cf. Dawson, ii. 272; *Am. St. Papers, Naval Aff.*, i. 294, 297; Cooper; Lossing; Roosevelt, 213; Preble's *Three Hist. Flags*; *Analectic Mag.*, by Irving, also in his *Spanish Papers*, ii.; Gould's *Portland, Me.*, 482, 490; *Hist. Mag.* i. 118; James, vi. 75.

² They will suffice for some of the minor operations, like the expedition to Gananoqui (Sept. 21, 1812), to St. Regis (Oct. 23d), to Elizabethtown (Feb.), and the attacks on Ogdensburgh (Oct. 4, 1812; Feb. 22, 1813).

³ Cf. *Canadian Antiquarian* (vii. 128); letter of Abraham Eustis in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* (xi. 492).

⁴ There is a contemporary view in the *Doc. Hist. N. Y.* (vol. ii.); Gay (iv. 197), etc.

⁵ Among Canadian accounts is that of an eye-witness, "La bataille de Chateaugay," in Coffin's *1812, the War, etc.* Cf. Sir Etienne Taché and the address of James Stevenson before the Lit. and Hist. Soc. of Quebec, Dec. 29, 1877.

Dawson (ii. 325) describes the expedition to Longwood (March, 1814); and for the attack on Oswego (May, 1814) we must resort to Lossing (p. 796, — also *Harper's Mag.*, xxviii. 149) and Dawson (ii. 340).

The American commander's defence of his conduct in this final campaign at the North is in the *Official Correspondence with the Department of War, relative to the mil. operations of the Amer. army under the command of Maj.-Gen. Izard on the northern frontier of the U. S., for 1814 and 1815* (Philad., 1816).

The readiest means for studying the topography of this region is given by the maps in Lossing (p. 881, etc.). Wilkinson's plans do not purport to be accurate surveys; but his drafts are followed more or less closely in James's *Mil. Occurrences*.

G. CAMPAIGNS ON THE NIAGARA RIVER, 1812-1815. — The plan of the invasion of Canada is sketched in Madison's *Letters* (iii. 560). The defeat at Queenstown (Oct. 13, 1812)¹ was the occasion of censure in Armstrong's *Notices*, and Gen. Solomon Van Rensselaer answered his critic in his *Narrative of the affair of Queenstown* (N. Y., 1836). Cf. Mrs. Bonney's *Legacy of Hist. Gleanings* (ch. 9-11). Armstrong prints a journal of the campaign by John Chrystie. Scott's account of the fight is in his *Autobiography* (ch. 6), and this gave occasion to a reply from Gen. Wool (*Hist. Mag.*, Nov. 1867). See a paper by Col. C. Whittlesey on "Gen. Wm. Wadsworth's Division" in the *West. Reserve and Ohio Hist. Soc. Tracts*, no. 5. Cf. Lossing (301) and Dawson (ii. 143). Sir James Carmichael-Smyth (*Précis, etc.*, p. 142) and Cullum (ch. 2) give a professional review. Sheafe's despatch is in the *Ann. Reg.* 1812, p. 253. Cf. F. B. Tupper's *Life and Correspondence of Maj.-Gen. Sir Isaac Brock* (London, 1845). Brymner's *Report on the Canadian Archives* (1883, p. 13) shows letters of Brock.²

The campaign of 1813 has also received professional treatment on both sides in Cullum's *Campaigns* (ch. 3, with a map) and in Carmichael-Smyth (p. 158). Lossing (p. 418, etc.) and Dawson (ii. 231, 244, 253, 259, 314) best illustrate the material we have for judgment.³

There is a general survey of the campaign of 1814, with those of 1812-13 as introductory, in David B. Douglass's papers in the *Hist. Mag.* (July to Oct., 1873), accompanied by a map of the Niagara country and special maps of the battles. Douglass was a lieutenant of engineers. The British official reports are in the *Ann. Register*, 1814 (pp. 200, 202, etc.).⁴ The conduct of the campaign is criticised adversely by Gen. Cullum (*Campaigns, etc.*, p. 222). The management of Gen. E. W. Ripley is elucidated in *Facts relative to the Campaign on the Niagara in 1814* (Boston, 1815).⁵

The interest of the campaign centres in three conflicts. The battle of Chippewa (July 5, 1814) was the occasion of Capt. Jos. Treat's *Vindication against the atrocious calumny contained in Maj.-Gen. Brown's Official Report of the battle of Chippewa* (Philad., 1815), which contains the proceedings of a general court-martial held at Sackett's Harbor. Cf. Samuel White's *Hist. of the Amer. troops during the late War, under the command of Colonels Fenton and Campbell* (Baltimore, 1829, 1830); Scott's *Autobiography* (i. 128); the professional treatment by Cullum (p. 206, with a plan); the topographical detail in Lossing (p. 810, etc.); also *Harper's Mag.* xxviii. 154; the collations in Dawson (ii. 348); and the account in Stone's *Red Jacket* (ch. 10).

The fight sometimes known as Lundy's Lane, otherwise as the battle of Bridgewater or Niagara (July 25, 1814), has been professionally examined in Scott's *Autobiography* (ch. 12), in Cullum's *Campaigns* (p. 213), and in Carmichael-Smyth's *Précis, etc.* (p. 180). Cf. Wilkinson's *Memoirs*, with plans showing the fight at four stages, and other topographical details in Lossing (p. 818, etc., — also in *Harper's Mag.* xxviii. 145), beside the details in Dawson (ii. 352).

The siege of Fort Erie (Aug. 3-Sept. 21, 1814). Loubat gives the medal (no. xlv.) to Gen. Gaines, and his report (i. 227). There are plans in Lossing (p. 839) and in the *Mag. West. Hist.* (April, 1886, pp. 711, 722). Cullum (ch. 6) gives a professional treatment, and also a plan (p. 244).⁶ After Gen. Izard came from Sackett's Harbor to assume command on the Niagara, we have his *Official Correspondence*, already referred to.⁷

II. THE MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES. — The military academy at West Point was established by

¹ The capture of two British vessels under the guns of Fort Erie, by Elliott, a few days before (Oct. 9th), is described in Elliott's *Address at Hagerstown* (Philad., 1844); Dawson (ii. 140); Ketchum's *Buffalo* (ii. 276); and in the *Correspondence in relation to the capture of the British brig Detroit and Caledonia on the night of Oct. 8, 1812* (Philad., 1843).

² Cf. Lossing, 414; J. C. Dent's *Last Forty Years of Canada*; W. L. Stone's *Life of Brant* (ii. 503, 537); John Symons's *Nar. of the battle of Queenstown Heights* (Toronto, 1859); *Canadian Antiquarian* (vii. 128). For further accounts of Indian service in the war, see Stone's *Red Jacket*.

³ Cf. Boyd's *Documents and facts relating to mil. events during the late War*. The events at Black Rock and near Buffalo can be followed also in Ketchum's *Buffalo*.

(Cf. view of Buffalo in 1815 in *Doc. Hist. N. Y.*, ii. 1178 and Gay's *U. S.*, iv. 211.)

⁴ Trimen's *British Army* shows that during the campaigns of 1813-14, the 6th, 8th, 82d, and 89th Foot were engaged.

⁵ Cf., for minor details, *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1844, p. 123; and an *Interesting Acc. of the Campaign of 1814 by a musician of the army*. Loubat records the medals (nos. xl.-xliii.) given to Maj.-General Jacob Brown, Maj.-General Peter B. Porter, Brig.-General E. H. Ripley, and Brig.-General James Miller, with their respective reports (i. 205, 216.)

⁶ Cf. further in Dawson (ii. 363), who uses Maj. Douglass's MS. Reminiscences; *Mag. Amer. Hist.* (June, 1881, vi. 401); and *Hist. Mag.* (3d ser., ii. 216).

⁷ Cf. *Buffalo Hist. Soc. Publ.*, ii. 351.

act of Congress, March 16, 1802, and for a while a part of its graduates became officers of the marines. The present organization of the academy dates back to 1812.¹

After many makeshift experiments and abortive attempts, the Naval Academy was founded at Annapolis by George Bancroft, then Secretary of the Navy, in 1845.²

I. STEAM VESSELS. — The earliest use of a steamer in the American wars appears to have been when the Americans employed a steamboat on the Potomac to reconnoitre, against the wind, the fleet of Admiral Warren (Preble's *Hist. of Steam Navigation*, p. 81). The "Fulton the First," launched at New York, Oct. 29, 1814 (*Ibid.* 83), a vessel with twin-hulls, with the paddle between, and with bulwarks four feet and ten inches thick, was the first war-ship on record propelled by steam. The war was over when she made her trial trip, June 1, 1815. She some years later blew up at her moorings, opposite the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Griffis, in his *Life of M. C. Perry* (ch. 13, 14), looks upon the real beginning of the steam navy in Perry's results in 1837 (Preble, 157), with the most conspicuous early performances in the twin-steamer "Mississippi" and "Missouri," in 1841 (ch. 18).

J. MAPS. — The maps of North America and of the United States, for some years before and after 1800, as serving to show the geographical knowledge at the time of the wars of that period, are mainly these: The early hydrography in Carleton Osgood's *American Pilot* (1791), engraved by Norman, the Boston engraver; the coast surveys of Capt. Holland, bearing date usually in 1794; and the *North American Pilot* of 1800.

The maps in Payne's *Universal Geography* (1792); in Thomas Kitchin's *New Universal Atlas* (1799); but the maps are often dated earlier, as the one of the United States in 1794, given in fac-simile in Mill's *Boundaries of Ontario*. Samuel Lewis's *Map of the United States* in 1795, and again in 1815; the French *Atlas* of Robert de Vaugondy (1798). The English *Map of the United States* by Arrowsmith (1813 and later dates). The American maps of the *Seat of War*, both in North America at large, with minor side maps, and in the *Southern Section of the U. S.*, published about 1813, and gathered later in the *Military and Topographical Atlas of the U. S.* (Philad., 1815; 2d ed., 1816). A map of the U. S. in 1814 is in Anderson's *Canada*.

¹ Cf. Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*, index, p. 1326; Benton's *Debates*; his *Thirty Years' View*, i. ch. 55; George W. Cullum's *Register of Officers and Graduates of West Point*, 1802-1850 (N. Y., 1850), and his more extended work, *Biog. Register of the Officers and Graduates, etc., 1802-1879*, 2d ed., in three vols., covering respectively 1802-1840, 1841-1867, and 1868-1879; Blanche Berard's *Reminiscences of West Point in the olden time, derived from various sources; and Register of graduates of the United*

States military academy, corrected to Sept. 1st, 1886, with an index (East Saginaw, Mich., 1886); R. Park's *Hist. and Topog. of West Point* (1840); Boynton's *Hist. of West Point*.

² Cf. index Poore's *Descr. Catal.*, p. 1332; Benton's *Debates*, and *Thirty Years*, ii. ch. 131; E. C. Marshall's *Hist. U. S. Naval Acad.* (N. Y., 1862); Jas. R. Soley's *Hist. Sketch of the U. S. Naval Acad.* (Washington, 1876), an official publication of chief importance.

CHAPTER VII.
THE DIPLOMACY OF THE UNITED STATES.
1789-1850.

BY JAMES B. ANGELL, LL. D.
President of the University of Michigan.

PRIOR to the inauguration of Washington as President in 1789, the United States had concluded eight treaties with foreign powers.¹ The eminent American statesmen who represented our country in these negotiations succeeded in incorporating into these compacts not a few of their broad and humane views, and in securing from the European powers the recognition of generous principles, which had not been formally acknowledged in international law. Several stipulations served to mitigate the cruelties and hardships of war, by regulating the use of letters of marque, by allowing citizens of one belligerent government proper time to retire with their property from the territory of the other, by limiting strictly the doctrine of contraband, by securing care for prisoners of war, and by protecting noncombatants. Generous commercial regulations were made. The *droit d'aubaine* was abolished, and provisions were made to enable aliens to hold, sell, and bequeath property, and to exercise religious liberty. The treaty with Prussia was, perhaps, too liberal for the times in its provisions for abolishing privateering against merchant ships and the forfeiture of goods as contraband.

The generous spirit which characterized and shaped these earliest diplomatic negotiations was never lost. Those first treaties naturally served in large measure as the models of subsequent treaties. Especially in the exposition and illustration of the rights and duties of neutrals, which had been so cogently set forth by Franklin and John Adams and their colleagues in their negotiations in Europe, the administration of Washington was soon called to take decided action. This it did under the most trying circumstances, and with so much fairness and skill as to draw from Canning, a few years later, in the House of Commons, the warmest commendations.² On taking the executive chair, Washington found himself

¹ These treaties were: a Treaty of Alliance and a Treaty of Amity and Commerce with France, negotiated in 1778; Treaties of Amity and Commerce with the Netherlands, 1782, with Sweden, 1783, and with Prussia, 1785; the

Treaty of Peace and Independence with Great Britain, 1783; a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with Morocco, 1787; and a Consular Convention with France, 1788.

² In 1823, Canning, then British Secretary of

confronted at once by serious difficulties with Great Britain, and not long after by almost as grave troubles with France. The British government had never fulfilled the obligations assumed by it in the treaty of 1783 to withdraw its troops from the posts on the northern frontier, and to make compensation for the negroes it carried off at the close of the war. It had steadily refused to make any commercial regulations satisfactory to the American government, and especially to remove what were deemed burdensome restrictions upon trading with the British West Indies. John Adams had spent three weary years at the British court in the vain attempt to secure a recognition of the American demands. The British government sent no minister to the United States, and after John Adams returned home, in 1788, there was no agent through whom direct official communication between the two governments could be held. The Americans were bitterly offended at the failure of the British to execute the treaty, and the British sharply complained that, in violation of the treaty, the American States and their citizens rendered nugatory all their attempts to collect debts from American creditors. The situation was the just cause of solicitude, especially on the part of the young republic, which was so poorly prepared to enforce its claims by a military or naval demonstration.

In October, 1789, Washington requested Gouverneur Morris, who, after a useful public career at home, was then residing in Paris, to go to London and endeavor to ascertain the intentions and the temper of the British government. Mr. Morris had interviews with the Duke of Leeds and with Mr. Pitt, but obtained no satisfaction.¹ The British government did, however, decide in 1791 to send a minister to the States. The choice fell on George Hammond, who had been secretary under Mr. Hartley at the negotiations in Paris in 1783. In the same year, 1791, Thomas Pinckney was commissioned as American minister at the Court of St. James. On Mr. Hammond's arrival, the Secretary of State, Mr. Jefferson, soon learned that the British representative was not empowered to make a treaty, but merely to talk about the principles which might form the basis of one.² Jefferson therefore decided to consider with him at once the means of securing the execution of the seventh article of the treaty of 1783, which provided for the evacuation of the military posts by the British. Mr. Hammond, in reply to Mr. Jefferson's first note on the subject, asserted that the king had suspended the execution of that article because the United States had not executed the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles. These articles provided that creditors on either side might without impediment

State for Foreign Affairs, opposing a motion to repeal the Foreign Enlistment Act of 1819, which had been made in imitation of the American Neutrality Act of 1818, said: "If I wished for a guide in a system of neutrality, I should take that laid down by America in the days of the presidency of Washington and the secretary-

ship of Jefferson." *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, viii. (new series), 1056.

¹ *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, i. 122-124.

² The correspondence, which is voluminous, between Jefferson and Hammond, is found in *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, i. 188 *et seq.*

collect debts due from citizens of the other nation, and that Congress should recommend to the States to provide for the restitution of confiscated estates of British subjects, and the articles also forbade future confiscations or prosecutions of persons for the part they might have taken in the war.

Mr. Jefferson then entered into details in his communication of December 15, 1791. He showed (1) that the British, in contravention of the treaty, retained possession of the following posts: Mackinaw, Detroit, Fort Erie, Niagara, Oswego, Oswegatchie (on the St. Lawrence), and Port-au-fer and Dutchman's Point (on Lake Champlain); (2) that the British officers had tried to exercise jurisdiction in the vicinity of the forts; (3) that they had excluded American citizens from the navigation of the American side of the lakes and streams forming the boundary, and had thus seriously interrupted their fur trade; (4) that they carried off negroes and also other property in ways which he specified; (5) and, finally, that it was important to determine which of the two rivers called the St. Croix was to be taken as our boundary on the east. Mr. Hammond, in his response, March 5, 1792, justified the retention of the posts as a proper retaliation for the vexatious laws and judicial decisions in our States concerning the collection of debts, but he said nothing of the seizure of the negroes and property. On May 29th Mr. Jefferson presented an elaborate review of the legislative and judicial decisions in the States, and affirmed, (1) that the treaty was the supreme law of the land; (2) that the United States government had done all that it promised to do, had in good faith recommended to the States what it stipulated it would recommend; and (3) that the delivery of the posts was a plain and simple duty, while the change of legislation in thirteen States was necessarily difficult and slow. To this cogent paper no answer was ever returned by Hammond.

Nothing had been determined by the long discussion when Jefferson resigned his position of Secretary of State, at the close of 1793. Mr. Pinckney, who reached London in August, 1792, could get no consideration of his representations to the British Foreign Office concerning the retention of the frontier posts, and concerning the impressment of seamen taken from American vessels and forced into the British service.

While the relations of the United States with Great Britain were thus unsatisfactory, the American government found itself involved in embarrassing discussions with France, as soon as the war between France and England began, in February, 1793.¹ By the treaty of 1778 with France, the American people had put themselves under certain obligations to her, such as they owed to no other power.² Among these obligations were that of guaranteeing the possessions of France in America, that of receiving

¹ Even before this there had been some friction concerning commercial relations. Congress having subjected French vessels to the same tonnage dues as British, the special favor, granted by royal decrees of 1787 and 1788, of admitting whale oil and other American articles

with low duties had been withdrawn. In general the French were disappointed in not reaping greater commercial advantages. *Foreign Relations*, i. 113.

² *Art. XI. Treaty of Alliance. Art. XVII. and Art. XXII. Treaty of Commerce and Amity.*

her prizes into American ports, that of denying refuge to vessels having made prizes of French subjects, people, or property, and that of forbidding privateers of her enemies to fit their ships or exchange or sell their captures in such ports. Under the Consular Convention of 1788 France could with plausibility claim a jurisdiction for her consuls, which might be very embarrassing to the United States as a neutral power.

Washington, believing it to be a duty to maintain an attitude of impartiality towards the belligerents, issued, with the approval of his cabinet, a proclamation of neutrality on April 22, 1793.¹ In this he exhorted and warned the citizens of the United States carefully to avoid all acts and proceedings whatsoever which might in any manner tend to contravene the disposition to preserve a friendly and impartial course towards France and her opponents, Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, Sardinia, and the United Netherlands.

The French minister, M. Genet, who landed at Charleston, S. C., June 8, 1793, eagerly and in impertinent language claimed for France not only the privileges granted by the treaties, but other unwarrantable privileges. He proceeded to fit out privateers in American ports, and send them forth to prey on British commerce on the coasts, and demanded that they should be allowed to bring their captured goods free of duty into port and sell them.² The public sympathy with the French was so strong and the antipathy to the British was so violent, that the difficulty of resisting Genet's appeals was greatly enhanced. But the administration remained firm. It demanded of France the return of the British prizes which French privateers had seized in American waters, and announced that in case of refusal the United States would pay the damages to the British and ask reparation from the French. In opposition to the French contention it maintained that American courts, not the French consular courts, must determine whether captures had been made in American waters.

The British minister also pressed Mr. Jefferson with his complaints. He objected to the selling of arms to French citizens, or to permitting the French to ship them from American ports. Mr. Jefferson, in his letter of May 25, 1793, set forth what is substantially the doctrine now generally accepted and embodied in neutrality acts, namely, that the citizens of a neutral nation may sell arms to a belligerent and send them to their destination subject to capture as contraband. Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury, on August 4th issued a circular to collectors of the ports, directing them to refuse asylum to unlawful belligerents. English privateers, as well as French, were interrupted in their attempts to violate neutrality.³ All

¹ *Foreign Rel.*, ii. 140. The word "neutrality" was avoided in the proclamation, as some doubt was felt whether the Executive had the power to issue a declaration of neutrality, and it was thought larger privileges might be gained by avoiding it. Jefferson's *Works*, iii. 591; iv. 18.


² It is now clear, though it was not known

then, that Genet was using American territory as a base of operations to recover for France the Louisiana territory, which had been ceded to Spain by secret treaty in 1762. Gardien (*Histoire*, vi. 266; viii. 40) makes this the chief object of his mission.

³ *For. Rel.* i. 159 and 163.

these acts of the administration, it should be remembered, antedated the first American Neutrality Act, that of 1794.

Meanwhile, the decrees of the British and French governments were seriously threatening our commerce. The national convention of France on May 9, 1793, directed French armed vessels to seize and carry into port



THE BATTERY AND HARBOR OF NEW YORK.*

vessels bound to an enemy's port, and laden with provisions or with merchandise belonging to the enemy, though the provisions, if neutral property, and the freight were to be paid for.¹ On June 8th of the same year the British ordered armed vessels to arrest and send into port vessels loaded with corn or meal or flour destined for France, and all neutral vessels, save those of Denmark and Sweden, which should attempt to enter any blockaded port.² Mr. Pinckney labored in vain at the Court of St. James for some modification of the British Order, which, he argued, violated the law

¹ *For. Rel.* i. 244. The decree was suspended as to the United States May 23d, but soon afterwards was again made operative. *Ibid.* 244. See Washington's Message, *Ibid.* 141.

² *Ibid.* 240. The British government claimed credit for generosity in not ordering the seizure of rice. *Ibid.* 242.

* [From *Letters written during a tour through the Northern and Eastern States of America*, by John Drayton (Charleston, S. C., 1794). The author says of the sketch: "While I was taking it, the 'Ambuscade' sailed by, having a liberty cap on the foretop-gallant-mast head."

The "Ambuscade" was the French frigate from which Genet had landed at Charleston in April, 1793. At a later day, while lying in New York harbor, she had been challenged by the British frigate "Boston," cruising off the port, to a combat. Going out, the two ships fought, when the "Boston" steered away for Halifax in a crippled condition, and the "Ambuscade" returned to New York, to be received with enthusiasm.

There is an engraving of Fort George, the Battery, and Bowling Green in 1792 by Tiebout. There is a sketch of the picture in Lossing's *Empire State*, 195.—ED.]

of nations by treating provisions as contraband and by denying that free ships make free goods.

The fairness and wisdom of the administration in these most trying circumstances were so conspicuous, its exposition of the rights and duties of neutrals was so just and so cogent, that publicists now willingly credit it with the honor of anticipating the position to which the world has at last been brought.¹

It seemed for a time that, in spite of the best efforts of the administration, the American government would inevitably be drawn into hostilities with Great Britain or with France. There were two parties in the country, one of which loved British political ideas, esteemed highly the value of commercial relations with Great Britain, and disliked the excessive radicalism of the French leaders. The other detested the English, admired the doctrines of the French revolutionists, and desired the government to show its sympathy with France by official action. On April 7, 1794, a motion was introduced into the lower house of Congress discontinuing commercial intercourse with Great Britain in articles grown or manufactured in that country until the posts should be surrendered and damages for property taken should be paid. It seemed probable that Congress was in a temper to pass it. That would have led to war. The administration decided that to avert such a calamity one more effort must be made to settle the questions at issue with Great Britain by negotiation. Washington hoped that this could be done without perilling the relations with France. He therefore determined on sending a special mission to the Court of St. James.

The President's first choice of a minister to perform this delicate and difficult service was Hamilton, but it was soon made apparent that his nomination would be sharply opposed by Monroe and others. John Jay was therefore nominated and confirmed (April 19, 1794), though the Virginians opposed both the sending of any mission and especially the appointment of Jay.² Notwithstanding the confirmation of Jay, the nonintercourse bill passed the House, and was defeated in the Senate only by the casting vote of the Vice-President. Both Jay and the mission were publicly denounced up to the time of his departure.

His instructions, drawn by Randolph (May 6, 1794), who had succeeded Jefferson as Secretary of State, touched on the following subjects :³—

¹ W. E. Hall, one of the latest English writers, says (*International Law*, p. 515): "The policy of the United States in 1793 constitutes an epoch in the development of the usages of neutrality. There can be no doubt that it was intended and believed to give effect to the obligations then incumbent upon neutrals. But it represented by far the most advanced existing opinions as to what these obligations were, and in some points it even went further than authoritative international custom has up to the present time advanced. In the main, however, it is identical with the standard of conduct which is now adopted by the community of nations."

² Jay was confirmed by a vote of 18 to 8. There was force in the objections, that he was Chief Justice; that while Secretary of Foreign Affairs under the Confederation he had expressed the opinion that the British could not properly have returned the negro slaves they had carried away, though they might well have paid for them; and that the retention of the posts was justifiable. See *Secret Journals of Congress, For. Affairs*, iv. 277-280; Trescot's *Dipl. Hist.* 102-105. On the other hand, Washington justly thought that the high position of Jay would lend weight to the mission.

³ *For. Rel.* i. 472.

1. Compensation was to be asked for injuries done to American commerce. 2. An adjustment was to be sought of the points of difference in the treaty of peace. 3. If an auspicious settlement of these two questions were reached, it was to be considered whether a commercial treaty should be negotiated. The general objects of the treaty were set forth. They looked to an enlargement of commercial privileges and the protection of the property of neutrals on the sea. 4. The ministers of Russia, Denmark, and Sweden were to be sounded, if necessary, on the prospect of forming an alliance with them, on condition of co-operating with them in support of the doctrines of the armed neutrality. 5. No treaty was to be made inconsistent with the obligations of the United States to France.

Jay reached England June 8, 1794. Mr. Thomas Pinckney, the American minister to London, could not but feel that the importance of his position was somewhat diminished by the appointment of Mr. Jay;¹ but he heartily co-operated with Jay. The latter was cordially received by Lord Grenville. The negotiations, begun on June 27th and carried on largely by informal conversation, proceeded with reasonable despatch. The British government promptly expressed its willingness to make provision for indemnity for illegal captures of vessels or cargoes. Very soon, as Jay's despatch of September 13th to Randolph shows,² the American negotiator was yielding to the British arguments on the carrying away of the negroes and the retention of the posts. The British contention concerning the negroes was, that when they or any other property came into the British lines in war they became British property, and therefore to carry them away was not to carry away American property. Their argument for holding the posts was that there was no obligation to give them up until after the ratifications of the treaty were exchanged in 1784, and that before the stipulation to yield them became binding some of the American States had enacted laws concerning the collection of debts by British creditors which were in contravention of the treaty, and therefore the British were justified in continuing their possession of the posts.³ On December 15th Randolph wrote a strong letter, opposing Grenville's argument on the negroes, and objecting stoutly to the postponement of the surrender of the posts from 1795 to 1796. But before the despatch was written Jay and Grenville had completed the treaty. It was signed on November 19th. The most important British demand refused by Jay was for the cession of territory at the head of the Mississippi.

The substance of the first ten articles, which were to be perpetual, was as follows: The posts were to be evacuated by the British by June 1, 1796. Free commercial intercourse across the boundary and free navigation of the Mississippi were secured. A survey of the Upper Mississippi was

¹ See Pinckney's own language, copied from his MS., Trescot, *Dipl. Hist.*, 106 (note).

² *For. Rel.* i. 485.

³ The details of the negotiations between Jay and Grenville, their projects and counter-projects of a treaty, are given in *For. Rel.* i. 476 *et seq.*

ordered to fix the boundary in that region. Three commissions were provided for: one to determine which river is the St. Croix named in the treaty of 1783;¹ one to fix the amount of debts due British creditors and not collectible owing to obstructions of justice, and to be paid by the United States; and one to determine the amount due from Great Britain for damages done by cruisers. Citizens of each country were to be permitted to continue in possession of lands held at that time, or to sell and devise them. Neither public nor private debts were thenceforward to be sequestered.

The twelfth article, which was to continue in force for two years after peace should be declared, but which was suspended, provided that citizens of the United States might trade in vessels not exceeding seventy tons burden with the British West Indies, carrying thither the produce of the United States alone, and transporting West India products to the United States alone; but American vessels were not to carry molasses, sugar, coffee, cocoa, or cotton anywhere from the United States, or from his Majesty's islands anywhere but to the United States.² British vessels of any tonnage were allowed to carry any products of the United States to the islands, and any products of the islands to the United States.

The most important provisions of the remaining articles, which were to remain in force for twelve years, were these: Citizens of the United States might trade between their country and the East Indies, but could not transport East India goods elsewhere. Commerce between the United States and the European possessions of Great Britain was to be unrestricted. Contraband was so defined as to include naval stores, and in some cases, not described, provisions. But if provisions were seized they were to be paid for. A vessel approaching a blockade in ignorance of its existence was to be warned off once. The commanders of privateers were to give bonds not to cause damage in contravention of the treaty. Joint action was to be had for the suppression of pirates. Neither British nor Americans were to be permitted to take privateers' commissions from a third party against the other. Foreign privateers were not to be allowed to fit or arm in the ports of either for war against the other. Reprisals were not to be authorized until justice should be formally refused. Neither party was to give refuge to prizes and privateers of an enemy of the other, and both were to guard the neutrality of their waters. In case of war, citizens of one country might remain in the other, if peaceable; if they were obliged to go, they should have a year's notice. Extradition for murder and forgery was authorized.

It is worthy of notice that this was the first provision made in any American treaty for extradition.³

¹ [See *ante*, p. 171.—ED.]

² It is said that neither of the negotiators knew at this time that cotton had been exported from the United States. Only a very little had

been exported, and certainly neither could foresee how important the growth of cotton was to become in the South.

³ The American government has steadily held

No sooner were the contents of the treaty made known than it was most fiercely attacked in all parts of the country. Public meetings were held in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston to inveigh against it.¹ The chief points raised against it were these: 1. The evacuation of the posts was deferred too long, and British traders were meanwhile allowed to remain in them, while American traders were excluded. 2. The surrender of the negroes was unjust. 3. The prohibition of the confiscation of debts in future wars was injurious, since the United States needed such a weapon as confiscation for its own protection. 4. The permission to aliens to hold land here would encourage mischief.² 5. The limitations on trade with the East Indies and the West Indies left America worse off than she was before. 6. The extension of the list of contraband articles, especially the inclusion of provisions among them, struck a blow at American commerce by perilling on the sea its principal article of exportation.

When Jay transmitted the treaty, November 19, 1794, he defended its provisions in a despatch to Randolph.³ This defence anticipated some of the objections above named. His chief argument, and really the main ground on which the treaty ever has been or can be defended, was that there was "no reason to believe or conjecture that one more favorable to us was attainable." His position on some of the details was as follows: The time granted to the British traders to remain at the posts was not unreasonable, since they had goods spread abroad, and could not collect the debts due them in a shorter period. The provision made for the settlement of debts was a *sine qua non*. No treaty could be had without it. The prohibition of confiscation would be helpful to Americans as borrowers. The provision for the East India trade showed good-will on the part of Great Britain. If the stipulations concerning the West India trade were unsatisfactory, there was the opportunity of reconsidering them in two years. The article making provisions contraband secured compensation in case of seizure, and did not abandon the general principles maintained by the United States. The privateering clauses were taken from treaties between England, France, and Holland.⁴

Hamilton, writing under the signature of *Camillus*, brought his vigorous

that extradition is obligatory only under treaty stipulation, though it may be exercised through courtesy where no treaty demands it. Wharton's *International Law Digest*, § 268.

¹ Perhaps the most formidable assault upon the treaty was made by A. J. Dallas of Philadelphia. See his *Life and Writings*, 160.

² The fear was cherished that British settlers would gain too large an influence in American public affairs.

³ *For. Rel.* i. 503.

⁴ In the *Life of Jay*, by his son (i. 329), it is stated that Jay proposed to Grenville the abolition of privateering.

It may properly be added here that Jay's son, in the biography of his father (i. 326), sets out these advantages gained by the treaty: 1. Reparation for damages done by British cruisers was secured by calling the spoliations acts done under color of royal authority (Jay's treaty, art. 7), and the United States did receive \$10,345,000. 2. By making concessions on the claims for negroes, America obtained her other claims. 3. While the general European policy was for each nation to retain the monopoly of its colonial trade, Jay obtained an important relaxation of this policy from Great Britain.

powers of argumentation to the support of the treaty. After a little time, merchants who wanted to trade in the Indies also held meetings and sent to the Senate petitions for the ratification. The tide of popular feeling against the treaty was at last stayed. The Senate, by a vote of twenty to ten, ratified it, with the exception of the article on the West India trade (the twelfth), which was suspended. The suspension was subsequently agreed to by Great Britain.¹

The President, on March 1, 1796, communicated to the two houses of Congress the proclamation of the ratification of the treaty. The question was immediately raised, whether, under the Constitution, the House was bound to furnish the appropriations needed to carry the treaty into effect. Assuming that it was not thus bound, the House requested of the President the papers relative to the negotiation of the treaty. The President respectfully declined to comply.² A remarkable debate, extending through three weeks, ensued. Madison and Gallatin were the leading opponents of the President's views. But finally, April 30, 1796, the House voted, 51 to 48, that it was expedient to carry the treaty into effect.³

After this action, the public excitement concerning the treaty rapidly subsided. But the treaty was long subjected to severe criticism;⁴ and it must be conceded that much of the criticism was well founded. The justification of the treaty is found in the fact that it saved the States from a war with Great Britain, for which they were entirely unprepared, and gave them years of peace, which in their weakness they so much needed. Looking back from our present point of view, we must admit that the completion of the negotiation was wise and fortunate.⁵

Congress made the necessary appropriations for executing the treaty,

¹ Mr. Pickering, Secretary of State, in a despatch to Mr. Monroe, minister to France, Sept. 12, 1795 (*For. Rel.* i. 596), sets forth the reasons why the administration assented to the treaty. 1. The negotiation did not proceed from any predilection to Great Britain. 2. War was seriously deprecated as most calamitous to the United States. 3. Many differences between America and Great Britain needed adjustment without delay. 4. The commercial part of the treaty, though not unimportant, was not subordinate and was not a new measure. Mr. Pickering argued that in allowing the seizure of provisions in certain cases as contraband, the government had not abandoned old doctrines, but by obtaining compensation for provisions seized had mitigated the severity of the British doctrine, the application of which by England, America was in no condition fully to resist. As his object in the despatch was to convince the French that our action was not unfriendly to them, he maintained that the stipulation concerning provisions would probably stimulate

Americans to send supplies of food to France, since in any event they would be secure against loss.

² His language was: "As it is perfectly clear to my understanding that the assent of the House of Representatives is not necessary to the validity of a treaty; as the treaty with Great Britain exhibits in itself all the objects requiring legislative provision, and on these the papers called for can throw no light; and as it is essential to the due administration of the government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office, under all the circumstances of this case, forbid a compliance with your request." *Annals, 1st sess. 4th Cong.*, 761.

³ For the debate, see *Ibid.* 423-783; 970-1291.

⁴ For recent criticism, see Schouler's *History U. S.* i. 292, and Adams's *Gallatin*, 158.

⁵ For collation of important judicial interpretations of the treaty, see Wharton's *Digest of Int. Law*, § 150 a.

May 6, 1796, and Parliament, July 4, 1797. Two mixed commissions were appointed to settle claims.¹

Meanwhile, during these prolonged negotiations with Great Britain from the arrival of Hammond to the conclusion of Jay's treaty, our relations with France were far from harmonious. We have already spoken briefly of Genet's extraordinary course. He became so offensive that his recall was asked in August, 1793. Gouverneur Morris, who had been appointed minister to France in 1792, had, by his sympathies with the royalist party, become unacceptable to the revolutionary party, which had come into power, and the Executive Provisory Council of the French Republic requested that he should be recalled. Accordingly, May 27, 1794, Washington recalled him and appointed James Monroe in his stead.² Monroe was opposed to the administration in politics, had stoutly opposed the confirmation of Jay, and warmly sympathized with France. In the circumstances the appointment was not a wise one, since the minister could not be in sympathy either with Jay or with Washington, when the hearty cooperation of the three was greatly needed.

Monroe was directed to say that Jay was instructed to do nothing incompatible with the obligations of the United States to France. He was also directed to endeavor to secure the removal of an embargo which had been placed on American vessels at Bordeaux, to ask compensation for illegal captures of our ships and goods, to demand the correction of violations by France of her treaties with us, to remove suspicions which France entertained of the purposes of Jay's mission, and to invoke the aid of France in securing for us from Spain the free navigation of the Mississippi.³

Monroe was cordially received, and during his few months' stay maintained pleasant personal relations with the French government. He found the Directory much disturbed by the negotiation of Jay's Treaty with Great Britain.⁴ They presented to him what they called "a summary exposition of the complaints of the French government against the government of the United States."⁵ These were substantially complaints that America was violating the treaty of 1778 by allowing United States courts to take jurisdiction over French prizes, and by admitting British men-of-war to American ports; that she was violating the Consular Convention of 1788 by neglecting to empower any one to enforce consular judgments; that the American government permitted the captain of the "Cassius" to be arrested in Philadelphia for an offence on the high seas, and the French

¹ For a succinct account of the proceedings of the commissions see J. C. Bancroft Davis's *Notes on Treaties of the U. S.*, 1013, a work to which once for all we wish to acknowledge our great obligations. No one can traverse the ground covered by this chapter without receiving assistance from Mr. Davis at every step.

² *For. Rel.* i. 463.

³ *For. Rel.* i. 668.

⁴ Jay, it will be remembered, refused to comply with Monroe's request for information concerning the negotiation and for a copy of the treaty to lay before the French government. Jay offered to send the desired information in confidence to Monroe personally, but the latter was unwilling to receive it unless he could communicate it.

⁵ *For. Rel.* i. 730.

minister's effects to be seized by a British vessel within American waters; and, finally, that Jay's treaty, by increasing the number of articles which as contraband a neutral was forbidden to carry, and especially by allowing provisions to be seized as contraband in certain cases, was discriminating in favor of England and against France. On July 2, 1796, the Directory decided to notify all neutral or allied states that the French would treat all neutral vessels as these suffered the English to treat them. Mr. Pickering made long replies to the complaints of the Directory in his instructions to Mr. C. C. Pinckney, who was commissioned in September, 1796, to succeed Monroe,¹ and in correspondence with the French minister to the United States, Adet.² In October the Directory recalled Adet and issued a decree prohibiting the importation of manufactured articles of English make or of English commerce. They announced to Monroe that they would neither recognize nor receive a minister from the United States until reparation was made for the grievances of which they had complained. Mr. Pinckney was treated in the most discourteous manner. He was placed under police supervision, and was finally obliged to retire to Amsterdam.³ The President of the Directory, in his farewell address to Monroe, among other words insulting to that minister's government, spoke of "the condescension of the American government to the wishes of its ancient tyrants." Decree after decree was issued, calculated and intended to destroy American commerce. Neutral ships carrying enemy's property were to be captured, enemy's goods on neutral ships were to be confiscated, the treaty of 1778 was to be treated as modified so as to conform to the French interpretation of Jay's treaty. It was under such clouds that Washington's administration ended and John Adams's began.

With the approbation of both houses of Congress President Adams decided to make one more attempt to adjust our difficulties with France by negotiation. He appointed John Marshall of Virginia, and Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, to be associated with Mr. Pinckney as commissioners to treat with the French government.⁴ The three envoys met in Paris October 4, 1797, and on the 8th had an interview with Talleyrand, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. He told them that when he had finished a report on the United States which the Directors had ordered him to make, he would let them know what steps were to follow. Soon after three gentlemen, referred to in the despatches of the American ministers as X, Y, and Z,⁵

¹ *For. Rel.* i. 559, 579.

² Mr. Pickering in his letter recalling Monroe criticised him for not having pressed upon the Directory with promptness and vigor the arguments which Pickering had furnished in explanation of Jay's Treaty. Monroe on his return demanded of Pickering the reasons of his recall. When Pickering gave them, Monroe published a pamphlet entitled *A View of the Conduct of the Executive*, in which he defended his action and criticised the administration. [See further on

this matter the Editorial Notes following the present chapter. — Ed.]

³ Garden, *Hist. Gén. des Traités de Paix*, vi. 118.

⁴ Francis Dana, Chief Justice of Massachusetts, was first appointed, but declined the place, and Gerry was named in his stead. The instructions of the Commissioners are found in *For. Rel.* ii. 156.

⁵ The name of Y is given by Gerry as M. Bellamy, that of Z as M. Hautval. The State Department has that of X. *Ibid.* 211.

began to visit them. These persons, professing to represent in some sense Talleyrand and the Directory, made certain extraordinary propositions. They said that before negotiations could be begun President Adams must apologize for language used in his message to Congress concerning the French government; that the United States must make a loan to France; and that the envoys must give money—they named £50,000 as a proper sum—to members of the Directory as a *douceur*, in other words, as a bribe.¹ After listening for a fortnight to these agents, the American envoys agreed on November 5th “to hold no more indirect intercourse with the government.” They renewed, but in vain, their efforts to begin negotiations with Talleyrand. On January 27, 1798, they addressed to him an elaborate review of the situation between France and the United States, and announced that if there was no hope of soon beginning negotiations they should wish to have their return home facilitated. After holding two unprofitable interviews with him they received a despatch from him, dated March 18, in which he made the remarkable statement that “the Executive Directory is disposed to treat with that one of the three whose opinions, presumed to be more impartial, promised in the course of the explanations more of that reciprocal confidence which is indispensable.”² Pinckney and Marshall at once withdrew from Paris; Gerry remained until July, but declined to enter into formal negotiations which Talleyrand requested him to undertake. Talleyrand disowned connection with the secret agents, but it is certain that they were employed by him.³ Gerry vindicated his course in remaining after his colleagues had gone by his fear of war, which Talleyrand threatened would be declared if he left. However patriotic his motives, his decision has been generally and justly condemned.⁴ The whole procedure of Talleyrand reflects the greatest discredit on him and on the Directory.

On hearing of the treatment the envoys had received, the American people were filled with indignation. Congress passed numerous Acts looking to preparation for war. Washington accepted the position of Lieutenant-General and Commander-in-Chief. The treaties with France were declared abrogated.⁵ The President expressed the general feeling when in his message in June, 1798, he declared: “I will never send another minister to France without assurance that he will be received, respected, and honored as the representative of a great, free, powerful, and independent

¹ The details of the interviews of the envoys with these French agents are given at length in *For. Rel.* ii. 158 *et seq.* See also Garden, vi. 120, who has only words of condemnation for the treatment of the envoys.


² *For. Rel.* ii. 191.

³ See Pickering's Report on the whole transaction, *Ibid.* 229.

⁴ See Austin's *Life of Gerry*, vol. vii. chaps. 7 and 8, for such defence as can be made of his action.

⁵ The constitutional and the international question whether the United States was at war with France in 1799 became important in determining the validity of claims of citizens for damages from French spoliations. The tenor of judicial decisions has been that the nations were not at war, although some engagements took place between the armed vessels of the two governments. See Wharton's *Int. Law Digest*, §§ 248, 333.

nation." But just as the clouds of war were gathering upon the horizon a ray of hope of continued peace broke in upon the country from an unexpected quarter. William Vans Murray, minister at the Hague, was approached by M. Pichon, the secretary of the French legation at that capital, who, doubtless by Talleyrand's direction, disavowed on the part



ELBRIDGE GERRY.*

of the Directory any purpose to make war, and intimated a desire to treat with a suitable envoy, particularly with such a man as Murray. Still later, Pichon was authorized to say that a minister from the United States "would undoubtedly be received with the respect due to the representative of a free, independent, and powerful nation." This was so obviously a response to President Adams's message that he nominated Murray as Minister to France. Afterward he named Chief Justice Ellsworth of Connecticut, and Gov. Davie of North Carolina, as associates with Murray.¹ But Ellsworth

¹ There was strong opposition, even by the Federalists, to the appointment of Murray alone. It was thought by some that after the indignities shown by France, overtures ought not to be accepted from her which did not come more directly and frankly. Washington was inclined to

* [Following an engraving in Austin's *Life of Gerry*, being by Longacre after a drawing by Vanderlyn. There was a large mezzotint engraving issued in 1811. (Copy in Am. Antiq. Soc.) Cf. cut in Gay, *Pop. Hist. U. S.* iv. 135. — Ed.]

and Davie were not to sail until assurances were given by France that they would be properly received. These assurances were given by Talleyrand.

The instructions to the Commission required them to demand indemnity for spoliations of our commerce and to negotiate a treaty.¹ The old treaties were not to be revived, especially the seventeenth and twenty-second Articles of the Treaty of Amity and Commerce of 1778 were not to be inserted in a new treaty unless with the understanding that they were not to derogate from the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth Articles of Jay's Treaty.² A Claims Commission was to be established. There was to be no guaranty of French dominion, and no alliance, no aid, no loan, no consular judicial authority, and the treaty should not be of more than twelve years' duration.

On March 30, 1800, the envoys were presented to the First Consul, and soon entered upon their negotiations. On asking a provision for the settlement, according to the old treaties, of claims for damages inflicted on our commerce prior to July 7, 1798, the date of the abrogation of the treaties by Congress, they were met by the French contention that one party could not alone abrogate a treaty. The French added, however, that they were willing to consider the action of the United States as equivalent to war, and so working an abrogation of the treaties. But in that case, they argued, no indemnity could be claimed. A fresh start could be taken and a new treaty made. The alternative must be the acknowledgment of abrogation and no indemnity, or the continuance of the old treaties and a claim for indemnity. Our ministers decided to take the first horn of the dilemma, to abandon their instructions, to give up their claims for indemnity, and to regard the treaties as abrogated. In the place of indemnity they sought to get rid of the duty of affording asylum exclusively to French privateers and of guaranteeing French possessions in America. The French objected that this would leave the priority or preference of asylum to England. So the negotiations on this line broke down.

The Commission next proposed the negotiation of a temporary convention, which was speedily accomplished. It was very long, consisting of twenty-seven articles, and was very general in its stipulations. The most important features were provisions to avoid abuses in captures (especially the French demand for a *rôle d'équipage*), the recognition of the right of convoy, the placing of France on the most favored nation basis as to asylum for privateers, the acknowledgment of the doctrine of "free ships, free goods," and prohibition of the sequestration of debts. The second article, which held the treaties of 1778 and 1788 in abeyance and promised future

this view. See his letter to Pickering in *Life of Pickering* (by Pickering and Upham), iii. 437. A description of a spirited interview between leading Federalists and President Adams in respect to the appointment of Murray is found in the same volume, p. 439. The President then added the names of Ellsworth and Patrick

Henry. The latter declined on account of old age, and Davie's name was sent in.

¹ *For. Rel.* ii. 306.

² These articles in the two treaties pertained to the admission of prizes to ports, and to the fitting of privateers in ports.

negotiation, was stricken out at the instance of the Senate, and the duration of the treaty was limited to eight years.¹

The vindication of this treaty, like that of Jay's treaty, is to be found mainly in the fact that it delivered the United States from the perils of war. It may also be said that it made it possible to acquire Louisiana by purchase three years later, while if the unhappy difficulties with France had continued much longer, such a piece of good fortune would probably not have been within reach.

It is time for us to trace the early negotiations with Spain. John Jay, who remained long at Madrid during the Revolutionary period, failed even to obtain formal recognition as Minister. The attempt which as Secretary of State he afterward made to negotiate a treaty in Philadelphia with Gardoqui, the Spanish minister, also failed. In 1790 Jefferson, then Secretary of State, instructed Mr. Carmichael, the American chargé at Madrid, to intimate to Spain that the question of the right to navigate the Mississippi must be settled. But this led to no result. In 1791 Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Short, then chargé at Paris, were appointed commissioners to negotiate a treaty with Spain, in which provisions should be made for adjusting boundaries, for recognizing a claim to the right of navigating the Mississippi, and for settling the conditions of commercial intercourse. But Spain, shocked at the execution of Louis XVI, was turning with a friendly spirit towards England. The relations of the American government with England were strained, and nothing was effected by the commissioners. But by 1794 Spain and England had drifted apart, and Jaudenes, the Spanish minister to the United States, intimated to Randolph, the Secretary of State, that Spain would negotiate with a minister of proper dignity and position.

Accordingly, in November, 1794, Thomas Pinkney was transferred from London to Madrid to enter upon negotiations. He reached the Spanish capital at the end of June, 1795. He encountered so many difficulties in his discussions with the Spanish minister, the Prince of Peace, that on October 24th he demanded his passports, that he might return to England. The result was that a treaty was completed in three days.² Its terms were,

¹ The details of these negotiations are found in *For. Rel.* ii. 307 *et seq.* Napoleon in ratifying the convention with the amendment of the Senate, striking out the second article, added this proviso: "that by this retrenchment the two States renounce the respective pretensions which were the object of said article." The Senate accepted this, and ratifications were exchanged. "So died the treaties of 1778, with all the obligations which they imposed, and with them passed from the field of international contention the claims of American citizens for French spoliation," says the Court of Claims, May 17, 1886 (in the case of *William Gray, Administra-*

tor, v. The United States). Among the embarrassing obligations from which the United States were freed was that of guaranteeing the American possessions of France, an obligation which they did not meet when her West India Islands were taken by Great Britain. As the claims of American citizens against France were sacrificed to relieve the country from the obligations laid by the treaty of 1778, it has been long maintained with justice that those claims should be met by their own government.

² The correspondence between Pinkney and the Prince of Peace is found in *For. Rel.* i. 533 *et seq.* The chief difficulties arose from the fact that

on the whole, very favorable to the United States. The southern boundary line between the States and the Spanish territory was the line established by the Treaty of Independence with Great Britain, and a commission was to be appointed to run it. The navigation of the Mississippi was to be free only to Spanish subjects and citizens of the United States, unless Spain should extend the privilege to others by special convention. American citizens were permitted for three years to use New Orleans as a port of deposit and export without paying other duty than a fair rent for stores. This privilege was to be continued either at New Orleans or at some other point on the river. A claims commission was to be established, to sit at Philadelphia. The doctrine of "free ships, free goods," was recognized. Neither naval stores nor provisions were to be deemed contraband. Each state was to restrain the Indians within its borders, and was to refrain from making treaties with Indians beyond its territory.

But the ratification of the treaty by no means terminated the difficulties with Spain. The commissioners could not even make a beginning of running the boundary line. The Spanish governor would not withdraw the troops which were upon American territory until it was decided whether they should destroy their works, whether the property of Spanish residents remaining within American bounds would be safe, whether he could be sure that the Indians would be quiet, and whether there was not danger of a British invasion from Canada. The government of the United States told the Spanish authorities to do as they pleased about destroying their works, offered protection to Spanish residents, and cited the declaration of the British minister that the rumor of an intended invasion was groundless.¹ Spain, in 1797, when engaged in war with England, formally protested against Jay's Treaty. She complained that the placing of naval stores and provisions on the contraband list worked hardship and injustice to her; that the American government undertook to recognize the right of the English to navigate the Mississippi in accordance with the treaty of 1794, notwithstanding its agreement with Spain in 1795 that she alone could grant the privilege of navigation to any nation but the United States; and that by the explanatory article, added by England and the United States to Jay's Treaty in 1796, it had been provided that no stipulation or treaty concluded since then was to derogate from the right to free communication and commerce guaranteed by the third article of Jay's Treaty. The Secretary of State made answer to these complaints in a somewhat prolonged discussion. He also entered complaints of Spanish orders depriving American citizens of the right to store their goods at New Orleans, and filed claims for damages from that cause and from maritime spoliations.²

In August, 1802, Mr. Pinkney succeeded in negotiating a treaty with

Spain did not want to treat of commerce, wanted to limit the use of the Mississippi to Spain and the United States, and wanted the American claims settled on a basis which could not be accepted.

¹ The correspondence on these questions is found in *For. Rel.* ii. 20, 78.

² The papers setting out the position of each country in these controversies are given in *For. Rel.* ii. 440, 469.

Spain, setting up a commission for the settlement of the claims for damages which citizens of the two countries had filed. But provision was not made in it for the payment by Spain of damages inflicted in Spanish ports and waters on American commerce by French cruisers.¹ The Senate on this account was reluctant to approve the treaty, but finally did advise its ratification. Soon afterwards the two countries were involved in discussions concerning the extent of territory ceded to the United States by France in the Louisiana purchase, and the king of Spain withheld his signature from the treaty of 1802. We postpone the study of the negotiations which ensued upon this territorial question until we have considered the history of the Louisiana purchase which led to it.²

By the Treaty of St. Ildefonso, which was signed October 1, 1800, Spain ceded Louisiana to France, in return for the assurance by France that the Duke of Parma, son-in-law of the king of Spain, should be raised to the dignity of a king, and have his territory enlarged by the addition of Tuscany.³ Rumors of the purport of the treaty reached America in the spring of 1801, though its exact terms were not known here till some months later. The excitement which the news was calculated to arouse was greatly increased by a proclamation of the Spanish intendant at New Orleans, issued October 16, 1802, declaring that that place could be no longer used as a place of deposit. Nor did he announce any other place of deposit, although the treaty of the United States with Spain stipulated that one should be designated, if that port should be closed. Congress authorized the President to direct the governors of States to call out 80,000 militia, if needed, and appropriated two millions of dollars to purchase the Island of Orleans and adjacent lands.⁴ Early in January, 1803, the President decided to send James Monroe to France, to be associated with Robert R. Livingston, the minister in that country, as a commission to negotiate for the purchase of New Orleans and the Floridas.⁵ They were instructed, if France were obstinate about selling the territory desired, to open negotiations with the British government, with a view to prevent France from taking possession of Louisiana.⁶

Meantime, Bonaparte, who had been dreaming of building up a powerful French colony in Louisiana, saw the clouds of war gathering on the horizon, and began to consider the expediency of selling the entire province. On April 10th he had a long interview on the subject with M. Marbois, who had been in diplomatic service in this country, and General Berthier, who had

¹ *For. Rel.* ii. 475.

² *For. Rel.* ii. 596 *et seq.* Spain argued that she was not responsible for damages by French cruisers whose American prizes were brought into Spanish ports and then condemned by French consuls, because she was powerless to prevent the action.

³ Garden, *Hist. Gén. des traités de Paix*, viii. 46.

⁴ A motion was made in the Senate to send 50,000 militia and seize New Orleans, and to vote \$15,000,000. But more moderate counsels prevailed. The British and Spanish ministers both tried to induce the intendant to withdraw his proclamation.

⁵ Madison to Livingston, *For. Rel.* ii. 529.

⁶ *Ibid.* 555.

served in the French army in America during the Revolution, and who had negotiated and signed the Treaty of St. Ildefonso. The former warmly urged the cession of Louisiana; the latter as warmly opposed it. On the morning of the 10th, tidings came from London that the Peace of Amiens was ended and war was at hand. Bonaparte at once sent for Marbois, and ordered him to open negotiations immediately with Livingston, without waiting for the arrival of Monroe, whose appointment had been announced to the First Consul. He told Marbois not to accept less than fifty millions of francs for the province. Monroe reached Paris on the 12th of April, and the negotiations went on rapidly.¹

Marbois first fixed the price of the cession at 80,000,000 francs, and asked in addition that the United States should pay the claims due from France to American citizens, reckoned at 20,000,000 francs. The sum finally agreed on was 60,000,000 francs, and a sum not exceeding 20,000,000 francs to meet the claims of Americans.² The treaty made the cession. Two conventions were made: one fixing the amount to be paid and the mode of payment, the other the method of settling the claims due to American citizens. The treaty did not attempt a precise description of the boundaries of the territory ceded. It copied from the Treaty of St. Ildefonso the article which ceded the territory to France, and transferred that territory to the United States.³ An attempt to define the limits with exactness would probably have been unsuccessful. It was thought that there were advantages in describing the extent of the cession in these general terms. When Bonaparte's attention was called to the form of the stipulation, he said, "If it was not somewhat vague already, it would perhaps be politic to make it so."⁴ The treaty gave to the French and the Spaniards exclusive right for twelve years to bring into the ports of Louisiana the products of their countries or colonies on the same terms as Americans; it placed French vessels, after twelve years, on the most favored nation basis, and promised the admission of the French inhabitants to American citizenship at the earliest time practicable, and assured immediate protection of them in the enjoyment of liberty, property, and religion. The treaty and the two conventions were signed on the 30th of April, in less than three weeks after the commission began their work.⁵ It were superfluous to dwell upon

¹ Garden (viii. 56) gives a most interesting account of the interview of Bonaparte with his two counsellors, and of his decision.

² It is interesting to note that Livingston, in a letter, dated April 13th, to the Secretary of State, suggested that if the price necessary to secure the province seemed too great, the territory west of the Mississippi might be sold to some friendly power, and the American government be thus reimbursed. (*For. Rel.* ii. 554.)

³ The cession in the Treaty of St. Ildefonso uses general terms only in defining the territory. It speaks of it as of "the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had

when France possessed it, and such as it should be after the treaties subsequently entered into between Spain and other states." The treaty of 1803 cedes "the said territory, with all its rights and appurtenances, as fully and in the same manner as they have been acquired by the French Republic in virtue of the above-mentioned treaty concluded with His Catholic Majesty."

⁴ Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, viii. 75.

⁵ There was subsequently some unprofitable discussion between the friends of Livingston and those of Monroe concerning the relative credit due to each for the success of this negotiation. Even these two gentlemen allowed themselves

the vast and permanent political and economical consequences to the United States of the purchase of Louisiana.¹

While the negotiation of the Louisiana treaty was proceeding in France, Rufus King, minister to England, and Lord Hawkesbury were completing a convention for determining more accurately the northern boundary between American territory and that of Great Britain. The fifth article provided that the line between the Lake of the Woods and the Mississippi should be the shortest between the two points. But as their convention was signed May 12, 1803, twelve days later than the treaty with France, which gave to the United States the right to all the territory France was entitled to under the Treaty of Utrecht, the Senate feared that the fifth article of the convention with England might work a limitation of our rights under the French treaty, and so dropped it. The British did not agree to this alteration of the convention.²

After the completion of the treaty for the purchase of Louisiana, Monroe repaired to London to assume the duties of minister at the Court of St. James. He was specially charged with the task of securing a treaty which should bind Great Britain to abstain from the search of American vessels, from the impressment of seamen taken from such ships, from the abuses of blockade, and from other wrongs which were suffered at her hands.³

The downfall of the Addington ministry soon after Monroe had opened correspondence with Lord Hawkesbury, the accession of the Pitt ministry with Lord Harrowby in the foreign office, and the absence of Monroe on public business in Spain for several months, made progress impossible for two years. In May, 1806, William Pinkney was united with Monroe in a commission for negotiation with Great Britain. After the death of Pitt, the Fox-Grenville ministry showed so conciliatory a disposition that hopes for reasonable success in the negotiation seemed justified.⁴ But Fox soon became too ill to attend to affairs. Lord Auckland and Lord Holland were appointed commissioners. On December 31, 1806, a treaty, which was far from satisfactory to the American commissioners, was completed.⁵

to write upon the matter. See Livingston to Madison (*For. Rel.* ii. 573), and Monroe MSS, referred to in Gilman's *Monroe*, p. 84; Hunt's *Life of Edward Livingston*, p. 305. They worked with practical harmony during the negotiation, whatever feelings of rivalry, if any, they then cherished.

¹ The prolonged debates on the so-called French spoliation claims of Americans for damages done to their commerce by the French have created a somewhat voluminous literature of Congressional reports, memorials, etc., on the interpretation of the early treaties with France, and especially of the conventions of 1800 and 1803. An excellent summary of the discussions is found in Wharton's *Digest of Int. Law*, ii. 248 *et seq.*, where copious references are given to authorities. The subject has engaged the atten-

tion of many of the ablest statesmen and lawyers down to this day. No better succinct discussion of it can be found than that given in the opinions of the Court of Claims (through Judge John Davis), rendered May 17 and 24, 1886, and Nov. 7, 1887 (*Wm. Gray, Administrator, v. U. S.*, and *Wm. R. Hooper, Ad'r, v. U. S.*).

² *For. Rel.* ii. 584-591. See Monroe's interview with Lord Harrowby on the subject (*Ibid.* iii. 93). The latter objected with spirit to the procedure of ratifying a part of a treaty. Monroe reminded him that such a course in respect to Jay's treaty had proved satisfactory.

³ For project of the treaty drawn by the State Department, and the explanations of Mr. Madison, see *For. Rel.* iii. 82-89.

⁴ *For. Rel.* iii. 113, 116, 117.

⁵ The treaty is given in *For. Rel.* iii. 147.

The fundamental defect of the treaty was that it contained no concession from Great Britain on the important subject of the impressment of seamen. The British were willing to give assurance that impressment should be resorted to only on extraordinary occasions and under certain precautions, but they were fortified by the law officers of the crown in the stubborn



WILLIAM PINKNEY.*

maintenance of the doctrine that merchant vessels on the high seas were not neutral territory in such a sense as to forbid visitation and search by the British navy in the pursuit of British subjects. Finding all attempts to move the British commissioners on this point vain, Monroe and Pinkney reluctantly signed the treaty, which in their opinion had merits rendering it worthy of ratification. But it encountered severe criticism from Mr. Madison, and was so unacceptable to Mr. Jefferson that he did not even send it to the Senate.¹

¹ Madison's criticism may be found in *For. Rel.* iii. 166. Jefferson, in his annual message in 1807, justified his disapprobation of the treaty by saying: "Some of the articles might have been admitted on a principle of compromise, but others were too highly disadvantageous; and no sufficient provision was made against the principal source of the contentions and collisions which were constantly endangering the peace of

the two nations." After his return home, Monroe made an elaborate defence of the action of the commissioners, in a letter to Madison, dated "Richmond, Feb. 28, 1808." It is found in *For. Rel.* iii. 173 *et seq.* It was charged at the time, but doubtless without any ground, that Jefferson and Madison opposed the treaty in order to damage Monroe's prospects for the presidency. Wharton's *Digest of Int. Law*, § 150 *b*, says:

* [From the *National Portrait Gallery* (1839); engraved by E. Wellmore, after a painting by C. B. King. Rembrandt Peale's picture, engraved by A. B. Durand, is in Wheaton's *Pinkney* (1826). — ED.]

The commissioners were instructed to renew efforts to reach a more satisfactory result. Hardly had they begun their conference with Mr. Canning, who had been placed in charge of foreign affairs, when the news of the attack of the British man-of-war "Leopard" on the United States frigate "Chesapeake," near to the American shore, and the capture of some of the latter's seamen, interrupted negotiations. The discussion of the question of reparation for that outrage was soon transferred to Washington, and Mr. Rose was sent out to represent Great Britain in the matter. His instructions forbidding him to offer any reparation until the repeal of the order which our government made immediately after the attack on the "Chesapeake," that our waters should be closed to all British men-of-war, his mission speedily terminated without any result.¹ Canning finally informed Monroe and Pinkney that it was impracticable to open a negotiation on the basis of a treaty which our government had refused to consider. Monroe therefore returned home towards the end of 1807, and left Mr. Pinkney alone to the thankless task of representing his country in fruitless protests against the outrageous Orders in Council, by which Great Britain was harassing American commerce, as France was ruining it by her decrees. Since the British Orders precluded neutrals from trading directly with France or her colonies, or from carrying French goods; and since the French decrees cut off neutrals in the same way from trading with Great Britain or her colonies, and from carrying English goods, the commerce of the United States was driven from the seas.² Congress, in self-defence, passed two notable acts: one (December 22, 1807) placing an embargo on all vessels in American ports, and the other (March 1, 1809), interdicting commercial intercourse with Great Britain and France and their dependencies.³ The relations between the States and the two great belligerent powers of Europe, who were harassing American citizens by an invasion of the rights of neutrals, became strained. All efforts to obtain relief or redress were long in vain. The limits of this narrative forbid a detailed report of the voluminous diplomatic correspondence which took place.⁴ The attempts to secure justice from Great Britain were so unsatisfactory that on June 18, 1812, a bill declaring war with Great Britain was signed by the President, and hostilities soon began.⁵

"Mr. Madison's private correspondence shows how reluctant he was to overrule it [the treaty]. Mr. Jefferson, in his subsequent letters to Mr. Monroe, speaks of his final non-acceptance of the treaty as an act peculiarly painful to himself. No one can study Mr. Monroe's unpublished writings without seeing that the scar remained with him through his whole life."

¹ Reparation was offered and accepted in November, 1811. See *For. Rel.* iii. 499, for the correspondence.

² For the British order, see *For. Rel.* iii. 263-284; for French decrees, see *Ibid.* 284-292.

³ These acts are found in *Statutes at Large*, ii. 451 and 528.

⁴ It can be largely found in *For. Rel.*, iii. The British ministers at Washington during this period were Erskine, Jackson, and Foster.

⁵ President Madison's message of June 1st, though it did not formally recommend war, was written in expectation of it. The report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, reciting the grievances and urging war, was written by Calhoun. It is given in *For. Rel.* iii. 567. The impressment of seamen, the orders in council, and various illegal blockades, are the chief causes dwelt on.

On June 26 the Secretary of State wrote to Jonathan Russell, who since the return of Mr. Pinkney had been left in charge of the legation at London, authorizing him to conclude an armistice with Great Britain, provided the latter would repeal the Orders in Council, abstain from illegal blockades, return impressed American seamen, and abandon the practice of impressment. In case this were done, it was promised that the United States would by law forbid the employment of British seamen on our vessels. The offer thus made through Mr. Russell was declined by Lord Castlereagh.¹

In March, 1813, the Emperor of Russia offered his services as mediator, and the United States accepted the offer.² John Quincy Adams, then minister at St. Petersburg, Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, and James A. Bayard, were appointed commissioners. Their instructions, which were somewhat prolix, named the stipulation against impressments as the chief object to be sought in negotiation.³ Two methods were suggested for adjusting the difficulty. The first consisted in imposing restraints on the naturalization of the seamen of one country by the other, and in excluding from service on vessels all others not naturalized. The second proposed to prohibit the naturalization of seamen, and to exclude from the service of each country all the natives of the other. Either method would be accepted by the United States. The commissioners were to seek to obtain a better definition of neutral rights, and especially of blockade, and to ask for indemnity for our losses by illegal seizure. The American requests on these points were not, however, to be made indispensable conditions of peace. Assurance might be given that the non-importation act would be repealed by Congress in case of peace.

Gallatin and Bayard sailed on May 9, 1813, for St. Petersburg. On their way they touched at Gottenburg. From that place Gallatin wrote to Alexander Baring, asking him in effect to acquaint the British government with the purpose of the mission. Gallatin and the President had supposed that Great Britain would willingly accept the mediation of Russia. But Mr. Baring's reply to Gallatin's letter speedily undeceived that envoy. It informed him that the services of Russia had been declined by the British government, but also assured him that an offer would be made to treat directly, either at London or Gottenburg, and that there was in England a strong desire for peace. Though the commissioners were cordially received at St. Petersburg, they could, of course, in these circumstances, accomplish nothing there. While they were at the Russian capital, Gallatin learned that the Senate had refused to confirm his appointment. They objected to his holding at the same time the office of commissioner and that of Secretary of the Treasury. Castlereagh having offered, on November 4, 1814, to open direct negotiations, the President accepted

¹ See correspondence, *For. Rel.* iii. 585 *et seq.*

² The Emperor probably desired to relieve England of the burden of war in America, so

that her whole strength might be employed in opposing Napoleon.

³ *For. Rel.* iii. 695.

the offer, and added Henry Clay and Jonathan Russell, and subsequently Mr. Gallatin, to the commission. They were to meet the British commissioners at Gottenburg. Bayard and Gallatin had left St. Petersburg on January 25th, and travelled to Amsterdam, and in April they arrived in London. Soon after, they heard of the arrival of Clay and Russell at Gottenburg. Meanwhile, the abdication of Napoleon had produced a state of feeling in England far less auspicious for the success of the American commission. They saw the desirableness of transferring the negotiations to some place where the influence of Continental friends might be felt more strongly than it would be at so secluded a city as Gottenburg. In May, Lord Bathurst proposed Ghent as the place for the negotiations, and this was agreed to. Bayard and Gallatin had, on the fall of Napoleon, promptly reported to Monroe the state of public opinion in England, and had intimated clearly that if the renunciation by Great Britain of the right of impressment was the condition of peace, then peace could not be secured. Consequently, notwithstanding the stress which Monroe and Madison had laid on obtaining such renunciation, they found themselves constrained to yield; and on June 27th, Monroe wrote to the commissioners as follows: "On mature consideration it has been decided that, under all the circumstances alluded to, incident to a prosecution of the war, you may omit any stipulation on the subject of impressment, if found indispensably necessary to terminate it." ¹

The British commissioners were Lord Gambier, a vice-admiral, Henry Goulburn, a secretary in the colonial department, and William Adams, an admiralty lawyer. They reached Ghent on August 6th, and the negotiations began on the 8th. The British commissioners were men of moderate ability, somewhat overbearing in manner, and entrusted by their government with almost no liberty of acting according to their own discretion. They were obliged to send home so constantly for instructions on every phase of the discussions that they seemed to play the part of clerks rather than of negotiators. The American commission contained much more talent than the British. Its case was presented with much more skill than that of Great Britain. But it was somewhat embarrassed by the difficulty of communicating with Washington, by the quick and fervid temper of Adams and Clay, and by those differences of opinion which generally manifest themselves in a commission composed of so many men.

The British commissioners announced at the outset, that they were instructed to treat: (1) Of the question of impressment of seamen; (2) of the pacification of the Indians, and the assignment to them of a definite

¹ *For. Rel.* iii. 704. These statements are added: "You will of course not recur to this expedient until all your efforts to adjust the controversy in a more satisfactory manner have failed. As it is not the intention of the United States, in suffering the treaty to be silent on the subject of impressment, to admit the British claim thereon, or to relinquish that of the United

States, it is highly important that any such inference be entirely excluded, by a declaration or protest, in some form or other, that the mission is not to have any such effect or tendency. Any modification of the practice to prevent abuses, being an acknowledgment of the right, is utterly inadmissible."

territory within the American domain ; (3) of the revision of the boundary line between the United States and the British colonies ; and (4) of the fisheries. They intimated that they had no special desire to discuss the first point. In respect to the second they made the astounding demand that the American government should not only fix the boundaries of the Indian domain, but should pledge itself not to deprive the Indians of it by purchase or otherwise, and declared that this concession was the *sine qua non* of a treaty. They disclaimed any intention, in fixing the boundary between the United States and the colonies, of gaining any new territory. The privileges enjoyed by Americans, under the treaty of independence, of fishing in British waters, they held, were lost by the war, and would be renewed only for an equivalent.

The American commissioners announced that they were instructed to consider the first and third points named by the British, and also to consider the subject of a definition of blockade, and, as far as might be agreed, of other neutral and belligerent rights, and to present claims for indemnities in certain cases of capture and seizure ; but they were not instructed to consider the subjects of Indian pacification and boundary and of fisheries, as these had not been the grounds of any controversy between the two countries, and had not been mentioned by Lord Castlereagh in his letter proposing the negotiation.¹

It soon appeared that in addition to the surprising request concerning the Indian domain, the British commissioners were directed to ask that the American naval force should be wholly removed from the Lakes, and that no fortifications should be erected by the United States on its shores of the Lakes, and that the territory in Maine lying between New Brunswick and Quebec should be ceded, to become a part of Canada. The American commissioners promptly replied that it was not necessary to refer such demands to their government for instructions. "They will only be a fit subject of deliberation," they said, "when it becomes necessary to decide upon the expediency of an absolute surrender of national independence."² There seemed at this stage of the negotiations no prospect of any result.³

Castlereagh, passing through Ghent, saw that his government had pitched its demands too high, and advised the modification of them. It was clear that if the negotiations were closed then, the Americans could not but be more strongly united in the prosecution of the war. Under instructions from Bathurst, the British commissioners announced, on September 19th, that they did not regard the exclusive military possession of the lakes as a *sine qua non*, but they still adhered to their demand on the Indian affairs.⁴ At the suggestion of Gallatin, who with some of his colleagues thought it not expedient to break off the negotiations avowedly on the Indian matter, even if it were decided to break them off, the American

¹ *For. Rel.* iii. 705.

² *Ibid.* 713.

³ Aug. 20, Mr. Gallatin wrote to Mr. Dallas :

"Our negotiations may be considered as at an end." Adams's *Gallatin*, 524.

⁴ *For. Rel.* iii. 718.

commissioners, while refusing to have the Indian tribes considered in any sense independent nations, offered, on September 26th, to provide that the Indians, being peaceable, should have all the rights, privileges, and possessions which they had at the commencement of the war.¹ The testy Mr. Goulburn wrote home that he considered this a rejection of the British demand. But his government, more sensible, recognized the advance of the Americans, and forwarded a proposition in harmony with their offer. With some reluctance, especially on the part of Mr. Adams, who was not unjustly offended at the language of the despatch, this was accepted by the Americans.² The first great obstacle being thus removed, the Americans asked the British to present a project of a treaty, promising to submit immediately after a counter-project. The British wished to treat concerning the boundaries on the basis of *uti possidetis*, but the Americans declined.³ The British government were disappointed and irritated, and at first thought the war must continue. They considered the advisability of sending Wellington to America to conduct the campaign. He gave them sound advice. He told them that their success in the war was not such as to justify their claim to American territory. Lord Liverpool and Mr. Vansittart, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, both saw that the treasury could ill afford to prolong the war. The condition of affairs at Vienna and in the interior of France, and the state of British finances, finally decided the government to try to end the conflict.

Meanwhile, the American commissioners, ignorant of this discussion among the British statesmen, were hard at work on their project of a treaty. Mr. Adams drafted the articles on impressment, blockade, and indemnities, and Mr. Gallatin those on the boundaries and the fisheries. A sharp difference of opinion soon appeared between Mr. Clay on one side and Mr. Gallatin and Mr. Adams on the other, in respect to an article drawn by Mr. Gallatin, and proposing to recognize the continuance of the right of the Americans to the fisheries and of the right of the British to the navigation of the Mississippi, as they were asserted in the treaty of 1783. Bayard voted with Gallatin and Adams on the adoption of the article, and Russell with Clay. The latter declared he would not sign the note communicating the article. The next day a suggestion of Clay was adopted, that the article be omitted, and a paragraph be inserted in the note, saying that they were not authorized to bring into the discussion any of the rights or liberties which the United States had enjoyed concerning the fisheries. This did, of course, recognize the right of the British to the navigation of the Mississippi as clearly as that of the Americans to the fisheries. The commissioners expressly declared their willingness to place the two coun-

¹ *For. Rel.* iii. 720.

² *Ibid.* 723.

³ Adams, in his *Life of Gallatin*, pp. 535-6, shows from the Castlereagh correspondence that Earl Bathurst's plan was, if the Americans should assent to the basis of *uti possidetis*, to give

to the United States Castine and Machias, then held by the British, and claim Michilimackinaw, Post Niagara with five miles circuit, and the northern angle of Maine. Of this, however, the Americans knew nothing. *Ibid.* pp. 539-40.

tries in all respects in the same state they were in at the commencement of the war.¹

The British commissioners at once pronounced inadmissible the articles on impressment, blockade, and indemnities, the article pledging each nation not to employ Indians in war, and the article exempting from prosecution persons in the dominion of one of the belligerents who had taken part with the other party in the war. But they abandoned the Indian boundary, the exclusive military possession of the lakes, and the claim of *uti possidetis*. A clause which they inserted, giving England the free navigation of the Mississippi, but saying nothing of the fisheries, led to prolonged discussions between the two commissions, and between the members of the American commission. The result of the debates was that all reference to the navigation of the Mississippi and to the fisheries was omitted from the treaty.² Under all the circumstances, it seems a just conclusion that Adams's view that the treaty of 1783 remained in force was thus sustained. Provision was made for commissions to determine to whom the islands in and near Passamaquoddy Bay belonged, and to fix and mark the boundary from the river St. Croix to the St. Lawrence, following in part the 45th parallel, and the boundary from the St. Lawrence at the 45th parallel to the northwestern point of the Lake of the Woods. Both parties stipulated to use their best efforts to suppress the slave-trade. Hostilities were to cease as soon as the treaty should be ratified, captured territory was to be restored, prisoners were to be exchanged, neither public nor private property was to be carried off, and dates were fixed beyond which captures at sea should not be valid.

Though not a single one of the objects for which the United States avowedly went to war was secured by the treaty, though the impressment of seamen and neutral rights were not so much as named, the return of peace was hailed with general joy in America, and the commissioners, somewhat to their own surprise, were warmly commended. The war was a heavy burden; in New England it was very unpopular; in comparison with the enormous demands of Great Britain at the opening of the negotiations, the stipulations of the treaty were extremely favorable; and the victory of New Orleans, which was won after the treaty was signed, had made for the Americans a glorious close to the war. The President, in communicating the treaty, declared that it "terminates with peculiar felicity a campaign signalized by the most brilliant successes."

In England the British commissioners and the government were severely criticised by the war party, who wished to humble the United States. But

¹ Clay thought this proposition ridiculous. He had also the idea that the acquisition of Louisiana impaired the right of the British to navigate the Mississippi. Gallatin inclined to the opinion that the war had abrogated the American right to the fisheries and the British right to navigate the Mississippi as secured by the treaty of 1783. *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, iii. 62-69.

² For detailed narrative of the discussions on this point, see *Memoirs of J. Q. Adams*, iii. 79-120. The Americans offered to insert clauses confirming the British right to navigate the river and the American right to the fisheries, or to omit mention of both. The British proposed to accept the latter alternative, but to provide for future negotiation. This the Americans refused to assent to.

Castlereagh, Liverpool, and Wellington were rejoiced to be well out of the war. No one can read the negotiations in detail, and recall the disadvantageous circumstances in which the American commissioners undertook their task, without recognizing the signal ability with which they brought it to a successful issue.

With Adams, who was appointed minister to England in February, 1815, Clay and Gallatin were associated for the purpose of negotiating a commercial treaty with Great Britain. The British commissioners were Charles Frederic Robinson, vice-president of the Board of Trade, afterwards Lord Goderich and Earl Ripon, and Mr. Goulburn and Dr. Adams. The negotiations began in May and continued till July. The British refused to take any action on the subjects of impressment and blockade and trade with enemies' colonies in war. Nor was any satisfactory arrangement about the West India and Canada trade found practicable. Reciprocal liberty of commerce between the United States and British territories in Europe was assured. An important stipulation, then made for the first time, but inserted in many treaties since, was agreed to, abolishing discriminating duties and charges. Direct trade with the East Indies was also continued. The convention was made for four years.¹ It was understood that the subjects not disposed of in this convention might be taken up at some later period.

Hardly were the ratifications exchanged when discussions upon various unsettled questions began, especially concerning the failure of Great Britain to return or pay for the slaves that her soldiers had taken away in contravention, as was claimed, of the Treaty of Ghent, and concerning the interference of British cruisers with our fishermen, who, they claimed, had no right to ply their industry within three miles of the coasts of the British colonies. John Quincy Adams, then minister at the Court of St. James, and Earl Bathurst were soon engaged in an elaborate discussion of the fishery question.² The former argued, with great ability, that the treaty of 1783 was in the nature of the case perpetual, including the grant to the British of the privilege of the navigation of the Mississippi and the recognition of the continuance of American fishermen in the enjoyment of the right previously had of fishing on the coasts of the British colonies. He reminded the Englishman that at Ghent the commissioners of the United States had offered to insert again the stipulations of 1783 on both these points, or to omit them both, since they held that they had not been abrogated by the war; but that they had refused the British proposition to negotiate at some

¹ The details of the negotiation are found in *For. Rel.* iv. 8 *et seq.*, and in *Memoirs of J. Q. Adams*, iii. 208 *et seq.* Mr. Gallatin, in a letter to Monroe (*Writings*, i. 665), expressed the opinion that the valuable part of the convention was that abolishing discriminating duties, "a policy which, removing some grounds of irritation, and preventing in that respect a species of commercial warfare, may have a tendency to lay the

foundation of a better understanding between the two nations on other points." J. Q. Adams successfully insisted, at the cost of some sharp words with Gallatin, that "the alternate" system should be followed in this convention in mentioning the contracting parties in the body of the treaty and in the order of signatures. The United States have since then insisted on it.

² *For. Rel.* iv. 349-355.

future time for equivalents of them. Bathurst pressed with energy the fact that the treaty of 1783 recognized the American *right* to fish on the Banks of Newfoundland, that is, on the high seas, but granted only the *liberty* to dry and cure fish in certain places, since that was a privilege bestowed by Great Britain. This *liberty*, he argued, was revoked by the war. To this Adams made elaborate reply to prove that, in the circumstances, the terms *right* and *liberty* were practically synonymous. But argument did not bring the disputants to any common ground.

The attempt to settle the difficulty was entrusted to Bagot, the British minister at Washington. He was authorized to offer the liberty of in-shore fishing from Mount Joli in the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Bay and Isles Esquimaux along the southern coast of Labrador, or a stretch on the south shore of Newfoundland, and finally to offer them both. All these offers were declined by Mr. Monroe, the Secretary of State, after conference with the New England fishermen.

Mr. Adams, meantime, had vainly attempted to induce Lord Castlereagh to treat on blockade or contraband, but had received from him an assurance of willingness to make slight concessions in the West India trade, and to consider the regulation of intercourse by land between the United States and their colonial neighbors on the north, and also to take up the vexed question of impressment. In view of British prohibition of American trade with the West Indies, Congress, in April, 1818, resorted to retaliatory legislation.

On April 28, 1817, an arrangement for regulating the naval force of the United States and Great Britain on the lakes was concluded by Richard Rush, Acting Secretary of State, and Mr. Bagot, the British minister. It was approved by the Senate April 16, 1818, and proclaimed by the President April 28th. Each power was permitted to keep on Lake Ontario one vessel, on the Upper Lakes two vessels, and on Lake Champlain one vessel. These vessels were not to be larger than one hundred tons burden, and were to be armed each with one eighteen-pound cannon.

Mr. Adams was called home in 1817 to take the office of Secretary of State in the cabinet of Monroe, and was succeeded at London by Richard Rush. The new administration decided in May, 1818, to appoint Mr. Rush and Mr. Gallatin, then minister to France, commissioners to negotiate a treaty of amity and commerce with Great Britain, if the latter power should be willing to join in the effort to adjust some of our difficulties with her. The British government assented to the proposition, and appointed again Robinson and Goulburn.

According to their instructions, Mr. Rush and Mr. Gallatin were charged to express a willingness to extend the treaty of 1815 eight or ten years, and were to ask for a relaxation of the restrictions on trade with the British colonies, the settlement of the question concerning the slaves carried away at the end of the war, the determination of the boundary line by fixing it on the 49th parallel, the recognition of the title to the settlement

at the mouth of the Columbia River, and the adjustment of the fishery difficulty.¹ On this last point a large concession — surprising to one who has followed the former arguments of the Adamses, father and son — was authorized. “The President authorizes you to agree to an article whereby the United States will desist from the liberty of fishing and curing and drying fish within the British jurisdiction *generally*, upon condition that it shall be secured as a permanent right, not liable to be impaired by any future war, from Cape Ray to the Ramea Islands, and from Mount Joli on the Labrador coast through the Strait of Belleisle indefinitely north, along the coast; the right to extend as well to curing and drying the fish as to fishing.”²

The commissioners were not to touch the subjects of blockade, or contraband, or impressment, unless the English should wish it.

Mr. Gallatin reached London August 16th, and the negotiations were begun at once. Lord Castlereagh showed, in his interviews with Rush and Gallatin, that he was decidedly in advance of public opinion in England in respect to relaxing trade regulations and to modifying the English contention on impressment. Could he have remained at home, it is possible the treaty might have proved more favorable to the United States, but he was called away on September 1st to the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle. Still the negotiations proceeded with dispatch, and were completed on the 19th of October.

Upon the fisheries the Americans obtained somewhat better terms than their instructions authorized them to accept. They justly say: “We succeeded in securing, besides the rights of taking and curing fish within the limits designated by our instructions as a *sine qua non*, the liberty of fishing on the coasts of the Magdalen Islands and of the western coast of Newfoundland, and the privilege of entering for shelter, wood, and water in all the British harbors of North America.” These rights were also secured “forever,” in spite of the earnest objection of the British to the introduction of that expression. But for their insisting on that, Gallatin says, they might have gained access to a longer line of coast. They also laid stress on their formally renouncing the right to the fisheries they relinquished. They sought thereby to prevent any implication that the fisheries secured were a new grant, and to incorporate in the treaty the statement that the renunciation extended only three miles from the coasts. As they understood that in their time most of the fishing on the coast of Nova Scotia

¹ *For. Rel.* iv. 375.

² The following passage from Mr. Adams's journal (*Memoirs*, iv. 96), dated May 15, 1818, two months and a half before the instructions were written, indicates that the President or the cabinet decided on this concession, contrary to the views of the Secretary. In describing a conversation with the British minister, Mr. Bagot, Mr. Adams reports his own words thus: “It [the proposal] was founded on the principle of assuming a range of coast within given latitudes for our fishermen to frequent, and abandoning

the right to fish for the rest. . . . For my own part, I had always been averse to any proposal of accommodation. I thought our whole right, as stipulated by the treaty of 1783, so clear that I was for maintaining the whole; and if force should be applied to prevent our fishermen from frequenting the coast, I would have protested against it, and reserved the right of recovering the whole by force whenever we should be able. It had, however, been otherwise determined here, and a proposal had been premised.”

was off-shore and that on the coast of Labrador was in-shore, they hoped they had retained a large part of our ancient rights and liberties of fishing.

The 49th parallel was secured as the boundary from the Lake of the Woods to the Stony (now called the Rocky) Mountains. The urgent request of the British for an article securing British access to the Mississippi from the north and the right to its navigation was successfully resisted.

The British intimated that the Columbia River would be a proper boundary beyond the Rocky Mountains, and demanded the harbor at the mouth. The American commissioners, without asserting that our right was perfect, maintained that our claim was good as against Great Britain, because the Treaty of Utrecht had fixed the 49th parallel as the line between the British possessions and Louisiana, now a part of our territory. It was finally agreed that the country on the northwest coast claimed by either party should without prejudice to the claims of either be left open for ten years, for the purpose of trade to the inhabitants of both countries.¹

The question of indemnity for the slaves taken away by the British, it was agreed, should be left to some friendly sovereign.

In respect to commercial intercourse, it was decided to extend the convention of 1815 for ten years. The American commissioners agreed to refer to their government, but declined to adopt, an article proposed by the British, granting a considerable extension of commercial privileges with the West India islands, but still forbidding Americans to carry salted provisions there, and leaving the British free to impose higher duties on articles carried thither from the United States than on those sent from the British dominions.

An article presented by the British on the impressment of seamen, and one presented by the Americans on blockade, contraband, and certain other maritime matters, failed of adoption in the conferences.²

The treaty, though it improved in some respects the condition of the American relations with Great Britain, was only a qualified success. The rights of fishery which were enjoyed by the United States on the British colonial coasts under the treaty of 1783 were materially curtailed, and the stipulation has proved a fruitful source of controversy down to our day. Mr. Gallatin wrote to Mr. Adams, expressing regret at the concessions he felt called to make.³ The disposition of the questions concerning the boun-

¹ [See further on this subject in the appendix of the present volume.—ED.]

² *For. Rel.* iv. 380 *et seq.*

³ "I will not conceal," wrote Gallatin, "that the subject caused me more anxiety than any other branch of the negotiations, and that, after having participated in the Treaty of Ghent, it was a matter of regret to be obliged to sign an agreement which left the United States in any respect in a worse situation than before the war. . . . But . . . if a compromise was to take place, the present time and the terms proposed ap-

peared more eligible than the chance of future contingencies. . . . With much reluctance I yielded to those considerations, rendered more powerful by our critical situation with Spain, and used my best endeavors to make the compromise on the most advantageous terms that could be obtained." (Cited in Adams's *Gallatin*, 572.) But the Nova Scotians were greatly distressed by the treaty. A report to the House of Assembly presents a most gloomy picture of the anticipated consequences. See Gesner's *New Brunswick* (London, 1847), 269.

dary, the northwestern coast, and the indemnity for the slaves was favorable to the United States. The discussions on impressment and commercial intercourse showed more liberal sentiments on the part of the English government than had before been evinced. Mr. Robinson made little effort to defend on principle the restrictions on our trade with the colonies, but argued that so great changes as were asked could not be suddenly made. Mr. Rush had the impression that the effort to reach an adjustment of the impressment difficulty would not have failed if Lord Castlereagh had been at home.¹

Various unsuccessful efforts were made to effect, through reciprocal legislation by Parliament and Congress and by diplomacy, some enlargement of commercial privileges in the British colonial possessions. By the convention of August 6, 1827, the provisions of the convention of 1815, which had been extended for ten years by the convention of 1818, were indefinitely continued.² But in 1829 Mr. McLane, the minister to Great Britain, found encouragement to renew negotiations, which resulted in securing a freer commercial intercourse. By a British Order in Council of November 5, 1830, and a proclamation of President Jackson of October 5, 1830 (authorized by an act of Congress of May 29, 1830), vessels of the United States were permitted to carry into all British possessions goods the produce of the United States, and to transport goods from the British possessions to any foreign country whatever; and British vessels and their cargoes, being the products of Great Britain or of British possessions in North or South America, were admitted to entry into the ports of the United States, and were allowed to clear for the colonial ports with such articles as vessels of the United States were allowed to carry; but if coming from the colonies, they were permitted to clear only for other ports than those in the colonial possessions.

By the tenth article of the Treaty of Ghent, the high contracting parties agreed to use their best endeavors to abolish the slave-trade. In February, 1818, Lord Castlereagh directed the attention of Mr. Rush to the treaties Great Britain had already formed with Portugal and Spain for the suppression of the slave-trade, and expressed the hope that the United States would co-operate with his government in this work. A correspondence on the subject continued for nearly two years. John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, found it impracticable to effect co-operation with Great Britain, because the British plan proposed mixed tribunals for trying slave-traders, and subjected American vessels to visit and search by British cruisers.³ In 1824 the subject was again taken up, and a convention was signed on March 13th of that year, by Mr. Rush on the part of the United States, and by William Huskisson, then a member of the cabinet, and Stratford Canning, British minister to the United States.⁴ The Senate

¹ Rush's *Memoranda of a Residence at the Court of London*, 409.

² *For. Rel.* vi. 678-688.

³ *For. Rel.* v. 69, 111.

⁴ See Convention and accompanying papers, *Ibid.* 315 *et seq.*

made amendments to the convention before they ratified it. They objected to a clause which gave the British men-of-war the right to cruise on the coast "of America" as well as on the coast of Africa and of the West Indies. The British government refused to ratify it with those words omitted.¹

It was not until the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, signed August 9, 1842, by Daniel Webster and Lord Ashburton, that the two powers joined in common action for putting an end to the slave-trade. By the eighth article of that treaty each party pledged itself to maintain a naval force on the coast of Africa. The two squadrons were to be independent of each other, but were to receive such orders from their respective governments as would enable them to co-operate effectively.²

That treaty also settled what was known as the Northeast Boundary Question, and made provision for more specific designation than had previously been made of the boundary line from the upper part of Lake Huron to the Rocky Mountains.³

The tenth article provided for the extradition of persons charged with the crime of murder, or assault with intent to commit murder, or piracy, or arson, or robbery, or forgery, or the utterance of forged paper.⁴ This article was to be terminated whenever either party desired. The article on suppressing the slave-trade was to remain in force five years, but was after that period terminable at the will of either party.

Mr. Webster had hoped that Great Britain, while joining with us, under the treaty of 1842, in efforts to put an end to the African slave traffic, would not attempt to exercise again, as she had done for so many years, in the face of our earnest protests, what she called the right of visit and search of vessels carrying the American flag. American Secretaries of State and ministers to England had never ceased to deny in the most emphatic terms that there was any such right.⁵ As British cruisers in earlier days often searched American vessels to take out of them British seamen, so now they claimed that it was necessary to go so far, at least, as to visit vessels carrying the American flag, to determine whether they were slavers. The British government attempted to set up a distinction between visit and search of a vessel. Disclaiming any purpose to search vessels bearing the American flag, the British claimed that it was their right to visit them and ascertain whether they had a right to carry our flag. This claim was consistently and constantly denied by the government of the United States, and in 1858 it was abandoned by Great Britain.⁶

¹ Both nations had meantime passed laws declaring, respectively, the slave-trade by their citizens piracy.

² France, in her treaty of May 29, 1845, with Great Britain, insisted on an arrangement like the American plan for co-operative action against the slave-trade.

³ [This part of the treaty is enlarged upon in the appendix of the present volume. — E.D.]

⁴ "I may now state, I suppose without offence and without cavil, that since the negotiation of this treaty, containing this article, we have nego-

tiated treaties with other governments of Europe containing similar provisions, and that between other governments of Europe themselves treaties have been negotiated containing that provision, — a provision never before known to have existed in any of the treaties between European nations." (Webster's speech, in *Works*, v. 142.)

⁵ The American diplomatic correspondence so teems with despatches on this subject that special references seem superfluous.

⁶ For the announcement of this change of attitude by the British government, see President

We resume the sketch of our diplomatic relations with France. We have spoken of the injury caused to American commerce by the British

Buchanan's second annual message, 1858. For copious extracts from the correspondence of the State Department on this subject, see Wharton's *Int. Law Digest*, § 327. See also Lawrence on the *Right of Visitation and Search*, and Wheaton's *Inquiry into the Validity of the British claim to the right of Visitation and Search, &c.*

During Lord Ashburton's visit, Mr. Webster corresponded with him on three other subjects of international interest. Brief reference to them should perhaps here be made:—

1. The case of the steamboat "Caroline" and of McLeod. In December, 1837, during the Canadian rebellion, some of the insurgents used a steamboat called the "Caroline" for hostile acts in Niagara River. Therefore a force of Canadians came over to Schlosser, in the territory of the United States, and seized her and destroyed her. In the capture an American citizen was shot and killed. When inquiry was made by the American government of the British minister at Washington concerning this invasion of its territory in time of peace, he replied that the British government assumed the responsibility for the act, and justified it as an act of self-defence. The American minister at London, in an official note to Lord Palmerston, pronounced the transaction an outrage upon the United States and a violation of United States territory. But the matter rested until November, 1840, when one McLeod, who came from Canada into the State of New York, boasted of having participated in the expedition against the "Caroline," and was arrested by the authorities of New York and charged with murder. The British minister demanded his release. No settlement was reached under Van Buren's administration, which ended March 4, 1841. The British request was promptly renewed to the Harrison administration, with the statement that McLeod's case could not properly be passed on by the state court of New York, but must be treated as an international question.


McLeod, after his arrest, was brought before the supreme court of New York by writ of *habeas corpus*, and his discharge was asked on the ground that, whatever he had done in the expedition against the "Caroline" he had done under orders of his government. The court refused to discharge him. He was tried and acquitted. But the Harrison administration thought that he could not be lawfully held to answer in the courts of New York for his offence, though the President had no power to arrest the proceedings in those courts. The Attorney-General of the United States was sent to attend the trial, and to see that the prisoner had skilful counsel. He was instructed that if the indictment were

pending in one of the courts of the United States, the President would direct a *nolle prosequi* to be entered. The case is reported in Wendell, xxv. 483. A review of the decision by Judge Tallmadge is found in Wendell, xxvi. 663, App. Calhoun, in the Senate, opposed the positions taken by our government, maintaining that the attack on the "Caroline" was not justified by necessity, and that persons concerned in the enterprise were responsible to the State of New York (Calhoun's *Works*, iii. 618). Congress passed an act, August 29, 1842, by which cases like this of McLeod can be reached by the Federal courts (*U. S. Revised Statutes*, §§ 752-754).

In Mr. Webster's correspondence with Lord Ashburton, the former maintained that, to justify such an act as the seizure and destruction of the "Caroline," the British government must show "a necessity of self-defence, instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation," and that in accomplishing their end their agents "did nothing unreasonable or excessive." Ashburton accepted Webster's statement of principles as correct, maintained that the act was performed under such conditions, and expressed regret that explanation and apology for the occurrence was not immediately made." This declaration was accepted by Webster as satisfactory (Webster's *Works*, vi. 292-303).

2. The case of the "Creole." In 1841 a Virginia planter sailed from Richmond, Va., on the "Creole," with a hundred and twenty-five slaves on board, for New Orleans. While at sea the slaves killed the captain, gained possession of the vessel, and carried her into Nassau. The local authorities arrested nineteen of the slaves, and allowed the rest to go free. We had no extradition treaty with Great Britain. Mr. Webster maintained that the officers of the vessel, which was taken into the British port against their will, should have received all proper assistance in resuming their authority and continuing their voyage, and should have been protected from all interference with the character and condition of persons or things on board. As slavery did not exist in Nassau, the question was raised whether slaves reaching port under the above conditions were made free by coming into British waters. According to Mr. Webster's argument, they were not. Lord Ashburton was not empowered to consider the questions raised by Mr. Webster. The claim for damages in the case of the "Creole" came before the joint commission which sat in London under the convention of 1853. The commissioners being unable to agree, the claim was referred to Joshua Bates as umpire,

Orders in Council and the decrees of the Emperor Napoleon in the early years of this century. In 1819, a stable government having been set up in France, the United States began to press for the payment of the claims



EDWARD EVERETT.*

of their merchants whose vessels and cargoes had been seized unlawfully by the Emperor.¹ France, on the other hand, claimed damages for alleged violations of the eighth article of the treaty of 1803. That article provided

who sustained the American position, and awarded damages to the claimant (*Webster's Works*, vi. 303-318; Lawrence's *Wheaton*, 206, note 70, containing summary of an article by Wheaton in *Rev. Etr. et Fr.*, tom. ix. p. 345. Dana, in note 62, p. 165, of his edition of *Wheaton*, criticises Bates's findings).

3. Impressment. Lord Ashburton was not prepared to treat on this subject. But Mr. Web-

ster, in his speech on the Treaty of Washington, said that the correspondence did not leave the question where it found it, but that his declaration, that "in every regularly documented American merchant-vessel the crew who navigate it will find their protection in the flag which is over them," will stand (*Webster's Works*, v. 145-6).

¹ *For. Rel.* v. 17-21.

* [After a photograph taken 1861, constituting one of a group of the living presidents of Harvard College. He was United States minister in England, 1841-1845. — ED.]

that the ships of France should be "treated upon the footing of the most favored nation" in the ports of the Louisiana purchase. By a reciprocal compact, British vessels were admitted into American ports and American vessels into the ports of England on equal terms. British vessels thus entered Louisiana ports on more favorable terms than the French. It was contended by France that the treaty of 1803 compelled the United States to admit French vessels to those ports on the same terms as the British, and that such a course was not followed. The American government contended that, inasmuch as Great Britain paid a price, and so gave a special equivalent for the admission of her vessels to such ports by the admission of American vessels to hers without any discrimination against the United States, the treaty with France was not violated. France could gain the same privilege as the British enjoyed, on the same conditions. M. de Neuville, the French minister at Washington, and John Quincy Adams discussed the question at great length.¹ They reached no agreement on the matter, and made no arrangement for settling claims. But on June 24, 1822, they signed a treaty, which fixed a discriminating duty of twenty francs on each ton of merchandise, the produce of the United States, imported into France in United States vessels, and a discriminating duty of three dollars and seventy-five cents on each ton of merchandise, the produce of France, imported into this country in French vessels.²

At last, by the treaty of July 4, 1831, the question of claims and that of the interpretation of the eighth article of the treaty of 1803 were settled. France agreed to give twenty-five millions of francs in full payment of claims of our citizens; the United States agreed to pay a million and a half of francs to satisfy certain claims of French citizens and of the French government; the duty on French wines imported into the United States was to be reduced; the duty on our long staple cotton imported into France was to be the same as on our short staple cotton; and the French government abandoned its old claims under the eighth article of the treaty of cession of Louisiana.³

Congress promptly passed the acts requisite to carry the treaty into effect. But the French Chamber of Deputies, on April 18, 1834, declined to make the needed appropriations. The President, Andrew Jackson, in his message in the following December, announced that further negotiation on the subject was out of the question. In February, 1836, he directed Mr. Livingston to leave France. After a spirited debate in the House of Representatives, it was voted that the treaty should be maintained, and that preparations should be made for any exigency which might

¹ *For. Rel.* v. 152, 476, 640. The correspondence covers a period of several years. Gallatin exhaustively argued the question in France.

² This was a large reduction, nearly one half, of discriminating duties levied by the two nations on each other's commerce.

³ This treaty was signed by William C. Rives, then minister to France, and Horace Sebastiani,

the French Foreign Secretary. The limitation put upon "the favored nation clause" by Mr. Adams has been consistently adhered to ever since his time by this government. See MSS. Instructions by Clay, Livingston, Frelinghuysen, Evarts, and Bayard, in Wharton's *Int. Law Digest*, § 134.

arise from the difficulties with France. The French minister, Pageot, was recalled from Washington. Diplomatic relations between the two nations were suspended for nearly two years. Early in 1836 the British government tendered its services as mediator. But before its offer had been accepted, the French government undertook the payment of the sum due. The cordial relations of the two nations were thus restored.

In 1843 a treaty of extradition was concluded with France, and in 1845 an additional article was added.

We now proceed to consider our troubles with Spain, growing out of the purchase of Louisiana and of the attempt to annex Florida. The action of the intendant in forbidding the American use of New Orleans as a port of deposit¹ was in April, 1803, disavowed by the king of Spain, who ordered some place of deposit to be offered. But he declined to ratify the treaty of 1802, partly because payment was insisted upon for damages done to American commerce by French cruisers in Spanish waters, and partly because Congress, claiming that the new purchase of Louisiana gave to the United States the territory extending eastward to the Perdido River, had established a customs district which included the port and bay of Mobile. In 1804, Charles Pinckney, minister to Madrid, and Cevallos, the Spanish Secretary of State, discussed the questions at issue with much spirit for months, but reached no result.² Mr. Monroe was directed to join Pinckney, after ascertaining whether France would not sustain the American claim of territory from the Perdido on the east to the Rio Bravo del Norte on the west. The American negotiators were to press Spain for the recognition of the validity of the American claim, and to offer, not to exceed two millions of dollars for the Floridas, to be applied to payment of the claims of our citizens against Spain.³ If the whole of East Florida could not be purchased, an effort should be made to purchase as far as the Appalachicola. Talleyrand, speaking for France, sustained the Spanish position that the eastern boundary of the Louisiana purchase was the river Iberville and the lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain. Spain also maintained that the western boundary was the river Mermentau, which

¹ See *ante*, p. 477.

² *For. Rel.* ii. 615-624. The correspondence of Yrujo, the Spanish minister to the United States, and Madison, Secretary of State, was equally fruitless. *Ibid.* 624-25. Yrujo, having procured the publication in a newspaper in Philadelphia, of an article attacking the administration, and having made himself otherwise offensive, the government of the United States asked for his recall. The Spanish government replied that, as he had already obtained permission to return home at the season suitable for the voyage, they desired the American government to permit his stay until then, and not to insist on a formal recall. This was assented to. But Yrujo

showed no intention of leaving the country. At the end of eight months, the Secretary of State, Jan. 15, 1806, wrote to him, informing him that his presence in Washington was "dissatisfactory" to the President. He wrote very impudent replies, and refused to go away. Cevallos attempted to defend his extraordinary course. (The history of Yrujo's controversy with our government in respect to his action is well given in the communication of Mr. Erving, minister to Spain, dated December, 1806, and found in Wharton's *International Law Digest*, 2d edition, § 106.)

³ The instructions are found, *For. Rel.* ii. 626-630.

is about halfway from New Orleans to the Sabine. Monroe and Pinckney, January 28, 1805, submitted a project of a treaty to Cevallos, providing for determining the boundary of Louisiana, and for the settlement of claims.¹ They discussed it at great length with him without any success, and the negotiations were stopped May 18th. Monroe returned to London, and Pinckney remained at Madrid.

There was no little friction, during the few years following, in the disputed territory. In 1808, diplomatic relations with Spain were suspended. Owing to turbulence among the inhabitants, the President, by proclamation, in 1810, took possession of the east bank of the Mississippi, to hold it provisionally for the benefit of Spain and of the United States. In 1812, the territory as far as the Pearl River was annexed to the new State of Louisiana, and the territory between the Pearl River and the Perdido was annexed to the Mississippi territory. General Wilkinson seized the fort at Mobile, April 15, 1813; Governor Mathews and Governor Mitchell of Georgia held East Florida for a time with their troops, though Congress refused to sanction their action. General Jackson, in 1818, having heard that Indians were to sally out from Pensacola into Alabama, seized that place, but our government offered to restore it at once. It was obvious that Spain could not long hold the Floridas without much expense and trouble, and without constant danger of most serious difficulties with the United States.

As early as 1815, diplomatic relations, which had been suspended for seven years, were resumed. Onís, the Spanish minister at Washington, opened his correspondence with Monroe, Secretary of State, by asking the restoration of West Florida, which was refused.² They continued discussion on the old lines for more than a year, when Monroe terminated it.³

Pizarro, having in July, 1817, succeeded Cevallos as Spanish Secretary of Foreign Affairs, proposed to our minister, Mr. Erving, to reopen negotiations. His plan was to exchange Florida for the territory west of the Mississippi, bringing the Spanish line eastward to the Mississippi. The Spanish claim on West Florida was to be waived. Erving replied that he was without authority to negotiate, and urged Pizarro to send favorable instructions to Onís. John Quincy Adams and Onís began negotiations in December, 1817. They reargued the boundary question in a very prolix correspondence, but came to no agreement.⁴ The offer of mediation by Great Britain was declined by the United States.⁵

In July, 1818, Pizarro took up the subject again with Mr. Erving, and the king of Spain, on the 9th of that month, ratified the convention of 1802. The correspondence between Pizarro and Erving consisted chiefly in a debate upon the meaning of an offer made by Pinckney in 1803, to guarantee to Spain her dominions beyond the Mississippi. And this, too, like

¹ *For. Rel.* ii. 638.

² *Ibid.* iv. 422.

³ *Ibid.* 422-441.

⁴ *Ibid.* 450 *et seq.*

⁵ J. Q. Adams's *Memoirs*, iv. 48-51. Great Britain having taken the part of Spain on some of the points in controversy, her services were not desired by us.

all the previous discussions between the representatives of the two nations, was fruitless.¹ The negotiations were again transferred to Washington. Onis, October 24, 1818, proposed to cede the Floridas and to fix the western boundary of Louisiana. But the terms were unacceptable to Mr. Adams. A second proposition, more liberal in respect to the western boundary, was also declined by Mr. Adams. Onis submitted a third proposition embodying a *projet*. Mr. Adams modified it in a counter-project, and at last, after long years of discussion, on February 22d, the treaty of 1819 was agreed on and signed.

The most important stipulations of this treaty were as follows: All Spanish territory between the Mississippi and the Atlantic, including both East and West Florida, was ceded to the United States. On the west of the Mississippi, the boundary between the territory of Spain and that of the United States was to run from the mouth of the Sabine River along its west bank to the thirty-second degree of latitude, thence due north to the Red River, then westward along that river to the one hundredth parallel of longitude (west from London), thence north to the Arkansas River, thence along its southern bank to latitude forty-two degrees north, and along said parallel to the South Sea.² The Spanish officers and troops were to evacuate the territory ceded within six months of the exchange of ratifications.

All grants of lands made before January 24, 1818, by Spain in the ceded territory were to be ratified and confirmed, provided the holders of the grants fulfilled the conditions of them according to the terms of the same; but all grants made after the above date were to be null and void.

Each party renounced all claims on the other for damages, and the United States agreed to pay five millions of dollars to their own citizens in satisfaction of their claims against Spain. The United States also certified that they had received no compensation from France for injuries done to them in Spanish waters. They also gave the exclusive privilege to Spanish vessels to bring in for twelve years Spanish goods to Pensacola and St. Augustine, without paying higher duties than our own vessels.

The ratifications were to be exchanged within six months, or sooner if possible.³

The President and Mr. Adams were much elated at the completion of the treaty, which secured so many advantages. But a little more than a fortnight after the signing of the treaty they were both exceedingly disturbed at hearing that on one important point they had been deceived.

¹ *For. Rel.* iv. 512. Pizarro, and afterwards Onis, tried to obtain a positive stipulation or a tacit promise that the United States would not recognize the independence of the South American colonies of Spain. *Ibid.* 674.

² [See Appendix at end of the present volume. — Ed.]

³ The details of the negotiation occupy a large part of vol. iv., *Memoirs of J. Q. Adams*. De

Neuville, the French minister, was most active, throughout the whole transaction, as an intermediary between Adams and Onis. There was a strong feeling in the United States that the government ought to claim westward to the Rio Grande. Monroe thought this unwise. Adams claims, with pride, the securing the line to the South Sea as his own idea.

The eighth article recognized the validity only of grants of lands in Florida made prior to January 24, 1818. Mr. Adams supposed that large grants to the Duke of Alagon, Count Puñon Rostro, and Señor Vargas were thus made invalid, and De Neuville and Onis had, by their language, left the impression on his mind that such was the effect of the eighth article. It was now reported that the grants were dated January 23, 1818, and so, unless there was fraud in the date, they were valid. Mr. Forsyth, minister at Madrid, was directed, in seeking an exchange of ratifications, to deliver to the king a declaration that the treaty was signed with the understanding on both sides that these grants were null and void, and that they would be so held by us.¹

The king, however, was not disposed to ratify the treaty. He took exception to our declaration concerning the grants, to the fitting out in our ports of privateers who attacked Spanish commerce, and to our obvious disposition to recognize the independence of the Spanish colonies in South America; and finally he alleged that the treaty had been changed after signature. This was not true. The question of taking possession of Florida was discussed both in the cabinet and in Congress. But the measure was not adopted. Fortunately, on October 24, 1820, in compliance with the advice of the Cortes, Ferdinand VII ratified the treaty, and appended to the ratification the statement that the three grants above referred to were invalid. The President and his cabinet, and especially Mr. Adams, were greatly relieved by this act of the king.²

¹ *For. Rel.* iv. 652. De Neuville declared that his understanding, and he believed that of Onis, was that the three grants were, under the treaty, invalid. *Ibid.* 653. The grants covered a large part of the territory of Florida, if Mr. Forsyth's description of them is correct. *Ibid.* 669.

² Mr. Adams's *Memoirs*, iv. and v., show that few matters of business ever troubled him so seriously as the discussion over these grants and the delay in the ratification of the treaty by Spain. He reproached himself with a certain carelessness in fixing the date for determining the validity of grants without having scrutinized more sharply the date of the three grants which came into dispute. He thought that he had been outwitted and duped by the dishonesty of Onis (*Memoirs*, v. 290), who had used De Neuville as a tool to perpetrate a fraud. He advised the President, and his colleagues in the cabinet joined him in the advice, to ask Congress for authority to take possession of Florida. Monroe decided on a more patient policy, and waited.

France and Russia asked him not to crowd Spain. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 9, 1820, reported in favor of requesting the President to seize Florida (*For. Rel.* iv. 690). After the contest over the Missouri compromise became hot, there grew up in the North

a strong feeling adverse to gaining possession of Florida, which would enter the Union, if at all, as a slave State. In the West and the South, the treaty was regarded by many with disfavor, because it did not make the Rio del Norte the western boundary. Mr. Adams had desired that boundary, believing with the Western men that Texas was of more importance to us than Florida. Henry Clay was active in his opposition to the treaty. But Monroe was in no haste to gain possession of Texas, which he was sure would come to us in due time. Adams was not then affected by the consideration that the acquisition of Texas would add a large slave territory to the Union. (For Monroe's opinions as manifested in his unpublished correspondence, see Wharton's *Int. Law Digest*, § 161 a.) Gen. Vives, envoy from Spain, arrived at Washington in April, 1820, but soon found himself unable to proceed with business because of a revolutionary movement in Spain, which restored the liberal constitution of 1812. He had to wait for new instructions. When these came, he announced that the king had sworn to the Constitution of 1812, and could not alienate any Spanish territory without consent of the Cortes, but would submit the treaty of 1819 to them when they met. He did so, and the ratification followed. The United States Senate, on Feb. 19, 1821, again

General Jackson was appointed governor of the Floridas. Congress, in 1821, passed an act setting up a commission to decide on the claims described in the eleventh article, and in 1843 an act to execute the ninth article, which provided for satisfying Spanish claims for injuries received from the operations of the American army in Florida.

In the war which Spain waged against her South American colonies to prevent their gaining independence, injuries were inflicted by her upon the commerce of the United States. The administration presented claims to her for reparation. After seven years of negotiation, it was agreed by the convention of 1834 that Spain should pay in full for all demands of the United States twelve millions of reals vellon, in inscription, interest at five per cent., to be paid every six months in Paris. The disturbed condition of Spain caused her to be very dilatory in fulfilling her engagements under this convention, and the United States waited for her with great patience.

With Portugal the United States have had one diplomatic controversy of importance. In September, 1814, the United States privateer "Gen. Armstrong" was destroyed in the harbor of Fayal by an English squadron. Damages were claimed of Portugal as responsible for permitting such a violation of her neutrality. A very prolonged correspondence ensued. Finally, by the treaty of 1851, the case was left to the arbitrament of a friendly sovereign. Louis Napoleon, President of the French Republic, was chosen arbiter, and decided against us, on the ground that the "Gen. Armstrong," by fighting without having first invoked the protection of the Portuguese authorities, violated the neutrality of the port.¹

The sympathies of the American people were naturally with the Spanish American colonies in their efforts to release themselves from the sway of Spain. The United States recognized their belligerent rights during the war, and sent agents to examine their condition and to report to the President.² The subject of determining relations with them repeatedly engaged the attention of Congress.³ On March 8, 1822, President Monroe sent in a message recommending the recognition of the colonies. He argued that they had fairly achieved their independence, and that Spain could not justly complain if the fact were recognized.⁴ On the 4th of May following, Congress appropriated a hundred thousand dollars for defraying the expenses of missions "to the independent nations on the American continent." An-

took action on the treaty, advising the President to ratify it. Mr. Adams says (*Memoirs*, v. 289), "I considered the signature of the treaty as the most important event of my life. It was an event of magnitude in the history of this Union."

¹ *Senate Ex. Doc. 24, 2d sess. 32d Congress*. The important part of this decision is translated in Davis's *Notes*, 1065.

² See the elaborate reports of C. A. Rodney, John Graham, and Theodoric Bland (*For. Rel.*

iv. 217 *et seq.*); of J. R. Poinsett (*Ibid.* 323); the letters of John M. Forbes and J. B. Prevost (*Ibid.* 820-827), and that of J. S. Wilcocks (*Ibid.* 836).

³ See *Annals of Congress*, from the 12th to the 17th Congress. Henry Clay was especially conspicuous in his efforts to hasten recognition.

⁴ *For. Rel.* iv. 818 *et seq.* gives the message and accompanying documents.

duaga, the Spanish minister at Washington, filed a spirited protest with the Secretary of State.¹ Mr. Adams, in his reply, said: "The United States confidently rely that the time is at hand when all the governments of Europe friendly to Spain, and Spain herself, will not only concur in the acknowledgment of the independence of the American nations, but in the sentiment that nothing will tend more effectually to the welfare and happiness of Spain than the universal concurrence in that recognition."² The earliest American republic was thus the first to extend the hand of friendship to the Spanish-American States.

In 1823, rumors reached America that the so-called Holy Alliance of European sovereigns, which had been engaged in suppressing attempts on the Continent to form popular and liberal governments, was considering a plan for crushing the Spanish-American States. Canning, the British Foreign Secretary, on September 18th, in an interview with Mr. Rush, our minister at London, earnestly inquired whether the United States and Great Britain could not together oppose this dangerous movement.³ Monroe, on hearing from Rush, communicated with Jefferson and Madison, who both strongly advised our opposing stoutly the project of the Holy Alliance.⁴

On December 2d, Monroe, in his annual message, gave utterance to what has ever since been known as the Monroe Doctrine. The two points which it embodies are an opposition to the extension of the political system of the Holy Alliance to the western hemisphere, and an opposition to the further colonization of the American continent by any European power. The last point was presented in connection with the consideration of a Russian claim to extend unduly its territory on the northwest coast.⁵ Although Great Britain was not yet ready to imitate our example in recognizing the independence of the Spanish-American States, the message of the President gave great satisfaction in England, and probably prevented an attempt on the part of the Allied Powers to interfere upon our continent. The

¹ "Who could think," he exclaims, "that in return for the cession of her most important provinces in this hemisphere, for the forgetting of the plunder of her commerce by American citizens, for the privileges granted to their navy, and for as great proofs of friendship as one nation can give another, this executive would propose that the insurrection of the ultramarine possessions of Spain should be recognized!" *For. Rel.* iv. 845.

² *Ibid.* 846.

³ For particulars of the interview, see Rush's *Court of London*, August and September, 1823.

⁴ See Jefferson's letter, in *Works*, vii. 315; and Madison's letters to Monroe and to Jefferson, *Madison's Writings*, iii. 339. For citations of earlier expressions of similar opinions by American statesmen in respect to European intervention on the American continent, see Gilman's *Monroe*, pp. 162-170.

⁵ Though often quoted, the most important sentences on these subjects may perhaps well be cited here from the message. In respect to the plan of the Allied Powers, Monroe said: "We owe it 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." In respect to the Russian scheme he said: "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 maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

influence of the sentiments which inspired the Monroe Doctrine has been strong in all our subsequent history.

In 1825, the United States were invited by the Spanish-American States to join them in a congress at Panama to consider common interests. Mr. Clay advocated with his characteristic fervor acceptance of the invitation.¹ President Adams and his whole cabinet shared Clay's views, and in his annual message the President announced that ministers would be sent to the congress.

As opposition to the scheme at once manifested itself in Congress, the President explained in another message² that the chief objects the United States might properly seek in attending the congress were the adoption of liberal maritime usages in their intercourse with the new states, an agreement that each state would guard against the planting of a European colony in its domain, the exercise of influence to develop religious liberty and to guard American interests in case of war, and in general the manifestation of friendly regard for the sister states. Still the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations opposed the sending of ministers to the congress.³ They objected on the ground that the country might be drawn into an entangling alliance, that schemes were meditated by the Spanish-American States against Cuba and Porto Rico, in which we could not properly take part, and that all we ought to try to accomplish could be effected by treaties negotiated in the usual way. Doubtless a real, and perhaps the chief, objection in the minds of the committee, certainly in the minds of many slaveholders, was that it was proposed to discuss in the congress the entire abolition of the slave-trade, and also the formal recognition of Hayti.⁴ Still, the power of public enthusiasm for the plan of the President was so great that an appropriation for sending ministers to Panama was voted. Richard C. Anderson, minister to Colombia, and John Sargeant of Philadelphia, were appointed. Anderson soon died, and Joel R. Poinsett, minister to Mexico, was named in his stead. After a brief and fruitless session at Panama in June, 1826, the congress adjourned, to meet at Tacubaya the next year. But no meeting was held then. The whole undertaking brought no other result than this, that the Spanish-American States were assured anew of our good-will to them. Seldom has a scheme which so earnestly engaged public attention, and of which so much was expected by our ablest statesmen, so signally disappointed all the hopes of its friends.⁵

¹ The same sympathy for "oppressed nationalities" which led Clay and Webster, and indeed the people generally, to seek opportunities for expressing their interest in the South American republic between 1820 and 1830 also manifested itself towards Greece, which was striving to gain independence. Generous private contributions were sent to the Greeks, but Congress did not hasten to recognize her independence. In 1823 and in 1824 resolutions looking to formal recognition, and in 1827 a resolution to appro-

priate \$50,000 for their relief, failed in Congress. A treaty was negotiated with Greece in 1837.

² *For. Rel.* v. 834.

³ Their report is found *Ibid.* 857.

⁴ See letter of Mr. Salazar, Minister of Colombia, to Mr. Clay. *For. Rel.* v. 836.

⁵ Schouler's *United States*, iii. 358; Von Holst's *Const. Hist.* i. 409. The report of the Committee of the House of Representatives, answering *seriatim* objections to the mission to Panama, is in *For. Rel.* v. 900.

On the 3d of October, 1824, a treaty of peace, amity, navigation, and commerce between the United States and Colombia was signed. Treaties almost identical with this were in following years concluded with the other Spanish-American States. They secured mutually large maritime and commercial privileges. Only articles fitted especially for use in war were deemed contraband. The doctrine of "free ships, free goods," was embodied, with the stipulation that the flag should cover the property only of the powers who recognize this principle.¹ Generous principles concerning the visitation of vessels, the notice of blockade, and the exemption of private debts from sequestration in war, shaped the articles on these subjects. The whole group of treaties with the new states was intended and calculated to cement our friendship and strengthen our relations with them.²

The Republic of Colombia was in 1831 divided into the republics of New Grenada, Venezuela, and Ecuador. In 1846 a new treaty was concluded with New Grenada. While renewing in the main the stipulations of the treaty of 1824, this treaty gave us the free right of transit of persons and goods over the Isthmus of Panama, and secured to New Grenada "the guarantee, positively and efficaciously," by the United States, of "the perfect neutrality" of the isthmus.³

In 1825, there was made a treaty of peace, amity, commerce, and navigation with the Federation of the Centre of America (better known as Central America), consisting of the states of Guatemala, San Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. The part of the treaty concerned with commerce and navigation expired by the provisions of the treaty in 1838, and the rest of the treaty by the dissolving of the Federation in the same year.⁴ In 1832 a treaty was made with Chili, and in 1836 one was concluded with the Peru-Bolivian Confederation.

In 1825, Joel R. Poinsett of South Carolina, who had previously visited Mexico as an agent of his government to study the condition of that country, was duly commissioned as minister to Mexico. A treaty of amity and commerce which he negotiated was loaded with conditions by the Senate

¹ This provision is first found in article xii. of the treaty of 1819 with Spain.

² The spirit of the treaties is described by President J. Q. Adams in his message of Dec., 1824: "The basis of them all, as proposed by the United States, has been laid in two principles: the one, of entire and unqualified reciprocity; the other, the mutual obligation of the parties to place each other permanently upon the basis of the most favored nation."

In the years immediately following, a similar spirit of commercial liberality shaped the treaties of the United States with European powers. For example, in treaties with Denmark, 1826, the Hanseatic republics, 1827, and Prussia, 1828, it was agreed that goods of a foreign country could be imported on equal terms into the ports

of either of the contracting parties in the vessels of either.

³ In 1862, New Grenada became "the United States of Colombia." A treaty was concluded with Venezuela in 1836, and one with Ecuador in 1839. These expired by limitation, and later treaties were negotiated.

⁴ Treaties were concluded with Guatemala in 1849, San Salvador in 1850, Costa Rica in 1851, Honduras in 1864, and Nicaragua in 1867. By the last-named treaty, the right of transit between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans is secured to us. The United States agreed to protect the routes of communication, and to guarantee the neutrality and innocent use of them, and are allowed to transport troops and munitions across Nicaragua.

which were fatal to its ratification by Mexico.¹ In 1828, he concluded a treaty which recognized the boundary line on Mexico as it had been traced in the treaty of 1819 with Spain. In 1831, the American chargé, Anthony Butler, negotiated with Alaman and Mangino, respectively Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury of Mexico, the treaty of amity and commerce which has, in the main, since remained in force.² It differs in no important particulars from the other treaties with the Spanish-American States. In 1835, an additional article to the treaty of 1828 provided for commissioners to run the boundary line. In 1839 and in 1843, conventions were concluded for the determination and payment of claims.³ The latter convention provided that a new convention should be entered into for the settlement of claims not yet adjusted. A treaty for that purpose was concluded in Mexico, November 20, 1843, but certain amendments were made by the Senate to which the Mexican government would not agree, and so the treaty failed.⁴

The relations of the United States and of Mexico to Texas, both before and after that State declared her independence (March 2, 1836), was a fruitful source of diplomatic discussion between the two nations. The United States recognized her independence March 1, 1837. Mexico complained because, before the attempt to gain independence, American soldiers were sent into Texas to suppress Indian depredations upon the frontier, and because, after the declaration of independence, American citizens were allowed to go to Texas, and arms were sold to the inhabitants of that State. On account of the military expedition against the Indians, Gorostiza, the Mexican minister, withdrew from Washington in 1835; and soon after, Mr. Ellis, the American minister to Mexico, having failed to secure redress for injuries he had complained of, returned home, and diplomatic intercourse was for a time suspended. In respect to the other complaints of Mexico, the United States maintained that they had not violated the obligations of neutrality.⁵ In 1843, rumors were rife that the annexation of Texas was contemplated. Bocanegra, the Mexican Secretary of State, warned Mr. Thompson, the American minister, that Mexico would resist by force such a step.⁶ The Mexican government proceeded to prohibit foreigners from conducting

¹ *For. Rel.* vi. 579.

² But see note, *post*, p. 511.

³ John Forsyth, Secretary of State, negotiated the first of these conventions, and Waddy Thompson, minister to Mexico, the second. The commissioners appointed under the convention of 1839, owing to differences of opinion as to their functions and as to procedure, did not entirely complete their work.

⁴ The treaty provided that the commission on claims should meet at Mexico, and should consider any claims or complaints of one government against the other. The Senate substituted Washington for Mexico as the place of meeting, and limited the "claims and complaints" to pe-

cuniary claims. President Polk charged (message, Dec. 8, 1846) that Mexico, by declining to ratify the amended treaty, had violated the treaty of 1843.

⁵ See Webster's reply to Bocanegra, the Mexican Secretary of State, July 8 and 13, 1842 (*Webster's Works*, vi. 441 *et seq.*). Bocanegra also issued a diplomatic circular to the representatives of the European powers, repeating his complaints against the United States. Thompson sent them a circular in reply, repeating Webster's arguments in vindication of the action of his government.

⁶ *Ex. Doc. no. 2, H. R., 1st sess. 28th Cong.*,

retail trade in Mexico, and closed her northern custom-houses. Mr. Thompson and Secretary of State Upshur maintained that these acts were in violation of treaty obligations.¹ Almonte, the Mexican minister at Washington, renewed the threats before made by Bocanegra.

On April 12, 1844, Mr. Calhoun, Secretary of State, negotiated with Mr. Van Zandt and Mr. Henderson, commissioners from Texas, a treaty of annexation, which, however, the Senate declined to ratify. France and England, through their ministers at Washington, remonstrated against the annexation. But on March 3, 1845, the joint resolution of the houses of Congress for the admission of Texas to the Union was approved by the President, and became law. Texas gave her assent July 4th. On March 10th, Almonte, the Mexican minister, withdrew from Washington, and soon after the American representative at Mexico, being denied communication with the Mexican government, returned home. But in October Mexico agreed to receive a commissioner from the United States on "the present contention." Mr. Slidell was at once sent, with regular credentials as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. The Mexican government declined to treat with him because his powers were not limited to settling the Texas controversy.² Slidell withdrew. General Taylor was ordered to occupy positions on the east shore of the Rio Grande; the Mexican troops crossed that river to the Texas side, and hostilities began.³

In April, 1847, the President, hoping that victories already achieved by the American troops might incline the Mexican government to negotiations for peace, decided to send Mr. N. P. Trist to General Scott's headquarters, with powers to make a treaty. The draft of a treaty was furnished to him. He reached his destination in May. Personal controversies between him and General Scott delayed for some time the forwarding of a letter which he bore from Mr. Buchanan, Secretary of State, to the Mexican minister of foreign relations. It was not until August that it was possible for him to begin negotiations, and even then there was in Mexico a great popular clamor against treating at all.

The draft of the treaty which Mr. Trist, under his instructions, presented, provided that Mexico should abandon all claim to Texas, and fixed the following boundary, namely: the Rio Grande from its mouth to the southern line of New Mexico, thence a line running west and south along the boundary of that State to the first branch of the Rio Gila, along that stream to its junction with the Colorado, and along the Colorado and the Gulf of

¹ *Ex. Doc. no. 2, H. R., 1st sess. 28th Cong., 31, 40.*

² *Ex. Doc. 196, H. R., 1st sess. 29th C., 19, 30.*

³ In the preamble of the act of Congress providing for carrying on the war, it is affirmed that, "by the act of the Republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that government and the United States." Taylor, being beyond the Nueces, was, as the Mexicans claimed, invading their territory. Polk and his supporters no

doubt expected and desired the war to be brought on by the advance of Taylor, yet in such a manner that the above declaration of Congress could plausibly be made. The diplomatic policy, like the general policy of the United States government, was for years largely under the direction of those who wished to extend the area of slavery by securing the annexation of Texas, and who were not over-scrupulous in their treatment of Mexico.

California to the Pacific. The right of way across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec was on certain conditions to be conceded to the United States. A sum of money, to be fixed by the commissioners, was to be paid to Mexico.¹

After deliberation, the Mexican commissioners reported Mr. Trist's propositions inadmissible. At their request, he agreed to waive the demand for Lower California, to yield such part of Upper California as would give Mexico free access to the head of the gulf, and to submit to his government the demand that the Nueces, and not the Rio Grande, should form the division line between Texas and Mexico. About forty-five days would be needed to get an answer from Washington, and during this time the armistice already existing was to continue.² But he insisted on retaining New Mexico. Finally the Mexicans, not satisfied with Trist's concessions, presented a counter-project of a treaty, giving to the United States all the territory east of the Nueces and north of the thirty-seventh parallel through to the Pacific. This Trist rejected, and the futile negotiations ended.

The President, on receiving Mr. Trist's reports of his negotiations, recalled him. But, with the most extraordinary persistence and audacity, Mr. Trist declined to go home, and devoted a letter, addressed to the Secretary of State, to a somewhat complacent defence of the policy he had pursued;³ and, what is quite as remarkable, he really did negotiate the treaty which terminated the war and gathered up the fruits of it for the United States.

The Mexican commissioners, Couto, Atristain, and Cuevas, learning through Trist that Scott would not agree to an armistice until a treaty was made, entered upon secret negotiations with Trist, and on February 2d he and they signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. It may well be believed that President Polk was surprised to receive a treaty signed by a man whose powers he had withdrawn. But since the Mexican commissioners had negotiated with Trist when they knew that he had been deprived of his powers, the President sent the treaty to the Senate on February 23d for their consideration; and, after warm discussion, it was ratified, with some amendments, on March 10, 1848, by the vote of thirty-eight to fourteen. Ambrose H. Sevier and Nathan Clifford were sent as commissioners to explain the amendments and exchange the ratifications. The amendments were accepted by Mexico,⁴ and on the 30th of May the ratifications were exchanged.

¹ *Ex. Doc. no. 52, Senate, 1st sess. 30th Cong.*, 85. The Mexican commissioners were Herrera, Mora y Villamil, Couto, and Atristain.

² Trist justified this proposed delay by asserting that it would be better for the soldiers to wait till cooler weather before resuming operations. But the army officers did not agree with him on this point. Even H. H. Bancroft, who is a warm advocate for the Mexicans in their controversy with the United States, admits that they prolonged the negotiations in order to gain time for completing military preparations (*Mexico*, v. 494).

³ *Ex. Doc. no. 52, Senate, 1st sess. 30th Cong.*, 231.

⁴ Articles 1 to 4 of the treaty relate to the restoration of peace, the evacuation of Mexico by our forces, etc. Article 5 fixes the boundary. This follows the Rio Grande up to the southern boundary of New Mexico, then follows that boundary to its western termination, runs up the west side of New Mexico to the first branch of the Gila, down that branch to the Colorado, and thence to the Pacific on the division line between Upper and Lower California. Article 6 gives free passage to Americans by the Gulf of Cali-

Our diplomatic relations with Oriental nations should receive notice. In 1832, the President dispatched the ship "Peacock" and the schooner "Boxer" to the southeastern coasts of Asia, to see how far our commerce was exposed to hostile acts in the Asiatic waters. Edmund Roberts, of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, sailed on the "Peacock," with a commission to make commercial treaties with Cochin China, Siam, and Muscat. He failed of success with Cochin China, but in 1833 he made treaties with the King of Siam and with the Sultan of Muscat, securing for us privileges of trade.¹

After some earlier and unsuccessful attempts at opening diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Porte, a treaty was negotiated in 1830 by Commodore Biddle, then in command of our Mediterranean squadron, David Offley, consul at Smyrna, and Charles Rhind of Philadelphia, on the part of the United States, and the Reis Effendi on the part of Turkey.² Privileges of trade and the sending of consuls were agreed on. A secret and separate article made provision for the building of ships and the purchase of ship timber by Turkey in the United States.³ This article was rejected by the Senate, though the treaty was approved.

When David Porter, who was appointed chargé d'affaires, arrived at Constantinople to exchange the ratifications, a discussion ensued, because

fornia and the Colorado River. Article 7 gives Americans free navigation of the Gila and of the Rio Bravo del Norte below the southern boundary of New Mexico. Article 8 gives to Mexicans remaining in the territory formerly belonging to Mexico the right to remain or to remove, and, if remaining, to become American citizens or to remain Mexican citizens, and guarantees respect for all their rights of property. Article 9 insures to such persons religious liberty. Article 11 promises the prevention of incursions of Indian tribes into Mexico. Articles 12 to 15 provide for payment by the United States of \$15,000,000 to Mexico for the territory she surrenders, and of the sums due from Mexico to American claimants. Article 16 reserves to each State the right to fortify any point in its territory. Article 17 revives the treaty of 1831 for eight years, so far as not incompatible with this treaty. Articles 18 to 20 provide for adjustment of customs-duties in the period of evacuation. Articles 21 and 22 provide for settlement of future questions by negotiation and arbitration, if possible, and for certain humane measures in time of war. The 6th and 7th articles were rendered for the most part nugatory by the treaty of 1853, annexing Arizona (Gadsden Purchase) to the United States. So also the 11th article of this treaty and the 31st of the treaty of 1831 were abrogated. The United States, moreover, procured the right of transit across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

H. H. Bancroft, in the volume cited (*Mexico*,

v.), gives copious lists of Mexican as well as of American authorities on the Mexican war. He writes with a strong spirit of condemnation of the policy of the United States. Ripley's *History of the War with Mexico*, two vols. (N. Y., 1849), is written in a fair spirit. We are indebted to it, especially for dates, in the above sketch. See also Von Holst, ii. and iii.

¹ The officials whom he met at the coast of Cochin China declined to take his letter to the Emperor until they had seen a copy. He refused to grant their request for a copy, and sailed for Siam. See *Embassy to the Eastern Courts of Cochin China, Siam, and Muscat* (N. Y., 1837), by Edmund Roberts, for details of his mission. He was cordially received in Siam and Muscat.

² A letter from Offley to Van Buren, 1830, cited by J. C. B. Davis in his *Notes* (p. 60), from the MS. in the State Department, states that before 1817, when efforts to secure a treaty began, American commerce in the Turkish territory had been "under the protection of the English Levant Company, for whose protection a consulate duty, averaging one and one fourth per cent. on the value of cargoes inward and outward, was paid."

³ Rhind, by agreement with his colleagues, went alone to Constantinople and conducted the negotiations, while they remained at Smyrna. On their arrival they disapproved of the secret and separate article, but nevertheless signed the treaty, and explained to the Secretary of State their reasons.

he had brought a translation made at Washington instead of the one signed at Constantinople. Four translations had been sent to America, and the French translation by the American negotiators was not the version sent to the Senate, ratified, and taken by Porter to Constantinople. He therefore signed a paper in Turkish, declaring that the Turkish original should be observed in case discussions concerning the meaning of the treaty should arise.¹

China was opened to us by the so-called opium war between her and Great Britain. On May 8, 1843, Caleb Cushing was commissioned as minister to China. He arrived at Macao in the frigate "Brandywine," February 24, 1844. He had prepared a draft of a treaty, and after brief negotiations this draft, without very important modifications, was signed at Wanghia on July 3d.² Perhaps, in all Mr. Cushing's diplomatic career, no work of his was more admirably executed than this. It formed the model which other nations followed in subsequent years in negotiating with China. Its prominent features were these: (1) It made needed arrangements for trading at five ports. (2) It provided for the trial of cases in which Americans were defendants in their consular courts. (3) It secured protection and aid for American seamen wrecked at other places than the five ports. (4) It contained the assent of the Chinese government to the employment of Chinese teachers, which had often been denied. (5) It secured the privilege of procuring sites for business, and also for hospitals, churches, and cemeteries. (6) It declared opium contraband, and left Americans dealing in it to the mercy of the Chinese authorities. (7) It fixed the tariff on imports and exports, of course following the rates secured by the English. (8) It gave the United States, under the most favored nation clause, the advantage of future concessions to any nation.

¹ "It appears from the archives of the Department of State that four translations were sent to America: (1) An English translation from the original Turkish, not verified; (2) a French translation from the original Turkish, verified by Navoni, the American dragoman; (3) another French translation in black ink, with annotations in red ink; (4) another English translation made from the French. The translation which went before the Senate and was acted on by that body was neither of these. No French version appears to have been transmitted to the Senate with the Turkish text, but a new English version, which, from internal evidence as well as from the tradition of the department, may be assumed to have been made in the Department of State, mainly from the French version No. 3." (J. C. B. Davis's *Notes*, 106r.)

In 1868, an important issue was raised under the fourth article of the treaty by the arrest and

imprisonment of two Americans by the Turkish authorities. By the American version of that article, the jurisdiction over the citizens of the United States is lodged in their minister or consul. When the American minister claimed the release of his two countrymen, the Turkish government asserted that in the Turkish copy of the treaty the words under which the minister made his claim were not found. This proved to be true. There has been much discussion between the two governments, in late years, to ascertain what is the true import of the Turkish original, and what is to be done in case American citizens commit offences in the Turkish dominions. Wharton's *Int. Law Digest*, § 165, gives copious extracts from the correspondence of Secretaries Fish, Evarts, Frelinghuysen and Bayard on these subjects.

² For brief sketch of negotiations, see Williams's *Middle Kingdom*, ch. 23.

In 1848, Congress completed the legislation necessary to confer judicial power on American ministers and consuls in China and in Turkey.¹

The visits of our trading-vessels to the northwest coast of America, early in this century, led to diplomatic correspondence with Russia, which caused the negotiation of the treaty of 1824 with that country. In 1808, the Russian government, through Count Romanzoff, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, represented, at the instance of the Russian-American Trading Company, to Mr. Harris, American consul-general at St. Petersburg, that the citizens of the United States were carrying on a clandestine trade in fire-arms and powder with the natives on the islands of the northwest coast, and asked that Congress forbid this traffic.² Later, in 1810, Russia proposed that, as her vessels were not admitted into Canton, American ships should do the carrying-trade from the northwest coast, while the trade with the natives in fire-arms should be forbidden, but other trade with them should be open.³ Mr. Adams was not ready to enter into any such arrangement, because it was not clear what was the boundary of the Russian territory. Russia had made more or less distinct claims to territory as far south as the Columbia River.

On February 11, 1822,⁴ Poletica, the Russian minister at Washington, sent to Mr. Adams regulations adopted by the Russian-American Company and sanctioned by the Emperor, forbidding to foreigners all commerce, whaling, and fishery from Behring's Straits to the fifty-first parallel of latitude; also from the Aleutian Islands to Siberia, and along the Kurile Islands from Behring's Straits to the South Cape of the Island of Urup; that is, to 45° 50' north latitude. Foreign vessels were prohibited to approach within a hundred Italian miles of the shores. He explained, in answer to Mr. Adams's inquiries as to the grounds of this extraordinary decree of the Emperor, that the fifty-first parallel had been taken as the southern boundary of the Russian possessions in a spirit of moderation, as the line midway between the Russian establishment of New Archangel and the Columbia River; and that the control claimed over the seas was justified as necessary to restrain illicit trade, though the waters might fairly be considered as a *mare clausum*.⁵ Mr. Adams reminded him that in 1799 the Emperor Paul had fixed the fifty-fifth parallel as the southern limit of his possessions, and that "the close sea" was four thousand miles across.⁶ Poletica referred the subject back to his government.

At the suggestion of the Russian Emperor, Mr. Middleton, the minister of the United States at St. Petersburg, was instructed, on July 22, 1823,

¹ Extra-territorial jurisdiction is now lawfully exercised by consuls also in Japan, Siam, Borneo, Madagascar, Persia, Tripoli, Tunis, Muscat, and Morocco. *Revised Statutes U. S.*, §§ 4083-4129.

² *For. Rel.* v. 439.

³ *Ibid.* 456.

⁴ *Ibid.* iv. 856.

⁵ *For. Rel.* iv. 861-2.

⁶ *For. Rel.* iv. 863. In J. Q. Adams's *Memoirs*, vi. 93, it is stated that the Russians borrowed the idea of the one hundred miles' limit from the exclusion in the Treaty of Utrecht of the French fishing-vessels from the waters within thirty leagues of Newfoundland.

to open negotiations concerning the differences which had arisen on the ukase of 1821.¹ His instructions, drawn by Mr. Adams, directed him to deny the claims which Russia had made for territory down to the fifty-first parallel and for the control of the seas; to assert our right to trade with natives in places not occupied by Russia, and our right to fish in the Pacific Ocean and the South Sea; to agree that citizens of both countries should trade in each other's domain only by permission of the authorities; and to accept the fifty-fifth parallel as the boundary line. It was expected that Great Britain would unite with Middleton in forming a joint convention with Russia. But she decided to negotiate separately with Russia, chiefly because President Monroe had announced in his message that the American continent was not to be further colonized by any European powers.² The conference between Mr. Middleton and the Russians began February 9, 1824, and continued about two months. The treaty negotiated fixed 54° 40' as the boundary, the Russians having asked the substitution of that line for the fifty-fifth parallel in order to include in their territory one of the ports they had established. The liberty of navigation and fishing in the Pacific Ocean and the South Sea, and of freely trading with natives at the unoccupied points, and, by the permission of the authorities, at each other's settlements, was secured to both parties. For ten years unrestrained liberty of resorting to any point on the coast for trading was agreed to, but spirituous liquors, fire-arms, and munitions were not to be sold to the natives. Neither power was to search the vessels of the other.

The treaty gave great satisfaction in this country, and was commented on rather enviously in England.³ When the fourth article, securing liberty of trade for ten years, expired by limitation in 1834, Russia declined to renew it, and our vessels were excluded from the ports of Russian America.⁴

In 1832, a commercial treaty was negotiated between Russia and the United States by James Buchanan and Count Nesselrode.

Prolonged discussions with Denmark concerning American claims for spoliations during the Napoleonic wars were terminated by the treaty of 1830, which that accomplished publicist, Henry Wheaton, negotiated with Count Schimmellmann. The Danish government justified its capture of American vessels under British convoy, and maintained that the condemnation of vessels in Danish prize tribunals must be taken as final. Mr. Wheaton argued with much learning and force against the Danish positions, and secured an indemnity of \$650,000, the first that was obtained of

¹ *For. Rel.*, v. 436.

² Letter from Mr. Rush, London, Jan. 9, 1824, in *For. Rel.* iv. 463. In J. Q. Adams's *Memoirs*, vi. 163, he says that when Baron Tuyl, the Russian minister, came, on July 17, 1823, to learn what instructions he was sending to Mr. Middleton, he told him "that we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment

on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments." That is an early statement of the Monroe Doctrine.

³ Schuyler's *American Diplomacy*, 301-2.

⁴ The cession of Alaska to us was made in 1867.

European powers for injuries inflicted on our commerce in the wars of Napoleon.¹ But article five of the treaty declares that this settlement is not to be taken as a precedent.

Mr. Wheaton concluded treaties with Hesse and Würtemberg in 1844, and with Bavaria in 1845, all of which abolished the *droit d'aubaine* and taxes on emigration.² In 1844, he also concluded a commercial treaty with the German Zollverein, by which duties in each country on certain products of the other were to be reduced. The treaty failed in the Senate. The reason assigned for opposing it was one which has of late years become familiar, — that tariffs should be changed by legislative acts of both houses of Congress, and not by treaty.³

When the kingdom of the Netherlands was set up after the Napoleonic wars, a discussion, which continued for years, was opened between the Dutch minister and the American government on the question whether its treaty of 1782 with the United Provinces was abrogated by the absorption of Holland in the French Empire. The Dutch claim, that it was no longer binding, was finally acquiesced in by the United States.⁴

During the period under consideration in this chapter, commercial treaties, in addition to those already named, were concluded by the United States with nearly all the civilized and semi-civilized nations.⁵

A survey of American diplomatic history from 1789 to 1850 shows that the broad and liberal spirit of the negotiators of the Revolutionary period was shared by their successors. A firm assertion of the rights of neutrals and of the responsibility of belligerents to neutrals; the persistent denial of the so-called right of visit and search of neutral vessels in time of peace, and especially of the exercise of it for the purpose of impressing into foreign service the seamen on board such vessels; the recognition of humane usages in war; efforts to suppress the slave-trade; wise doctrines of contraband and of blockade; advocacy of the abolition of privateering, combined with the exemption of private property on sea from capture, and the declaration that the neutral flag should protect the cargo; generosity towards semi-civilized nations; patient and skilful pressure of demands for justice on strong powers that the United States were not in a condition to coerce; vigilant watching for opportunities to expand the national commerce; just views of the functions of prize tribunals; provisions for the extradition of criminals; a rational interpretation of the "favored nation" clause; an American spirit which has striven to prevent European infringement on the autonomy of American States; a ready and sympathetic welcome to colonies and provinces which had fairly won their independence;

¹ Lawrence's *Wheaton* (ed. 1863), 858 *et seq.* Treaties to settle like claims were concluded with France in 1831, and with the Two Sicilies in 1832.

² A similar treaty was concluded with Saxony in 1845.

³ Lawrence, in his sketch of Wheaton, says that Calhoun, who favored the treaty, informed


Wheaton that the treaty was defeated "from strictly party motives." Lawrence's *Wheaton* (ed. 1863), p. liv.

⁴ Davis's *Notes*, 948.

⁵ For list of abrogated treaties (except claims conventions), see Wharton's *Int. Law Digest*, § 137 *a.*

timely plans of enlargement of the nation's territory; — all these characterize the diplomatic work of the threescore years we have been reviewing. The beneficent effect of that work has been shared by all nations. The policy of the American people has helped make the international law of the world more humane and just and benign.

Nor are the men who have shaped this policy unworthy to be named with their predecessors of Revolutionary days. Jay, indeed, belongs to both groups. But William Pinkney and the Pinckneys of Carolina, Albert Gallatin, John Nelson, James Monroe, the Livingstons, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, Richard Rush, George W. Erving, Henry Wheaton, Caleb Cushing, and Edward Everett are men who need no eulogium to secure recognition of their merits. To this list we must add the names of such Secretaries of State as Thomas Jefferson, Edmund Randolph, Timothy Pickering, James Madison, Martin Van Buren, Daniel Webster, and John C. Calhoun, who did so much to determine the foreign policy of the country. One must close the study of this part of diplomatic history with the proud conviction that the American statesmen whose work we have been tracing have no occasion to fear comparison with the ablest European diplomats of their time. They rendered a worthy service to their country and to all mankind.



EDITORIAL NOTES ON THE SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

THERE is no sustained history of the diplomacy of the United States covering the whole period of the foregoing chapter. Theodore Lyman, Jr., produced *The Diplomacy of the United States, being an account of the foreign relations of the country, from the first treaty with France, in 1778, to the treaty of Ghent, in 1814, with Great Britain* (Boston, 1826), which in 1828 passed to a second edition, taking the narrative to 1828, embracing two volumes. William H. Trescot speaks of it as "an accurate, laborious, and useful book;" but disapproving Lyman's point of

view, Trescot published his *Diplomatic Hist. of the Administration of Washington and Adams* (Boston, 1857), and never carried the narrative farther. The particular subject of *American Diplomacy and the furtherance of Commerce* has been treated by Eugene Schuyler (N. Y., 1886).¹

The documentary resources for the study of the subject are ample, such as the *Messages of the Presidents* and the *Annual Reports* of the successive Secretaries of State; the *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*. The various treaties have usually been printed as ratified,²

¹ There is a condensed sketch of American diplomatic history by J. C. Bancroft-Davis in Lalor, iii. 944; and his *Notes on Treaties* are of great importance.

The lives of the successive Presidents; those of the different Secretaries of State (Jefferson, Edmund Randolph, Pickering, Marshall, Madison, Robert Smith, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, Van Buren, Edward Livingston, Louis M'Lane, John Forsyth, Webster, H. S. Legaré, A. P. Upshur, Calhoun, and Buchanan), of some of whom there are no extended accounts; and those of the successive ministers to the European courts, are essential sources of more or less of personal detail in the diplomatic history of their terms.

² A collection of *All the Treaties between the United States and Great Britain; from the Treaty signed at Paris, 1783, to the Treaty signed at Ghent, 1814*, was published by order of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts at Boston, 1815.

and the governmental collection covering the whole period is the *Treaties and Conventions between the U. S. and other powers, since July 4, 1776, with notes showing what treaties or parts of treaties have been abrogated, and decisions thereupon* (Washington, 1871; revised ed. 1873).¹

The present authoritative *Digest of the international law of the United States, taken from documents issued by presidents and secretaries of state, and from decisions of federal courts and opinions of attorneys-general*, is edited by Dr. Francis Wharton (Washington, 1886), in three volumes; 2d ed., with Appendix, 1887.²

Jefferson continued his mission in France³ until called home to take his place as Secretary of State in Washington's administration.⁴

Gouverneur Morris had gone to Europe before the organization of the new government (Sparks's *Morris*, i. ch. 18), and during 1789 we have his reports on affairs in France to Washington and to his other American correspondents (*Ibid.* ii. pp. 61, etc.). We find in John Trumbull's *Autobiography* a statement by Lafayette at this time (1789) respecting the condition of France, which was committed to Trumbull to be delivered to Washington.⁵

From January to September, 1791, Morris was in London as the private agent of the government, endeavoring to reach commercial conclusions with England.⁶ In 1792 he was sent to Paris as minister, and continued in that capacity till October, 1794 (*Ibid.* i. ch. 20, 21), when he had made himself objectionable to the French government, and Monroe was sent to succeed him.⁷

There are abstracts by Washington of the letters sent to Monroe (1794-1795) in Sparks's *Washington*, x. 474.⁸ A *Memoir of James Monroe, relating to his unsettled claims upon the people and government of the United States* (Charlottesville, Va., 1828), throws light upon Monroe's diplomatic service, largely through the documents included. Sparks (*Washington*, xi. 483) prints the opinions of the cabinet (July, 1796) advising Monroe's recall.⁹

We have various contemporary sketches of the progress of events as affecting the relations of the United States and France.¹⁰

We best trace the development and progress of the influence of the French Revolution on the politics of the Washington and Adams administrations in the writings and lives of Jefferson and Madison, on the side of the anti-Fed-

¹ For the principal collection of treaties, see *ante*, p. 82.

² Leone Levi's *International Law* (Intern. Scien. Series, N. Y., 1888) gives the principal works on the subject from Vasquez (1509-66) down; and he particularly groups the fishery clauses in treaties (ch. 12).

³ *Ante*, p. 235. His letters are in his *Writings* (vols. i.-iii.; cf. also Randall's *Jefferson*, i.).

⁴ The correspondence of Jefferson (1791-1793) as Secretary of State with George Hammond, the English envoy, was printed as *Papers relative to Great Britain* [Philad., 1793] and *Authentic copies of the Correspondence*, etc. (London, 1794).

⁵ Cf. Rosenthal's *America and France*, ch. 4, 5. Cf. *Ibid.* p. 264, for the influence of Joel Barlow in France at this time. He was made a citizen of France in Feb., 1793.

⁶ We have the attendant correspondence in Sparks's *Gouverneur Morris*, i. ch. 18; ii. 1-57. Cf. Sparks's *Washington*, i. ch. 19; Hildreth, iv. 133; Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 45; Roosevelt's *G. Morris*.

⁷ McMaster, ii. 256; Schouler, i. 317; Hildreth, iv. 645.

⁸ Cf. Sparks's *Gouverneur Morris*, i. ch. 22; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 422, 527, 571; Gilman's *Monroe*, ch. 3, with bibliographical references, p. 258.

⁹ Cf. Hildreth, v. 97; McMaster, ii. 321. Monroe sought to vindicate himself in his *View of the Conduct of the Executive in the Foreign Affairs of the United States, connected with the Mission to the French Republic in the years 1794, '5, and '6. Illustrated with his Instructions and Correspondence and other Authentic Documents* (Philad., 1797; London, 2 eds., 1798). Washington's animadversions in his own copy (now in Harvard College library) are given in Sparks (xi. 228, 504), to be supplemented by his notes on Monroe's Appendix, given in Gilman's *Monroe*, App. iii. A pamphlet in response to Monroe, called *Scipio's Reflections on Monroe's View*, etc. (Boston, 1798), published "to promote the cause of federation and good government," was first printed in the *Federal Gazette* in Boston, and is usually ascribed to Uriah Tracy, of Connecticut (*Brinley Catal.*, iii. no. 4839), though it has sometimes been assigned to Hamilton. Trescot (p. 168) holds that Monroe was not justified in such explanations, even in his own defence, but should have abided the due coming of vindication. Cf. McMaster, ii. 335. New light has been thrown on Monroe's term in Paris in the researches of E. B. Washburn in the *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1876, p. 129. Cf. Rosenthal's *America and France*, p. 295.

¹⁰ William Duane's *Hist. of the French Revolution, with a free Examination of the Dispute between the French and American Republics* (Philad., 1798). J. Dennis's *Address on the Origin, Progress, and Present State of French Aggression* (Philad., 1798). S. C. Carpenter's "view of the rise and progress of French influence and principles" in his suppressed *Memoirs of Jefferson* (N. Y., 1800). Robert Walsh's *Enquiry into the Past and Present Relations of France and the United States* (London, 1811), reprinted from the *Amer. Review*, then edited by Walsh (cf. Allibone). Camillus's *Hist. of French Influence in the U. S.* (Phil., 1812).

For later treatment, see Trescot (ch. 3); Sullivan's *Pub. Men* (pp. 80, 102, 111); Schouler, i. 351, 357; Hildreth, vi. 215; McMaster, ii., with much detail; Upham's *Pickering*, vol. iii.; Parton's *Burr*, i. ch. 13, etc.

eralists; and we find the steady efforts at repressing this influence, in the writings and lives of Washington, Hamilton, and John Adams, — not to name others on either side.

The most virulent and probably effective pamphleteering was done on either hand by William Cobbett and Thomas Paine.¹

Washington submitted the question of his proclamation of neutrality to his cabinet,² and its publication led to a pamphlet controversy between Pacificus (Hamilton) and Helvidius (Madison).³

The official sources on the mission of Genet are the *Messages* of Washington, Dec. 5, 1793, with accompanying documents,⁴ and later *Messages*, with document, of Jan. 15 and 16, 1794; beside the correspondence between *Genet and*

the Federal Government, [with his] instructions (Philad., 1793).⁵

How far Jefferson's approval of Genet went is a question on which authorities differ.⁶

As the French and anti-French factions grew warm, Freneau's *National Gazette* became the favorite channel of the attacks on the administration,⁷ and Fenno's *Gazette of the U. S.* that of the defence. In this last paper, John Adams, then Vice-President, began the publication of a series of papers in 1790, calculated, as the rising Republicans then thought, to enforce the argument for monarchy. "They were stimulated mainly," says his biographer (Adams's *Works*, vi. 225), "by the manifest tendencies of the revolution in France; but mediately by the publication of the Marquis Condorcet, entitled *Quatre*

¹ The *Porcupine's Works* of Cobbett, as published in 1801, contain much of this sort of offensive warfare. Here we find (vol. iv.) his *Diplomatic Blunderbuss* (originally Philad., 1796), in which, in a preface, he arraigned the *Notes of Adet* and his cockade proclamation; his severities on Monroe's mission (vols. v., vi., vii.), and (vol. x.) Dr. Jedediah Morse's exposition of French intrigue. Cf. Morse's *Thanksgiving Sermon* (2d ed., Boston, 1799, App.).

See account of Porcupine in McMaster, ii. 206. Cobbett also published John Lowell's *Antigallican; or, the lover of his own country; in a series of pieces partly heretofore published and partly new, wherein French influence and false patriotism are fully and fairly displayed, by a citizen of New England* (Philad., 1797). There was nothing that was more incensing to the supporters of Washington's administration than the *Letter to George Washington on affairs public and private*, which Thomas Paine sent from Paris to be printed in Philadelphia in 1796 (also Baltimore, 1797, etc., and Paine's *Works*, Philad., 1854, vol. i.).

Among the replies are: P. Kennedy's *Answer to Mr. Paine's letter to General Washington, or Mad Tom convicted of the blackest ingratitude* (London, 1797; Philad., 1798). An American Citizen's *Letter to Thomas Paine*, N. Y., 1797. *A Five minutes' answer to Paine's Letter* (London, 1797). On Paine's influence in Paris, see Rosenthal's *America and France*, p. 266.

Washington denounced in his message to Congress, Nov., 1797, the Jacobin societies and their excesses. Cf. Jay's *Jay*; Schouler, i. 283; McMaster, ii. 205; and the note to Jedediah Morse's *Thanksgiving Sermon* (Boston, 1799).

² Sparks, x. 533. Cf. C. F. Adams's *Struggle for Neutrality in America* (N. Y., 1871, p. 11), and Dawson's advance review in *Hist. Mag.*, Feb., 1871.

³ Ford's *Bib. Hamil.* pp. 48, 49. Hamilton's paper was appended to the 1802, 1818, and other editions of *The Federalist*, and is of course in his *Works*. The Helvidius letters, beside being published separately (Philad., 1796), are included in Madison's *Letters*, i. 607. Cf. his letter to Jefferson in *Ibid.* i. 581; and Rives's *Madison*, iii. 325.

⁴ Philad., 1793; reprinted, London, 1794, without the documents; Philad., 1795; also Sparks, xii. 96.

⁵ Cf. Gibbs's *Administrations of Wash. and Adams*, i. ch. 4; Hildreth, iv. 411; Schouler, i. 241, etc.; Tucker, i. 504; McMaster, ii. 98, 141; Von Holst, i. 112, etc.; Hamilton's *Works*, iv. 360; Morse's *Hamilton*, ii. ch. 3; Sparks's *Washington*, x. 534; Marshall's *Washington*, ii. 270; Irving's *Washington*, v. 147; Wells's *Sam. Adams*, iii. 320; Madison's *Letters*, i. 596; *Life*, by Rives, ii. 322; Austin's *Gerry*, ii. ch. 5; *Hist. Mag.* x. 329; xii. 154; xix. (Feb. 1871); Sparks's *G. Morris*, ii. 288; Jay's *Jay*, i. 298.

⁶ Hildreth (iv. 413) and Randall (ii. 157). We have a comparison of judgments in Von Holst (i. 113). See Jefferson's own expressions in his *Works*, iii. 563; iv. 7-100; ix. 140-180, 438; and further, in Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 49, 50 (with Parton in the *Atlantic*, xxxi., on Genet's exploits); C. DeWitt's *Jefferson*, tr. by Church, pp. 195, 414.

There are accounts of the banquet given to Genet in Philadelphia, in Westcott's *Philad.*, and in Chas. Biddle's *Autobiog.* (p. 253). We get a glimpse of the terrorism which Genet's upholders worked up in John Adams's letter to Jefferson, in 1813 (Adams's *Works*, x. 47). Cf. McMaster, ii. 109.

For the trials for fitting out privateers, see Wharton's *State Trials*, 49, 65, 93, 185. Cf. Judge Iredell's charge, June 2, 1794, in McRee's *Iredell*, ii. 410.

For Genet's efforts to induce the Kentuckians to invade Louisiana, see *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, i. 454; Pitkin, ii. 359; McMaster, ii. 141; histories of Kentucky, by Marshall, ii. 99; Butler, 2d ed., 224, 524; Shaler, 128; Albach's *Annals*, 663; *Mag. Western Hist.* i. 373.

For something of Genet's later history, see Mrs. Bonney's *Hist. Gleanings*, i. 159, etc.

⁷ On the slanderous attacks on Washington at this time, see Hildreth, v. 43; McMaster, ii. 111, 289; Barry's *Mass.* iii. 328.

lettres d'un Bourgeois de New Haven sur l'unité de la législation."¹ Adams spoke, many years afterwards, of the courage he had to oppose his opinions to the universal opinions of America, and that no one man in America then believed that he had caught the true meaning of the revulsion in France. He explained also the abrupt ending of the papers to be, because "the rage and fury of the Jacobinical journals increased as they proceeded, intimidated the printer, and convinced me that to proceed would do more hurt than good" (Adams's *Works*, vi. 272). Adams protested, years afterwards (*Ibid.* x. 54), in a letter to Jefferson, that the *Discourses* contained not one sentiment which, by a fair construction, could favor the introduction of a hereditary monarchy into America. The papers called *Discourses on Davila* were in shape of comments on Henrico Caterino Davila's *Dell' Istoria delle Guerre Civili di Francia*,² a record of the civil convulsions in France in the sixteenth century. Meanwhile, Edmund Burke published in London his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, and it reached Philadelphia only to find a ready response in the minds of the Federalists. Tom Paine had answered it in his *Rights of Man*, and this rejoinder speedily followed across the Atlantic the essay which occasioned it, and found as ready a welcome among the Republicans, upon the first copy coming to Philadelphia in May, 1791. When it passed into the hands of a printer for republishing, a private note of Jef-

erson commending the publication accompanied it, and was used, without authority, as a sort of introduction to the republication; and by this means Jefferson was publicly committed, as his opponents held, to the approval of Paine and his principles.³ Another reply to Burke⁴ had publicly brought upon its author, Joseph Priestley at Birmingham (England), the indignation of his neighbors, which resulted in riots and the flight of the offender, who in 1794 found it most agreeable to come to America.⁵ Here the Republicans hailed him, but the Federalists looked gloomily askance, and he barely escaped another enforced migration under the alien and sedition laws. Peter Porcupine held him up to detestation, and he was not unconscious of the dangerous exposure to which his opinions subjected him.⁶ Priestley saw that Adams, in the height of the indignation against France, in answer to the numerous addresses made to him, went too far in their direction, and wrote to a friend (May 31, 1798) that "there cannot be any good understanding with France while he is President."⁷

As the dispute had deepened, the administration found no stronger defender than Robert Goodloe Harper of South Carolina, a State, as he said, "at one time the most devoted to the French interests of any in the Union;" and in explanation of his course of refusing longer to abide the dictation of France, he addressed his constituents in May, 1797, in *Observations on the dispute between the U. S. and France*.⁸ The Bos-

¹ Included in Mazzei's *Recherches historiques et politiques sur les Etats-Unis*, vol. i. Cf. Rosenthal, p. 157.

² Adams seems to have used a French translation made by the Abbé Mallet (Amsterdam, 1757), as a copy with his notes is in the library at Quincy, showing marks of consultation, which do not occur in Aylesbury's English translation (London, 1647) in the same collection.

Adams's *Discourses* were gathered in Boston in 1808, and published in a volume under the editing of some one unknown to Adams; and his copy of this edition has his own marginal notes, made in 1812-13, which have been used in annotating the text in Adams's *Works*, vi.

³ Garland's *Randolph*, i. 54. The implication in Jefferson's note, thus published, of his detestation of the views of the author of Davila inevitably drew very strongly the lines of division between the Vice-President and the Secretary of State. Jefferson protested to Adams, in a private letter, that he meant no reference to him; but he wrote to Washington that he did mean to refer to Adams, and the world now knows it (Adams's *Works*, i. 618).

The controversy was further complicated when John Quincy Adams, then a young lawyer in Boston, printed the letters of *Publicola* in a Boston paper, giving a new blow to the Jeffersonian faction, and the influence of these papers increased as they were gathered and reprinted in New York, Philadelphia, and London.

⁴ *Letters to Edmund Burke* (Birmingham, 1791).

⁵ Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 52.

⁶ He writes to George Thacher of Massachusetts that it is to him alone that he ventures to express his political views by letter, and Thacher was of quite the other party in politics. Even to him he says but little, as the letters printed in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* (June, 1886) show. Cf. *Memoirs of Dr. Priestley to the year 1795, written by himself, with a continuation to the time of his decease, by his son* (Northumberland, 1806), in 2 vols. For references, see Allibone, ii.

⁷ *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, June, 1886, p. 21. There was much in the decided frankness of Adams that pleased Priestley. "I like him better than your late President. He is more undisguised. We easily know what he thinks and what he would do; but I think his answers to several of the addresses are mere intemperate railing, unworthy of a statesman." *Ibid.* p. 26.

⁸ Philad., 1797, 1798; London, 1797, 1798; Boston, 1798; in French, Londres, 1798; and in Harper's *Select Works*, Baltimore, 1814.

ton edition had a preface aimed at Jefferson's subserviency to French influence, and included Harper's speech of March 2, 1798, on the Foreign Intercourse Bill, in which he had replied to Gallatin's speech of the previous day, which last we have in various editions.¹ Harper, a few months later, published *A Short Account of the principal proceedings of Congress in the late session, and a sketch of the state of affairs between the U. S. and France, in July 1798* (Philad., 1798).

The despatch of Fauchet, which had been sent to the French government, and which seemed to imply that Edmund Randolph, Washington's Secretary of State, was in French pay, and to intimate that the purpose of Washington was to establish a monarchy, having been intercepted by the British, was sent to Hammond, their minister in Philadelphia, to use as he best might.²

Randolph's *Vindication*³ of himself did not satisfy the Federalists, then in the midst of party passion, and is not altogether satisfactory to later cooler judgments; but Trescott (pp. 159, 161) claims that "the misconstruction of Randolph's conduct has not received historical sanction." He charges Gibbs (*Administrations of Washington, etc.*) in what he says of the matter, with "malicious ingenuity."⁴

Fauchet published, after his return to France, a *Coup d'œil sur l'état actuel de nos rapports politiques avec les États-Unis* (Paris, an V—1797), which, translated by William J. Duane, appeared

as *A sketch of the present state of our political relations with the United States* (Philad., 1797).⁵

Of the Jay treaty of 1794,⁶ the edition printed at the time: *Treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation, between His Britannic Majesty and the United States of America, conditionally ratified by the Senate of the United States, at Philadelphia, June 24, 1795* (Philad., 1795), has annexed "a copious appendix," intended to place before the public the leading arguments for and against it.⁷

A more extensive collection of the divergent criticism on the treaty was published at the same time by Matthew Carey as *The American Remembrancer; or, An Impartial Collection of Essays, Resolves, Speeches, etc., relative, or having affinity, to the Treaty with Great Britain* (Philad., 1795), in three volumes. The most important support came, however, from a series of papers, *A Defence of the Treaty* (N. Y., 1795), of which the introductory paper, signed Curtius, was probably written by Rufus King; but the signature of *Camillus*, attached to all the others, marks the author of most of them as Hamilton, though Jay is said to have given countenance to the series, if not to have had an actual share in the writing. Ames said of them, "Camillus holds up the ægis against a wooden sword."⁸

The speech of Madison was the one most conspicuous in disapproval. Ames (*Works*, i. 189) wrote of him, "Conscience made him a coward; he flinched from an explicit and bold creed of anarchy."⁹

¹ Cf. Addison's *Observations on Gallatin's Speech*, 1798; and lives of Gallatin by Adams and by Austin. Gallatin had printed *An Examination of the Conduct of the Executive of the U. S. towards the French Republic* (Philad., 1797), in which he denounced "the cloven foot of the British faction." The Thomas Paine of Boston, who later changed his name to Robert Treat Paine, to avoid being confounded with the English Tom Paine, took high Federalist views in his *Oration* at Boston, July 17, 1799, on the dissolution of the treaties with France.

² Sparks's *Washington*, xi. 52, 90; Upham's *Pickering*, iii. 210, 228; Garland's *Randolph*, i. 85; Sullivan's *Public Men*, 97; McMaster, ii. 231; Hildreth, iv. 557; Irving's *Washington*, v. ch. 28; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, 1885, p. 589.

³ The *Vindication of Mr. Randolph's Resignation*, written by himself (Philad. 1795), was reprinted (Richmond, 1855), edited by P. V. Daniel, Jr. Randolph's defence gave occasion to *Political Truth . . . an inquiry into the charges against Mr. Randolph* (Philad., 1796), and to Cobbett's *Observations on Randolph's Vindication* (Philad., 1796).

⁴ Randolph has been freshly vindicated by M. D. Conway in his paper on "A Suppressed Statesman of our Early Republic," in *Lippincott's Magazine*, xl. 429.

⁵ An American merchant in Paris answered the ex-minister in *L'indépendance absolue des Américains des États-Unis prouvée par l'état actuel de leur commerce avec les nations européennes* (Paris, 1798).

⁶ *Treaties and Conventions*, p. 318; Martin, v. 641; *Annual Reg.*, 1795.

⁷ This contains Curtius's "Vindication of the Treaty," which was written by Noah Webster, except nos. 6 and 7, the production of James Kent; and as an offset a paper called "Features of Jay's Treaty," taken from the *Amer. Daily Advertiser*, which had been written by A. J. Dallas (*Life and Writings of A. J. Dallas*, p. 51). Dallas had also drawn up the antagonistic memorial of the citizens of Philadelphia. The Appendix further contained a "View of the Commerce of the U. S.," taken from the *Philad. Gazette*.

⁸ Ford's *Biblio. Hamiltoniana*, no. 58; Lodge's *Cabot*, 84; John Adams's *Works*, i. 485; ii. 195; J. C. Hamilton's *Hamilton*, vi. 273; Hamilton's *Works*, vii. 172; Morse's *Hamilton*, ii. ch. 5; Lodge's *Hamilton*, ch. 9; McMaster, ii. 251. An *Examination of the Treaty by Cato* (N. Y., 1795), though ascribed to Hamilton, is thought to have proceeded from R. R. Livingston.

⁹ The speech is in Moore's *Amer. Eloquence*. A long letter by Madison, Aug. 23, 1795, analyzes the treaty (*Letters*, ii. 46; his opinion in 1823, *Ibid.* iii. 297). Cf. Rives's *Madison*, iii. 412, 499, 502, 504.

In Feb., 1796, Washington issued his proclamation that the treaty was in force, and on the question of appropriating money to carry out its provisions there was a protracted discussion in the House, touching the power of that body over treaties. Washington, to signify his sense of their unwarranted interference, refused (Mar. 30, 1796) to transmit to the House the instructions under which Jay had acted, though he made them public.¹

Timothy Pickering had become Washington's Secretary of State, Dec. 10, 1795, and he continued in Adams's cabinet till May, 1800, and upon him devolved the official intercourse with the French minister, Adet. Their respective letters are in the *Review of the Administration*

of the government since the year 1793, or Correspondence between the Secretary of State and the French minister on that subject (Boston, 1797).²

For the negotiations with France in 1798, the American case, in the form of a letter to Talleyrand, Jan. 17, 1798, was written by Marshall and revised by Gerry, and is given in Waite's *State Papers*, iii. 219.

Adams's *Message to Congress*, April 3, 1798, covers all the essential documentary proofs.³ Marshall kept a journal during the negotiations, and this was used by Austin in his *Gerry* (cf. ii. 203), and Pickering had it when writing his *Review of the Adams-Cunningham correspondence* (p. 118), where he examines the conduct of Gerry. Pickering made his *Report on the mission as Secretary of State*, Jan. 21, 1799, which,

The debates on the ratification are given in *Annals of Congress* (1795-96), pp. 426, 975; Benton's *Debates*, i. 639-754. Cf. Hildreth, iv. ch. 8; McMaster, ii. 215; Stevens's *Gallatin*, 113. Fisher Ames chronicles in his letters some of the phases of the discussion (*Works*, i. 183). The most effective speech was that of Ames, which has generally been considered as saving the treaty (*Speeches in Congress*, 116; *Works*, ii. 37; Frank Moore's *Amer. Eloquence*, vol. i.; Johnston's *American Orations*, vol. i.). The speech is said to have been written out from memory by Samuel Dexter, and corrected by Ames (*Life of Jeremiah Smith*, p. 97). On the effect of the speech, see Sparks's *Washington*, xi. 127; *Memoir of Jeremiah Mason*, 36; *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1887, p. 374; McMaster, ii. 277; Schouler, i. 313; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 563.

¹ Sparks's *Washington*, xii. 112; Randall's *Jefferson*, ii. 286; Hildreth, iv. 585; McMaster, ii. 263. The discussion was published as *Debates on the constitutional powers of the house with respect to treaties and upon the British Treaty* (Philad., 1796), in two parts; called, in the second edition, *Debates upon questions involved in the British treaty of 1794* (Philad., 1808), in two vols.

For symptoms of the widespread dissatisfaction, see Hildreth, iv. 547; Schouler, i. 289; McMaster, ii. 247; Von Holst, i. 124; Randall's *Jefferson*, ii. 265; Rives's *Madison*, iii. 511, 551; Parton's *Jefferson*, 513; Sullivan's *Public Men*, 94, 102; *Memorial Hist. Boston*, iii. 204; Wells's *Sam. Adams*, iii. 350; C. F. Adams's *Struggle for Neutrality in America* (N. Y., 1871), p. 21. Cf. Jefferson's *Works*, iv.

The breadth of the opinions in defence of the treaty can be seen in Jay's *Life of Jay*, and in the lives of him by Flanders and Whitelock, and also in some letters sent by him to Washington (Sparks, xi. 481-82); R. G. Harper's *Address to his Constituents* (N. Y., 1796), and in his *Select Works* (Baltimore, 1814, p. 1); Gibbs's *Adm. of Washington*, etc., i. ch. 8-9; J. H. Morison's *Jeremiah Smith*, ch. 4. Cobbett represents the extreme Federal pro-Anglican view (*Porcupine's Works*, ii.); and in his *Little plain English on the Treaty* (Lond. and Philad., 1795), in answer to *Letters of "Franklin"* (Philad., 1795). Cf. the younger James Bowdoin's *Opinions Respecting the Commercial Intercourse between the United States and Great Britain* (Boston, 1797), and Oliver Wolcott's *British Influence on the Affairs of the United States proved and explained* (Boston, 1804), in which it is claimed that it was the action of Virginia that earlier stood in the way of settling the question of the collection of British debts under the treaty of 1782-83.

In general, see Trescott, ch. 2; Schouler, i. 289, 309; McMaster, ii. ch. 9; Von Holst, i. 212; *Washington*, by Marshall, 2d ed., ii. 361; Sparks, xi. 32; Irving, v. ch. 27, 29; Sparks's *G. Morris*; Garland's *Randolph*, i. 79; *Life of Pickering*, iii. ch. 5; and the succinct sketch in Lalor, ii. 634. Col. John Trumbull was Jay's secretary in London, and afterwards a commissioner under the treaty. Cf. his *Autobiog.*, ch. 12, 14; and Wheaton's *Pinkney*. It is not easy, at this length of time, for comments on the treaty to be always in unison. Cf. J. K. Hosmer's *Sam. Adams*, 409; and S. H. Gay's *Madison*. There are in Harvard College library two volumes of the opinions (in MS.) given in 1797 by the commissioners under article vii. of the treaty, on the case of the "Betsy" and various other vessels.

² Cf. Upham's *Pickering*, iii. 353. This diplomatic fence also includes the *Notes adressées par le citoyen Adet au Secrétaire d'État des États-Unis* (Philad., 1796; and in English, Philad., 1796, and N. Y., 1796). Pickering's letter to C. C. Pinckney, then minister to France, in reply to Adet's charges, was republished in French at Paris, 1796, and Pickering's letter later gave occasion to C. C. Tanguy de la Boissière's *Observations sur la dépêche écrite le 16 Jan. 1797 à M. Pinkney* (Philad., 1797; and in English, Philad., 1797).

³ They are included in the *Executive Docs. Fifth Congress* (Philad., 1798), and in *Authentic Copies of the Correspondence of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, John Marshall, and Elbridge Gerry, Esqres., Envoys Extraordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary to the Republic of France, as presented to Congress April 3, 1798* (London, 1798). Cf. *State Papers, For. Rel.*, ii. 153.

with the *Message* of Adams, Jan. 18th, and the accompanying documents, constitute the final developments.¹

Austin (*Gerry*, ii. 301) says that it was in consequence of Adams's interviews with Gerry, during the summer of 1798, that the President determined to try a new mission to France, upon which followed the great outbreak in the Hamiltonian wing of the Federalists.² Adams was always strenuous in his defence of his course.³ The resulting convention of Sept. 30-Oct. 3, 1800, is in the *Statutes at Large*, viii. 178; *Treaties and Conventions*, 266.⁴

The claims of American citizens for losses inflicted by cruisers under the French Republic

were, under this convention, reserved for future settlement; but under the treaty for the purchase of Louisiana, three years later, they were assumed by the United States up to the amount of 20,000,000 livres.⁵

As regards the attempted treaty with England in 1806-1808, the instructions to Monroe and Pinkney, May 17, 1806, with supplemental instructions, Feb. 3 and May 20, 1807, are in *St. Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 119, 153, 166.

Final instructions, March 23, 1808, accompany the President's message of that date, which conveyed to Congress the information that Canning had declined to reopen the negotiation.⁶

Monroe, on his return, drew up a defence in a

¹ Cf. *Ex. Docs. Fifth Cong., third session* (Philad., 1799); *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.; Statesman's Manual*, i. 116. A history of the mission, in defence of Gerry, is given in Austin's *Life of Gerry* (ii. ch. 5-8). Trescot (p. 193) does not hold this defence satisfactory. Cf. Hildreth, v. 125, etc.; Schouler, i. 373; Magruder's *Marshall*, ch. 7; Jay's *Jay*; Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 57; Randall's *Jefferson*, ii.; Jefferson's *Works*, iii., edit. 1830, p. 384; Morse's *John Adams*, ch. 11; C. F. Adams's *John Adams*, i. ch. 10; viii. 546-681; ix. 10-307; Lodge's *Hamilton*, 203; Lyman, i. ch. 8; Garland's *Randolph*, i. 102; Gibbs's *Adm. of Wash.*, etc., ii. 15, for the anti-Adams view. Johnston (Lalor, iii. 1122) gives a good succinct account. On the X Y Z letters, see particularly Hildreth, v. 203, 253; Schouler, i. 373, 387; McMaster, ii. 369; Von Holst, i. 138; Tucker, i. 597; ii. 71; Marshall's *Washington*, ii. 424; Garland's *Randolph*, i. ch. 19; Benton's *Debates*, ii. 225; Waite's *State Papers*, 2d ed., ii. 187; iii. 456; iv. i.

It was in reference to this attempted extortion on Talleyrand's part that C. C. Pinckney, at a dinner given to Marshall on his return, said: "Millions for defence; not a cent for tribute." Trescot (p. 186) speaks of the account of Talleyrand in the *Biographie Universelle* as being a more unscrupulous attack than is found in even American histories, on Talleyrand's character as developed in the correspondence of his creatures, Hottinguer, Bellamy, and Hautval.

² Cf. *Works of Hamilton*; the letters of Pickering (Sparks's *Washington*, xi. App. 21,—also Upham's *Pickering*, iii. 439) and McHenry (Sparks, xi. App. 21); the *Works* of Fisher Ames (i. 252, etc.),—not to name other of the Federalist leaders of that temper.

³ Cf. his *Boston Patriot* letters, reprinted in his *Works*, ix. 241; also *Ibid.* x. 113, 148; C. F. Adams's *Life of J. A.* in *Ibid.* i. 549; Morse's *John Adams*, 303, 308, and the same writer's view of the case in his *Life of Hamilton*, ii. 277. Cf. further in Lodge's *Hamilton*, 217; Lodge's *Cabot*, ch. 7; Hildreth, v. 255, 387; Schouler, i. 443, 479; McMaster, ii. 429. The President's messages to Congress during 1799 and 1800 show his attitude, as in those of Feb. 18, Dec. 5, 1799, and Dec. 15, 1800, with correspondence (the last is in *State Papers, For. Rel.*, ii. 295).

⁴ Cf., on the peace, John Adams in *Works*, x. 113, 115, 120, 148. The contemporary documentary repository of these prolonged negotiations with France, the *Actes et Mémoires concernant les négociations qui ont eu lieu entre la France et les Etats-Unis*, 1793-1800 (Londres, 1807), in three vols., was reissued with an English title, *State Papers relating to the Diplomatick transactions between the American and French governments, 1793-1800. Collected by A. G. Gebhardt* (Lond., 1816). The documents of this collection are in the languages in which the papers were originally written.

⁵ The long struggle of claimants for indemnity for these and later losses has produced a mass of Congressional documents, speeches, pamphlets, etc., a large part of which are enumerated in a bibliography in the *Boston Public Library Bulletin*, 1885, pp. 393-402. A considerable part of them refer to claims for losses after 1806, under the Napoleonic wars, and coming within the treaty with France, signed July 4, 1831, by which France agreed to pay 25,000,000 francs. Cf. B. P. Poore's *Descriptive Catal.*, index, p. 1370; Lyman's *Diplomacy*, ii. ch. 7; Benton's *Debates*, and his *Thirty Years*, ch. 117, etc.; *Niles's Reg.*, xliii. 6; xlvi. 455; Schurz's *Henry Clay*, ii. ch. 16; Parton's *Jackson*, iii. ch. 40; Sumner's *Jackson*, 170, 343; Curtis's *Buchanan*, i. 235-280; Hunt's *Edw. Livingston*, ch. 17.

One of the most important of the documentary depositories is Lewis Goldsmith's *Exposition of the Conduct of France towards America*, illustrated by *Cases [1793-1800] decided in the Council of prizes in Paris* (Lond. and New York, 1810), which aimed to show that France was more hostile to America than England.

How Perry with a fleet collected the claims for spoiliations of Naples is told in Griffis's *M. C. Perry*, ch. 11.

⁶ The course of negotiations is followed in Hildreth, v. 653; Schouler, ii. 137; Gilman's *Monroe*, 96, 257; Wheaton's *Pinkney*; Pinkney's *Pinkney*, 136; Carpenter's *Jefferson* (1809). The treaty is contained in *All the treaties between the U. S. and Great Britain, 1783-1814, including the convention between Mr. King and Lord Hawkesbury, and Monroe and Pinkney's treaty rejected by Jefferson* (Boston, 1815). It is also given with the accompanying papers in *State Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 142-153.

letter to Madison, dated Richmond, Feb. 28, 1808.¹

The negotiations with Erskine, the British minister at Washington, can be followed in the *State Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 158, 209, where he exchanged views with Madison relative to the French decrees and the British Orders in Council. (Cf. Hildreth, vi. 167.) *The Correspondence of Erskine and Smith, accompanying the President's message of Nov. 29, 1809*, was issued "in anticipation of the mail" at the *Boston Gazette* office, Dec. 4, 1809, in a pamphlet. This was the message announcing the failure of the British government to approve the understanding reached by Smith and Erskine.²

On the burdens of the mercantile restraints at this time, Hildreth (vol. v., vi.) and Schouler (vol. ii.) are the only general historians worth the student's attention. Some of the contemporary spirit is easily traced in such works as the *Annual Register* and Carey's *Olive Branch*. Barry's and other histories of Massachusetts, and those of the other New England States, record the feelings under the commercial straits of the times, when they were felt most. A few leading biographies, like Curtis's *Webster* (i. 91), necessarily touch it. Of William Gray, the merchant most extensively engaged in commerce

of any, there is no adequate biography. He bravely stood up for the administration through it all, and became lieutenant-governor under Gerry (*Mem. Hist. Boston*, iv. 158).

The question of the rights of neutrals, whether in the abstract or in the circumstances then surrounding the question, and as finally complicated by the preposterous counteractions of Great Britain and France, had run down all the years from 1791 to the outbreak of the war in 1812. Jefferson, in his message of Dec. 23, 1808, had included copies of all the acts affecting the commercial rights of neutrals, from 1791 to that time; and for the same period Tench Coxe published *An Examination of the Conduct of Great Britain respecting neutrals since 1791* (Boston, 1808, a 2d ed. with corrections).

Perhaps the most important of the earlier expositions of the American view of neutral rights emanated from Marshall, as Secretary of State, in 1800, in his instructions to Rufus King, as minister to England, and in other papers (*State Papers, For. Rel.*, ii. 486, etc.). It is worth while to compare Henry Brougham's speech in the Commons against the Orders in Council (London, 1808), which in a Boston edition (1808) is introduced by a preface holding that the American view had found an able defender.³

¹ *State Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 173. Cf. *Correspondence between the President and Monroe* (Boston, 1808), and as issued at Portland, Me., in 1813, *To all who are honestly searching after Truth. Mr. Monroe's Letter . . . also the treaty itself and documents connected with it.*

The despatches of Monroe and Pinkney, beginning April 15, 1804, are in the *State Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. pp. 91, etc., where will also be found some of the correspondence between the American and British negotiators, as well as despatches of Secretary Madison to Monroe; Jefferson's message of Dec. 18, 1806, with accompanying correspondence (*Ibid.* iii. 262); and an account of the negotiations submitted April 22, 1807 (*Ibid.* iii. 160). Madison's comments on the treaty, May 22 and July 30, 1807, are also included (*Ibid.* iii. 183, 185).

Reference may also be made to Jefferson's message on British aggressions, Jan. 17, 1806; Madison's report on the oppressive conduct of the British government, Jan. 29, 1806; Jefferson's message of Oct. 27, 1807, in which he announced that the American envoys had exceeded their instructions; the correspondence of Madison and Monroe accompanying the message of March 23, 1808, printed separately as *Letters from Madison*, etc. (Washington, 1808, and again, 1808, with additional letters); later papers accompanying Jefferson's message of Nov. 8, 1808; and finally Pinkney's correspondence with Canning was transmitted with message of Jan. 17, 1809, and further matters in that of Jan. 30th.

The memorials of the different American cities at this time on the British aggressions are given in Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 11-17. Lord Holland, who was one of the commissioners appointed to negotiate with Monroe and Pinkney, says they were found to be "fair, explicit, frank, and intelligent" (*Whig Party*, ii. 100).

² Cf. Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 30; Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy*, 195; Gay's *Madison*, ch. 18; Schouler, ii. Additional documents are found accompanying the messages of May 23, June 16, Dec. 15 and 18, 1809.

The English blue-books give us the correspondence of Lord Howick and Erskine (1807); the correspondence of Canning and Erskine on his exceeding his instructions (cf. *Parl. Debates*, xv. 324; *Ann. Reg.*, 1810, p. 255); and the correspondence of 1809-1810 in *Papers relating to America*. Compare further on attending developments the *Important State Papers: Corresp. between the British Minister and Mr. Smith* (Boston, 1809); A. C. Hanson's *Reflections upon the Correspondence*, etc. (Balt., 1810); *Speech of Josiah Quincy* (Balt., 1810); John Lowell's *Diplomatic Policy of Mr. Madison unveiled; or strictures upon the late correspondence between Mr. Smith and Mr. Jackson* (1809; reprinted in London, 1810), and his *Ten hints addressed to wise men, concerning the dispute which ended Nov. 8, 1809, in the dismissal of Mr. Jackson* (Boston, 1810). Cf. for the correspondence of Smith and Jackson the *Quebec Lit. and Hist. Soc. Docs.*, 5th series, p. 49.

³ Stevens (*Albert Gallatin*, p. 314) speaks of the report prepared by Gallatin, in 1808, for Mr. Campbell, chairman of the Com. on Foreign Relations, as covering the whole ground of the American argument. Cf. Secretary Monroe's letter, July 23, 1811, to the British minister, defending the rights of neutrals (*St. Papers, For. Rel.*, iii.).

Again we find the British view somewhat violently set forth in J. Stephen's *War in Disguise, or frauds of neutral flags* (London, 1805; N. Y., 1806),¹ which drew out from Gouverneur Morris his *Answer to "War in Disguise," or remarks upon the new doctrine of England, concerning neutral trade* (N. Y., 1806).

We have the opinions of Pinkney, who endeavored with Monroe to settle the controversy in the rejected treaty of Dec., 1806, in the memorial of Baltimore merchants to Congress, which he drew up (Pinkney's *Pinkney*, 158-187). Madison embodied the studied views of the administration in the book which Randolph, in his new-fledged ardor of opposition, flouted at, and it was published in 1806 as *A memoir containing an examination of the British Doctrine which subjects to capture a neutral trade, not open in time of peace*, and which is now contained in his *Letters*, etc., ii. 227.²

The question of impressment of American seamen as a proximate cause of the war of

1812 is surrounded with a multifarious array of reports, messages, correspondence, and pamphlets. It may be well to present the testimony of each side in succession.

On the American side we find accompanying a message of Madison, dated July 6, 1812, a series of documents touching British impressments between 1792 and 1803; and the collection was republished in London as *Copies and Extracts of documents on the subject of British impressments of American seamen* (1812).³

Just before the end of the war of 1812, and in order to impart new vigor to the military movements by stirring the people, Alexander J. Dallas was employed by the government to review the causes of the war. The peace soon coming precluded the necessity of publication for the purpose intended, but his paper was not long afterward printed (April, 1815), both at Baltimore and Philadelphia, as *An Exposition of the Causes and Character of the late War with Great Britain*.⁴

On the British side, the Parliamentary blue

¹ Lord Holland, in his *Memoirs of the Whig Party* (London, 1854, ii. p. 98), speaks of the British view of neutral rights as "enforced in a popular but intemperate pamphlet of Mr. Stephen, 'War in Disguise,' adopted in some measure by the decrees of our Court of Admiralty, and highly relished by our navy, to whom it opened unexpected sources of wealth, or rather plunder."

Stapleton's *Canning and his Times* (p. 144) shows how strenuously that minister resisted any yielding of the principle which Great Britain had contended for as to neutral rights. For the debates in Parliament on the Orders in Council, see *Ann. Register*, 1808.

John Randolph, in his crazy leaps in the new harness of opposition, reiterated the views of Stephen in his *War in Disguise*, as ready-made argument just as good to toss about as any others (Schouler, ii. 106). Cf. also Randolph's speech on non-importation (1806,—in Moore's *Amer. Eloquence*, ii.), and a second speech, with Stephen's *Observations on Randolph's Speech* (London, 1806; N. Y., 1806).

² It also accompanied a *Letter from the Minister of the U. S. to Lord Mulgrave*, as published in London in two editions in 1806.

Other indicative tracts of this time are *An Inquiry into the present State of the Foreign Relations of the Union, as affected by the late measures of Administration* (Philad., 1806).

Gouverneur Morris's *British Treaty* (1806), with an App. of state papers, 2d ed. (London, 1808).

Wm. L. Smith's *American Arguments for British rights, being a republication of the celebrated letters of Phocion on the subject of neutral trade* (Charlestown, S. C., 1806).

An anonymous *Remarks on the British Treaty* (Liverpool, 1807).

Thomas G. Fessenden's *Some thoughts on the present dispute between Great Britain and America* (Philad., 1807), a more serious review than his Hudibrastic satire of *Democracy Unveiled*; Alexander Baring's *Inquiry into the Causes and Consequences of the Orders in Council, and an Examination of the Conduct of Great Britain towards the neutral commerce of America* (London, 1808, three editions; and N. Y., 1808, two editions).

T. P. Courtenay's *Observations on the American Treaty* (London, 1808), and *Additional Observations with some remarks on Mr. Baring's pamphlet . . . to which is added an App. of State Papers, including the treaty* (London, 1808).

C. J. Ingersoll's *View of the Rights and Wrongs, power and policy of the U. S.* (Philad., 1808).

³ These and other papers in the interests of the administration's views, are in *Facts and Documents relating to the State of the Controversy between America and Great Britain, and the dispositions of the two Cabinets to make peace* (Boston, 1813).

⁴ This document is well supplied with references to the mass of illustrative public documents by which the course of the controversy can be traced.

Schurz's *Henry Clay* has a good succinct account of the differences with England leading up to the war. The story is told by Morse in his *John Quincy Adams* with no softness of indignation. Cf. on impressment, particularly Garland's *Randolph*, i. ch. 30; Cooper's *Naval Hist.*, ii. 170; Ingersoll's *War of 1812* (ch. 1).

The *American State Papers and Correspondence* (1808-1812), which was printed at Philadelphia, was reprinted in London, 1812.

books afford most of the correspondence, English as well as American.¹ Lord Brougham made one of the leading speeches on the repeal of the Orders in Council.²

The most irritating events of these treacherous times were the affairs of the "Chesapeake" in 1807 and the "Little Belt" in 1811, and of

these untoward encounters there are abundant official records, though somewhat in conflict.³

The relations of the New England Federalists to all these foreign relations was not better calculated to inspire respect than the lingering sympathy for France in their opponents.

¹ *Correspondence of Wellesley, Liverpool, and Castlereagh with the American Ministers in London*, Jan., 1810-July, 1812 (London, 1813—*Pub. doc.*).

Correspondence between Wellesley and Mr. Morier, July 10, 1810-March, 1811 (London, 1813—*Pub. doc.*).

Correspondence between Wellesley and Mr. Foster, April, 1811-Dec., 1811 (London, 1813—*Pub. doc.*).

Correspondence between Castlereagh and Messrs. Foster and Baker, March-Aug., 1812 (London, 1813—*Pub. doc.*). These collections of papers include enclosures in the letters.

Correspondence relative to the French decrees and the Orders in Council subsequent to 20th May, 1812 (London, 1813—*Pub. doc.*). There are letters between Castlereagh and Jonathan Russell, after the declaration of war, as to propositions for further negotiations; and the letters of Castlereagh to Foster relative to the revoking of Orders in Council, before and after Foster left Washington.

On Aug. 1, 1812, Henry Brougham offered his mediatorial services to his government as minister to the United States (*Mem. and Corresp. of Castlereagh*, i. 119, — where will also be found some of Castlereagh's letters).

On July 12, 1813, Madison sent to Congress a *Message*, with the information relating to the repeal of the Berlin and Milan decrees (Washington, 1813).

² *Parliamentary Debates*, xxiii. Cf. Alison's *Lives of Castlereagh and Stewart*, i. 522; his *Hist. of Europe* (N. Y. ed.), iv. 453. This British historian calls the war "unseemly" on the part of the United States.

Stapleton (*Canning and his Times*), 148, contends that the Orders in Council were only a pretence, but that the right claimed by England of the impressment of its own subjects, wherever found, was the real instigation of the war, together with a purpose of the Americans to use the war for securing Canada.

³ We have for the earlier event of the "Chesapeake" and "Leopard," on the American side, the *Proceedings of the General Court-Martial, convened for the trial of Commodore James Barron, etc., Jan., 1808* (Washington, 1808, 1822); the summary given by Representative Thomas Blount, in his *Report on the President's Message, Nov. 17, 1807*; the *Proceedings of the Court of Inquiry*; and Secretary Robt. Smith, correction of inaccuracies in those proceedings, Nov. 23, 1807. Also, *British Papers relating to the U. S.* (London, 1810), as presented to the House of Commons in 1809; and the *Trial of Jenkin Ratford* (reprinted at Boston).

Jefferson, in his message of Dec. 8, 1807, gave the correspondence between his Secretary and the British government up to that time (*State Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 24). Madison's letter, July 6, 1807, to the American minister in London led to correspondence and interviews between Monroe and Canning (*Ibid.* iii. 183, 189, 191, 199); when further negotiation in London was interrupted by the sending of Mr. Rose by the British government to Washington, who at once (Jan. 26, 1808) demanded the recall of the President's proclamation of July 2, 1807 (*Ibid.* iii. 213). Madison's notes of his conferences with Rose in February, 1808, are in *Madison's Letters*, ii. 411. In March, Madison formulated the causes of complaint (*State Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 214, 217), and the President (March 22) sent a message to Congress on the negotiations, and (March 23) he submitted the documentary records of the conferences, with a long report by Madison, of the same date, covering not only the Chesapeake difficulty, but those of impressments in general, and laying before Congress the documents of the negotiations of the ministers in London for a treaty. Senator Anderson, April 16, 1808, made a report on the progress of the negotiations; and Nov. 8, a message from Jefferson indicated continued indisposition on the part of Great Britain to make the necessary amends.

A convenient grouping of the documents is in a *Letter from the Secretary of State to Mr. Monroe on the . . . attack on the Chesapeake. The corresp. of Mr. Monroe with the British government; and also Mr. Madison's corresp. with Mr. Rose on the same subject* (Washington, 1808); and also in the British blue-book, *Papers relating to America presented to the House of Commons* (London, 1810).

For the effects of the attack on the country, see Carey's *Olive Branch*, ch. 20; and Kennedy's *Wirt*, i. ch. 15. Poore's *Descriptive Catal.* (pp. 68, 69, 71-75, 86) will guide to the official publications of the government respecting the affair. Cf. Hildreth, v. 679; Schouler, ii. 145; Cooper's *Naval Hist.*, ii. ch. 7; *Quebec Lit and Hist. Soc. Docs.*, 5th series; L. M. Sargent's *Dealings with the Dead*, ii. 608.

For the "Little Belt" affair, there is a collation of the evidence, with the official accounts of both commanders, in Dawson's *Battles of the U. S.*, ii. ch. 13. These accounts are at variance as respects the ship which fired the first gun. Perry's diary is in W. E. Griffis's *Matthew Calbraith Perry* (Boston, 1887), p. 75. The proceedings of the court-martial (Aug., 1811) of Com. Rodgers accompany the message of the President, Nov. 6, 1811. Cf. Poore's *Desc. Catal.*, p. 90; *Niles's Reg.*, May 16, 1811; Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 184; Hildreth, vi. 245; *Quebec Lit. and Hist. Soc. Docs.*, 5th series, p. 72.

At home, the New England "British faction" had no stronger pamphleteer than John Lowell, and he produced tract after tract.¹ The overtures and rejections of the recent diplomatic intercourse with England and France served him as a text in his *Analysis of the late Correspondence between our Administration and Great Britain and France, with an attempt to show what are the real causes of the failure of the negotiations between France and America* (Boston, 1808), to which was added, shortly afterward, a *Supplement to the late Analysis*, etc. (Boston, 1808).² It was, however, the stand which Mr. Lowell took on the attack on the "Chesapeake" which, in its palliation or justification of the British conduct, expressed the extremity of his party feeling.³

It was these views of Lowell that were among the chief inducements which carried John Quincy Adams, who with Pickering was then Senator from Massachusetts, over to the side of the administration; while Adams's note in support of the embargo completed the breach between the senators. It was when Pickering addressed a letter to Governor Sullivan, *A View of the imminent danger of an unnecessary and ruinous war* (Boston, 1808), that the public first was made to comprehend the radical differences of the two senators.⁴

Adams's reply appeared in the shape of a *Letter to Harrison Gray Otis on our National Affairs*.⁵ Adams further exemplified his views in a *Review of the Works of Fisher Ames*, which originally appeared in the *Boston Patriot*, but was soon published separately as *American Principles* (Boston, 1809). In this he severely animadverted on Fisher Ames's justification of the British Orders in Council. Lowell at once replied in *Remarks on the Hon. John Q. Adams's Review of Mr. Ames's Works* (Boston, 1809), and rebuked what he called an insinuation on Adams's part that Ames meant to drive the country into revolution.

No one was more pained at the defection of Adams than Josiah Quincy of Massachusetts,

but he hesitated to carry with his political aversions to Adams's personal course the inimical relations which other leading Federalists manifested (Quincy's *Quincy*, p. 123). The life of Quincy and some of his speeches,⁶ which are occasionally found in their original pamphlet form, and of which parts of the most representative ones are quoted by his son and biographer, give us the picture of a wary and emphatic opponent of the administration in these troublous times.

John Lowell's *Appeal to the People on the causes and consequences of a war with Great Britain* (Boston, 1811) began his direct attacks on the war party. In his *Mr. Madison's War: a dispassionate inquiry into the reasons alleged by Mr. Madison for declaring an offensive and ruinous war* (Boston, 1812), he presented himself as the champion of those who would criticise the war, even after it was declared, and he urged the reversal of what he called a ruinous policy by a resistance at the polls; and in his *Perpetual War the policy of Mr. Madison* (Boston, 1812), in which he enlarged upon the fruitless efforts of Monroe and Pinkney to settle the impressment question, he claimed that the elections had shown a great revulsion of feeling, and had brought out a body of freemen "who are totally opposed to a war for the privilege of protecting British seamen against their own sovereign." His purpose was further to show that at the last moment the President managed the negotiations with England through Mr. Russell with the purpose of making them unsuccessful, and that the plea on the score of impressments was a pretence. His argument of the right of impressment, as one of long standing, was precisely that of the British themselves.

The progress of the negotiations at Ghent, as they reached Washington, was reported to Congress in the President's messages of Oct. 10 and 14 (with Monroe's instructions), Dec. 1, 1814, and the message of Feb. 20, 1815, laid the treaty⁷ before Congress. Much of the corre-

¹ Sabin, x. nos. 42, 442, etc.

² How its arguments were responded to in England became apparent in *American Candour in a Tract lately published at Boston, entitled An Analysis, etc.* (London, 1809). Madison at this time was accused of suppressing the evidence of "the insulting conduct of the Emperor of France," and of withholding the "most pacific expressions of Great Britain." Cf. *Further and still more important suppressed documents, 1807-1808*.

³ *Peace without Dishonor — War without Hope. A calm and dispassionate Enquiry into the Question of the Chesapeake* (Boston, 1807). *Thoughts upon the Conduct of an Administration in relation to Great Britain and France, . . . especially in reference to . . . the attack on the Chesapeake* (Boston, 1808).

⁴ J. Q. Adams's *Memoirs*, i. 522; Upham's *Pickering*, iv. 126. Cf. Timothy Pickering's *Letters addressed to the people of the U. S. on the conduct of the past and present administrations towards Great Britain and France*. London, 1812.

⁵ Boston, 1808; two eds.; Salem, 1808; London, 1808; Baltimore, 1824, with an app.

⁶ The best known of these speeches were those on fortifying harbors (1806); on the Embargo (1807); on foreign relations (1808); on the extra session (1809); and on the Jackson imbroglio.

⁷ The treaty is found in *Treaties and Conventions; Statutes at Large*, viii. 218; Lossing's *War of 1812*,

spondence is preserved in the *State Papers, For. Rel.*, iii. 705, iv. 810; and in the *Documents relating to the negotiations for peace* (Philad., 1814). One of the commissioners at a later day published *The duplicate letter, the Fisheries and the Mississippi; documents relating to transactions at the negotiations of Ghent, collected and published by John Quincy Adams* (Washington, 1822).¹

The diplomatic negotiations of Monroe's term centred mostly in those with Spain and with her colonies. The *Descriptive Catalogue* of Poore will direct the inquirer to the official publications of the American government, and the bibliography annexed to Gilman's *James Monroe* will be helpful.²

The enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine in the message of Dec. 2, 1823,³ was not wholly novel, though the threatened intervention of the Holy Alliance to subjugate the Spanish-American re-

App. The fac-similes of the signatures are given in Gay's *Pop. Hist. U. S.*, iv. 241; and in Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 1062. Cf. Daniel Chapman's *Crisis, — On the origin and consequences of our political discussions, to which is annexed the late treaty* (Albany, 1815).

¹ Madison (*Letters*, iii. 288), receiving a copy from its compiler, wrote to him: "Incidents elucidating the transaction cannot but be interesting; and they are made the more so by the eloquent strain in which they are presented." We gain more knowledge of the every-day aspects of the negotiations through Adams than in any other way. His *Memoirs* (vol. ii. and iii.) give us his daily jottings. Cf. J. T. Morse's *J. Q. Adams*, pp. 77-98.

Schurz (*Henry Clay*, i. ch. 6) gives us a very intelligible account of the negotiations. Cf. *Clay's Correspondence*. Gallatin, however, is the central figure. Cf. Adams's *Writings of Gallatin*, i. 618-646, for letters; and his *Gallatin*, book iv.; Stevens's *Gallatin*, ch. 8; C. F. Adams's *Struggle for Neutrality in America*, p. 43.

Among the general historians, see Hildreth, vi. 567; Schouler, ii. 433; Lossing's *War of 1812*; Ingersoll's *War of 1812* (2d ser. ch. 1).

On the English side, beside the regular Sessional Papers, see the *Castlereagh Correspondence*, x. 67-71, 89; 3d ser. ii.; Wellington's *Supplemental Despatches*, ix. Adams, in his *Gallatin*, gives the substance of these.

² Cf. particularly for territorial disputes, *The official correspondence between Don Luis de Onís and J. Q. Adams in relation to the Floridas and the boundaries of Louisiana* (London, 1818). On the Spanish side, see Luis de Onís's *Memoria sobre las negociaciones* (Madrid, 1820), which was translated by Tobias Watkins as *Memoir upon the negotiations between Spain and the U. S.* (Washington, 1821). In illustration of the protracted and at times dangerous tendencies of these negotiations, see Adams's *Memoirs*, iv., and Morse's *J. Q. Adams*, p. 111.

³ *Statesman's Manual*, i. 460; *State Papers, For. Rel.*, v. 245.

⁴ Randall, iii. 263; Schouler, ii. 202.

⁵ Randall, iii. 493; Morse's *J. Q. Adams*, 130.

⁶ *Works*, iv. 455.

⁷ *Memoirs*, xii. 218; *Cong. Globe*, xviii. 712; *Penna. Mag. Hist.*, vi. 358.

⁸ Benton's *Debates*, vii. 470; Morse's *J. Q. Adams*, 137; Lalor's *Cyclopædia*, ii. 900.

⁹ Cf. *Poole's Index*, p. 862; Rush's *Court of London*, ch. 23; Webster's exposition in *Works*, iii. 178, 201; and life of Webster by Lodge (p. 141); Gilman's *Monroe*, ch. 7; Schouler, iii. 287; Gay's *Pop. Hist.*, iv. 279; Von Holst, i. 419; Gorham Abbott's *Mexico*, p. 310; F. Kapp's *Aus und über Amerika* (Berlin, 1876), i. 130; G. F. Tucker's *Monroe Doctrine, a concise history of its origin and growth* (Boston, 1885); Joshua Leavitt's *Monroe Doctrine in The New Englander*, xxii. 729, and separately (N. Y., 1863); Dana's ed. of Wheaton, note 36; and *No. Am. Rev.*, Sept., Dec., 1881, by Kasson.

There is a partial bibliography of the Panama Congress in Gilman's *Monroe*, 273. For official Amer. documents, see Poore's *Descriptive Index*, p. 1339; and references under Panama Mission in *Poole's Index*. For personal relations, see Benton's *Debates*, vols. viii., ix.; his *Thirty Years*, i. ch. 25; Webster in *Works*, iii. 178; Levi Woodbury's *Writings*, i. 67; Winthrop's *Address*, 1878, etc., p. 47; Peleg Sprague's *Speeches* (Boston, 1858); Sumner's *Jackson*, 107; Garland's *Randolph*, ii. ch. 30; Curtis's *Buchanan*, i. 64; Schurz's *Clay*, i. 267; Schouler, iii. 359.

publics for Spain first gave it a practical significance at this juncture. Gilman (*Monroe*, p. 162) points out instances of the thought going back to the time of the Revolution. Something like it had been uttered by Jefferson⁴ fifteen years earlier, and both Jefferson and John Quincy Adams, within a short time before Monroe published his message, had formulated the idea.⁵ Indeed, Adams had given shape to that part of the message which expressed it.⁶ Calhoun has given us his recollections of the origin of Monroe's expressions and his interpretation of the doctrine.⁷ Popular estimation has given a more defiant meaning to Monroe's language than was intended.⁸

A considerable bibliography of the Monroe Doctrine and its application is furnished by J. F. Jameson in the Appendix of Gilman's *James Monroe*.⁹

For the negotiations in London during Monroe's administration, beside the records in the

official publications of the two governments, we have a good personal exposition in Richard Rush's *Narrative of a residence at the Court of London, 1817-1825* (London and Philad., 1833).¹

Albert Gallatin was prominent at this period in the negotiations both in England and in France.²

For the negotiations of J. Q. Adams's term (1825-1829), we have the usual record in the *Foreign Relations*, vol. vi.,³ and for that of Jackson's administration (1829-1837) we must trust to the official documents as reached through Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*.⁴

The negotiations for the treaty⁵ of 1842 with England are best followed in the documentary records of the two countries, which are enumerated in the Appendix of the present volume (*post*) in connection with the northern-boundary controversy.⁶

¹ The second revised edition was called *Memoranda of a Residence at the Court of London* (1833); and to this was added a second series, *Memoranda of a Residence, etc., comprising incidents, official and personal, 1819-1825; including negotiations in the Oregon question, and other unsettled questions between the U. S. and Great Britain* (Philad. and London, 1845); again edited with occasional notes by his son, Benj. Rush (London, 1873). Cf. references in Allibone, ii. 1893. Rush's diplomatic papers are in *State Papers, For. Rel.*, iv., etc.

² For Gallatin's negotiations for commercial relations in England, see Adams's *Gallatin*, and A. G. Stapleton's *Polit. Life of Geo. Canning, 1822-1827* (London, 1831), iii. ch. 13. His correspondence as minister to France, 1816-1823, is in the *State Papers, For. Rel.*, v. 24, 284, 645. Cf. Stevens's *Gallatin*, 343; Adams's *Gallatin*. The medal struck to commemorate the convention with France, June 24, 1822, is given in Loubat, no. liii., showing the head of Louis XVIII.

³ Cf. also Adams's *Gallatin*; Stevens's *Gallatin*; Schurz's *Clay*, i. 296; Schouler, iii. 391.

⁴ Cf. also Benton's *Debates*; his *Thirty Years*, i. ch. 134; Sumner's *Jackson*, ch. 15; Parton's *Jackson* (titles i. pp. xviii, xx); Hunt's *Edw. Livingston* (France); Smith's *Lewis Cass*, ch. 22 (France); and J. Q. Adams in *Ann. Reg.*, vii. 16.

⁵ *Treaties and Conventions*, 369; Webster's *Works*, vi. 356 (with message communicating it to Congress, p. 347).

⁶ Cf. Webster's *Works*, vi. 292; Curtis's *Webster*, ii. ch. 28, 29; Lodge's *Webster*, 253; Benton's *Thirty Years*, ii. ch. 101-106; Roosevelt's *Benton*, ch. 12; L. G. Tyler's *Tylers*, ii. 201.

For the McLeod case, see *Webster*, v., vi.; *Lalor*, ii. 822; S. G. Brown's *Rufus Choate*, and Choate's *Speech of June 11, 1841* (Washington, 1841). In general on the revolt in Canada, 1837, see Bonney's *Gleanings*, ii. ch. 4, 5; Gay, iv. 855; Benton's *Thirty Years*, ii. ch. 75, 76.

For operations on the African coast as the result of the treaty of 1842, see Griffis's *M. C. Perry*, ch. 19, 20.

⁷ *June 24, 1846, 29th Cong., 1st sess. Ho. Rept. No. 752.*

⁸ Thus J. Q. Adams's *Memoirs* serve us as to his mission to Holland in 1794 (i. ch. 2); as to those to Prussia in 1797 (vol. i.); to Russia in 1809-1813 (vol. ii.); to Great Britain in 1815 (vol. iii.). Curtis's *Webster* (i. 201) and his *Works*, as well as the lives and speeches of Clay, show us the feeling of the country on the Greek Revolution of 1823. (Cf. Schouler, iii. 303; C. K. Tuckerman in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Aug., 1887.) The *Life of John Randolph*, by Garland (ii. ch. 41), and Bouldin's *Home Reminiscences of Randolph* (ch. 11), give us the personal aspects of the mission to Russia in 1830; and in Curtis's *James Buchanan* (i. ch. 7-9) we have the succeeding minister's experiences.

For the relations with the Barbary States, the lives of Joel Barlow, General Eaton, and the naval commanders supplement the official records. The *Life of Webster*, by Curtis (ii. 177), and Webster's *Works* help us in the history of the treaty with China.

For all these matters the feelings in Congress must be looked for in Benton's *Debates* and in his *Thirty Years' View*; and the general histories of Lyman, Trescott, and Schuyler will not, of course, be overlooked.

As respects the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, we have the usual government publications, reached through Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*, and for commentary a *Review of the diplomatic policy of the Executive of the United States to conquer a peace with Mexico* (Washington, 1847). The defence of the war and its diplomacy is traced in the *Report of C. J. Ingersoll*, in answer to deprecatory memorials, made for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.⁷ The best key to the Mexican documents, and indeed to all the diplomatic papers of the subject, is in H. H. Bancroft's *Mexico* (vol. v.).

As regards the minor diplomatic relations, the government records, so far as made public, must be in the main sought in the official publications reached through Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*, supplemented by the personal memoirs of the principal negotiators.⁸

APPENDIX.

I.

TERRITORIAL ACQUISITIONS AND DIVISIONS.

By the Editor, with the coöperation of Professor Edward Channing.

THE claim laid by Virginia, under her charter and by reason of the conquests of George Rogers Clark,¹ to so large a part of the country beyond the mountains² had early in the Revolutionary War been questioned by those States having no chartered extension to the west, on the ground that they had made common cause in securing independence, and that accordingly such results as might accrue from the confirmation to them, at the peace, of these unsettled lands ought to be shared in common by the States, since they had all been instrumental in acquiring them. Maryland, in discussing the Articles of Confederation in 1777, had ineffectually tried to curtail the States of this Western territory. On June 13, 1778, Rhode Island had pressed this consideration,³ and almost immediately New Jersey urged that the Confederation should have power to dispose of these lands for defraying the expenses of the war.⁴ Maryland finally took a bold and somewhat adroit stand, Dec. 15, 1778, in blocking the transition to the Confederation, by refusing to join in the votes establishing it until this question was settled, and on May 21, 1779, her protest was laid before Congress.⁵ Virginia, at whom the blow was principally aimed, rather arrogantly told the remonstrants that she could manage her own affairs, and proceeded to arrange for disposing of her lands through a land office,⁶ for it was apparent that the feeling was growing among the smaller States; and Delaware had also entered her protest in the previous January.⁷ By autumn Congress was brought to take action, and on Oct. 30 that body, by a resolution, asked Virginia to pause, and at least to refrain from issuing land warrants while the war lasted.⁸ All the delegates joined in this recommendation except those of Virginia and North Carolina.

The first movement came from New York. She had claims to the territory from the Lakes to the Cumberland Mountains, including Kentucky, which Virginia also claimed. New York professed to hold this territory, both north and south of the Ohio, under treaties which she had made with the Six Nations and their conquered tributaries; and on Feb. 19, 1780, she authorized the cession of these claims to the United States, under certain conditions.⁹ In the autumn, Congress went farther than in its resolution of the previous year, and (Sept. 6, 1780) recommended all the States holding such claims "to make a liberal surrender of a portion" of them in order to secure the stability of the entire Union; and a month later (Oct. 10th) it was determined, as the first step in the administration of the public domain, that all Western lands thus ceded should be disposed of for the common advantage, saving only that the reasonable expenses of any State thus ceding her right might be allowed to her, in case she had been at the cost of defending during the war the ceded parts; and furthermore, Congress provided for forming new States out of such cessions.¹⁰ At the same time, Connecticut made proposals for a cession, but with restrictions which compelled Congress to reject them. It was now that Thomas Paine, in his tract called *Public Good* (Philadelphia, 1780), attacked the justice of the Virginian claims, while he urged, with hardly the old vigor of his earlier days, that a new State should be formed of these Western lands, and the proceeds of the sales of land should be used to pay the debts of the war. Public opinion was ready for the support which such views gave it, and Maryland had put herself in the centre

Connecticut under their charters, and New York under her treaties with the Indians, disputed this claim of Virginia in large part. Virginia had reiterated her charter-claims of 1609 (*Laws of the U. S.*, Duane, i. 465) in her declaration of June, 1776 (Hening, ix. 118). She also, in the issuing of land warrants, ignored the claims of the earlier land companies to the same territory.

¹ Story on the *Constitution*, i. 215.

² *Journals*, iii. 384.

³ *Public Domain*, 65.

⁴ *Journals*, iii. 526, 535.

¹ Vol. VI. ch. 9.

² Rives's *Madison*, i. 433. Cf. Towle's *Constitution*, p. 350.

³ *Journals of Congress*, ii. 601.

⁴ *Journals*, ii. 605; *Secret Journals*, i. 377.

⁵ *Journals*, iii. 281; *Secret Journals*, i. 433; Hening, x. 549; Donaldson's *Public Domain*, 61; Curtis's *Constitution*, i. 501; Towle's *Constitution*, 351. Maryland had assumed a similar position as early as 1776. Shosuke Sato's *Land Question*, 27, with references.

⁶ Hening's *Statutes*, x. 50-65, 357. Massachusetts and

of the negotiations. There could be no confederation until she acceded, and the stand made by Virginia was in the way. The next year had just opened, when Virginia (Jan. 2, 1781), attaching certain conditions, signified her willingness to make a cession of the territory above the Ohio.¹ One of these conditions, looking to her retention of the present territory of Kentucky, called upon Congress to guarantee to Virginia all her other possessions. The price was too great, and Congress declined to accept the conditions, and Virginia yielded to New York the opportunity of assuming the lead in this great movement, as was done in March (1781), when Congress formally accepted the grant which New York had earlier proposed.² The principle was established. Maryland did not insist longer upon keeping aloof; on the same day she joined the Confederation; and the organization under the Articles was at once completed.³

To carry the war to a successful issue, and to reap the fruits of the victory at Yorktown, were measures just becoming too engrossing, and the Western projects made little development till the peace was assured. The army now looked to this great domain to recompense its sufferings. Gen. Rufus Putnam took a leading



RUFUS PUTNAM.*

part in the petition to Congress for grants of land, and Washington urged the matter approvingly upon Congress.⁴ The scheme of a settlement there also engaged the attention of Timothy Pickering, who came forward with a plan of organization which should emphatically exclude slavery from the soil.⁵ Theodorick Bland, on June 3, 1783, with the support of Hamilton, offered in Congress the first pattern of an ordinance for the government of the region which it was proposed to accept conditionally from Virginia, and ultimately to divide into States, as soon as such sections of it should contain 20,000 inhabitants. Here it was also planned that the soldiers should receive lands, the civil list and navy should gain support, and seminaries of learning find an income.⁶ Congress some months later, on Sept. 13th, at last prescribed the conditions of the Virginia cession, and they were agreed to by all the States except Maryland and New Jersey.⁷ Virginia no longer resisted, and on Oct. 20th authorized her delegates to make the cession on the prescribed terms, and on March 1, 1784, the deed of cession was passed,⁸ and Virginia was shrunken to the limits contained in the present States of Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky. Some weeks later (April 23, 1784) an act, known as the ordinance of 1784, was, after some

amendments, passed in Congress for the temporary government of this ceded region, and it was proposed to divide it ultimately into ten States.⁹ The ordinance was inoperative, and nothing was done under it. Jefferson was trying to induce Virginia and the other Southern States to unite in ceding all lands west of the meridian of Kenawha.

The attempt of North Carolina to meet such expectations was not propitious. She passed a vote of cession in June, 1784,¹⁰ when the inhabitants of the region beyond the mountains, on the pretence of finding themselves thrown off from the protection of the parent State, took occasion to set up as a State by themselves, under

¹ *Journals*, iv. 265; Hening, x. 564; *Public Domain*, 67.

² New York placed her own western limits on the meridian of the extreme western end of Lake Ontario, which left the "Erie Triangle" at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania. This was included both in the New York and Massachusetts cessions; and the United States, in 1792, sold this to Pennsylvania, to give her a frontage on Lake Erie. The history of the Erie Triangle is told in the *Report of the Regents' Boundary Commission upon the N. Y. and Penna. Boundary* (Albany, 1886, App. M, p. 438). Cf. *Penna. Archives*, xi. p. 104; *Col. Rec.*, xv.

³ *Journals*, iii. 582.

⁴ Walker's *Athens County, Ohio*, 30, for this and later correspondence of Putnam and Washington; also *Life of M. Cutler*, i. 152.

⁵ Pickering's *Pickering*, i. 509, 546.

⁶ Bancroft, final rev., vi. 81.


⁷ Cf. New Jersey's claim; *Journals*, iv. 341.

⁸ *Journals of Congress*, iv. 267, 342; Hening, xi. 336, 571; *Public Domain*, 68. The requirement which she imposed of divisions into States was modified, Dec. 30, 1788, by request of Congress. Her other requirement, that certain parts of the cession should be allowed to her soldiers in the war, was accepted by Congress. These military lands are shown in the map on a later page.

⁹ In the beginning of the discussion it had been proposed, somewhat fantastically, to call these divisions *Sylvania*, *Michigan*, *Chersonesus*, *Assenisipia*, *Metropotamia*, *Illinoia*, *Saratoga*, *Washington*, *Polypotamia*, *Pelesipia*. Cf. *Journals of Congress*; *Public Domain*, 147; Sparks's *Washington*, ix. 48; McMaster, i. 166; C. M. Walker's *Athens County*, 40; *St. Clair Papers*, ii. 604; Sato, p. 80; W. F. Poole in *No. Amer. Rev.*, 1876, p. 238; Cole's *History of the Ordinance*, 7; *Life of M. Cutler*, ii. App. D; Bancroft, final revision, vi. 116.

¹⁰ Cf. J. G. M. Ramsey in *Land we love*, iv. and v.

* After a cut in *Harper's Mag.*, lxxi. p. 553. Cf. *Hist. Washington County, Ohio*, p. 28.



DIVISION OF STATES, ORDINANCE OF 1784.*

* A folding map showing this division appeared in *Francis Bailey's Pocket Almanac* for 1785, published at Philadelphia, with a copy of the ordinance in the body of the little book. The same plate, with Bailey's name erased, was used in *John McCulloch's Introd. to the Hist. of America, designed to instruct American youth in the elements of the history of their own country* (Philad., 1787). It was reengraved in the *Reise durch einige der mittlern und südlichen vereinigten nord Amerikanischen Staaten, in den Jahren 1783 und 1784, von Johann David Schöpf* (Erlangen, 1788), and from this last the above cut is reproduced. The only other map showing these divisions, which I have seen, is one on a much larger scale, crudely "engraved and printed by the author," John Fitch, and called *A map of the north west parts of the United States of America*. It bears this note: "The several divisions on the north west of the Ohio is the form

the name of Franklin,¹ with John Sevier, the hero of King's Mountain, as governor, where he and his legislature maintained a precarious existence for four years.² The people of the district were by no means unanimous in the scheme, and a considerable portion looked with distrust upon a tendency to ally the new government with Spain. The parent State supported this distrustful class by annulling the act of cession (Nov., 1784) before Congress could accept it, and reestablishing its own sway. The country was for a while distracted with a conflicting allegiance. By 1786 the conservative party had gathered strength enough to give warning of the collapse to the premature State, which came in 1787. Sevier was tried for high-treason and convicted, but was subsequently pardoned. For two years more (1788-1790) the territory remained a part of North Carolina, till finally (April 2, 1790) ceded,³ when it became a territory of the Union, and in 1796 it was admitted to the Union as the State of Tennessee.⁴



SKETCH MAP OF CESSIONS.*

war. It was on this trip that Washington first met Albert Gallatin, who, at the suggestion of Patrick Henry,

¹ It is sometimes given Frankland; but Franklin was assured by the movers in the matter that the State was named for him. Franklin's *Works*, x. 260, 266, 290; Hildreth, iii. 469, 539; Albach's *Annals*, 507.

² On Sevier, see "Knoxville in the Olden Time" in *Harper's Mag.*, lxxi. 69; Parton's *Jackson*, i. 230.

³ But subject to such conditions and claims as left no land for the public domain (Hildreth, iv. 205).

⁴ Gannett's *Boundaries of the U. S.*, 108; I. W. Andrews in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Oct., 1887, p. 306; Parton's *Jackson*, i. ch. 15; McMaster, ii. 285; Jameson, *Const. Convention*, 159; J. G. M. Ramsey's *Annals of Tennessee* (Charleston, 1853; Philad., 1853, 1860, — Sabin, xvi. no. 67, 729).

Field (*Indian Bibliog.*, nos. 670, 1,261) finds that Ramsey adds greatly to original material, beyond what he took from John Haywood's *Civil and Political Hist. of Ten-*

nessee to 1796 (Knoxville, 1823, — now rare, and worth say \$30-50); W. H. Carpenter's *Hist. of Tennessee* (Philad., 1857); W. W. Clayton's *Davidson County, Tenn.* The history of the early Cumberland settlements is told in A. W. Putnam's *Hist. of Middle Tennessee, or the life and times of Gen. James Robertson* (Nashville, 1859). W. R. Garrett's paper on *The northern boundary of Tennessee* (Nashville, 1884) covers the question of the bounds on Kentucky.

J. R. Gilmore's *John Sevier as a Commonwealth builder* (New York, 1887) is founded in part on material gathered by Ramsey since he wrote his *Annals*. Isaac Smucker on the "Southwestern Territory" in the *Mag. Western Hist.*, Aug., 1887; Poole's *Index*, p. 1294. James D. Davis's *Hist. of Memphis* (Memphis, 1873) begins with the grants to John Rice and John Ramsey in 1789.

⁵ Cf. *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Nov., 1887, p. 437.

which that country is to be laid off into according to an ordinance of Congress of May 20, 1785." Fitch dedicates the map to Thomas Hutchins, Geographer of the United States, and acknowledges his indebtedness to the surveys of Hutchins and William M. Murray. Whittlesey (*Fitch*, xvi.) says that Fitch took his impressions on a cedar press in Bucks County, Penn., where he sold his map at six shillings to raise money to follow his steamboat experiments. (Cf. Preble's *Steam Navigation*, p. 13.) There is a recognition of these proposed States in a legend across the country on the map in Winterbotham's *America*; but no lines are defined.

The most convenient record of the subsequent actual division of this territory into States, with the consecutive changes, is in Gannett's *Boundaries of the U. S.* (Washington, 1885), and in Donaldson's *Public Domain* (p. 160). A series of sketch maps in Farmer's *Detroit and Michigan* (p. 86) show at a glance territorial changes, particularly as they affected the limits of the territory now known as Michigan at different times (1787, 1800, 1802, 1805, 1816, 1818, 1834, 1836).

Surveys of the Ohio and Mississippi (below the Ohio) were made by Andrew Ellicott in 1796, and are given in his *Journal* (Philad., 1803).

* The region 1, 1, was acquired under the specific bounds of the treaty of 1782-83, which gave to the United States all territory east of the Mississippi, supposing, however, that the Mississippi reached the 49° parallel, — the geographical error compelling the line to follow a meridian north till it struck that parallel. The tract 2, 2, was a continuation of the Massachusetts charter extreme bounds westerly, and was the region ceded by that State. Her claims to the lands in Western New York were based on the same rights, which the charter to the Duke of York for Eastern New York had not annulled. Region 3 was Connecticut's claim for similar charter rights, which also involved claims to the Susquehanna country in Pennsylvania, over which there was a long controversy (see Vol. VI. p. 680). The small triangular region at the northwest corner of Pennsylvania was also in the Connecticut cession, and was later sold to Pennsylvania by the general government. The country northwest of the Ohio, marked 4, was the cession of Virginia; but this, as well as a portion of 5, was also ceded by New York, on the ground that treaties with the Iroquois had given that State rights over the lands of the tribes tributary to the Iroquois. Kentucky (5) is sometimes considered a cession of Virginia, but she parted with her jurisdiction over it only to let the territory become a State, and it never fell into the public domain. The North Carolina cession was Tennessee (6). The narrow strip (7) south of Tennessee was ceded by South

had crossed the mountains in search of a place to settle. Washington saw the danger of the trade of the new country tending by the easier water channels to Canada or Louisiana, if a passage for merchandise and peltries through the mountains could not be made. Jefferson was looking forward to the time when the valley of the Hudson might be the rival of that of the Potomac, as the readiest method of opening communication with these Western lands.¹ Washington urged his project of a canal upon Virginia and Maryland; and as a result the Potomac Company was formed, with Washington as its president, a position he held until he took the Executive Chair of the States in 1789.²



JOEL BARLOW.*

¹ Sparks's *Corresp. of the Rev.*, iv. 64.

² Cf. H. B. Adams on Washington's interests in the Potomac Company, in Johns Hopkins University Studies, 3d series, no. 1, developing material earlier used in Andrew Stewart's *Report on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal* (1st sess., 19th Cong., no. 228, in 1826) and in John Pickell's *New Chapter in the early life of Washington in connection with the narrative history of the Potomac Company*


(N. Y. 1856). The charter of the Potomac Company was surrendered in 1828, when the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. succeeded to its purposes and archives; and from these latter, with the help of Washington's private letters contributed by Sparks, Pickell wrote his book.

Cf. also the *Washington-Crawford Letters concerning Western Lands*, Ed. by C. W. Butterfield (Cincinnati, 1877), and Irving's *Washington*, iv. ch. 35.

Carolina, and was afterwards divided between Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Georgia's cession was 8, but there was some question if the southern part of it, below the parallel of the Yazoo River (*d*), as having been joined to West Florida by England in 1768, was not added to the public domain by the treaty of 1782-83. The peninsula of Florida (*g*) as far west as the Appalachicola (*c*) was acquired by the treaty of 1819; but whether the westerly part to the Mississippi and Lake Pontchartrain was so acquired admits of argument. That treaty confirmed the United States in possession; but they had claimed that the Louisiana purchase extended to the Appalachicola. The present disposition of bounds carries the State of Louisiana easterly to Pearl River (*a*), and Florida westerly to Perdido River (*b*), — the intervening territory being divided between the States of Alabama and Mississippi.

* After a print by Edwin in the *Analectic Mag.*, Aug., 1814, with a memoir. It is the upper portion of a portrait by Robert Fulton, representing the poet sitting and holding a manuscript. This was engraved by A. B. Durand for the *National Portrait Gallery*, 1834; and it is also given by C. B. Todd in his *History of Reading, Conn.*, 1880, and in his *Life and Letters of Joel Barlow* (1886). Cf. Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 94. A portrait by Baroier, engraved by Ruotte, appeared in the fifth corrected edition of his *Vision of Columbus*, at Paris, in 1793.

In 1785 (April 19) Massachusetts ceded the territory¹ which she claimed under her charter as extending westward beyond the country where her title had been extinguished by later grants, being a region wide enough to be bounded easterly by the southerly end of Lake Huron and its water passage to its outlet in Lake Erie, and so stretching westerly across and beyond Lake Michigan till it reached the Mississippi River. The territory above the northern line of this strip (43° 43' 12" N. latitude) had come into the Union by the treaty with Great Britain, without being claimed by any of the States.



BARLOW'S MAP.*

¹ *Journals of Congress*, iv. 697; *Public Domain*, 71.

* Fac-simile of the sketch given in Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 179, showing the essential parts of a map issued by Barlow in Paris, with his proposals to induce immigration, but the legends are turned into English from the original French. There is a copy of the original (Portfolio 3,830) in Harvard College library, *Plan des Achats des Compagnies de l'Ohio et du Scioto*. "The map," says Howe, "is inaccurate in its geography and fraudulent in its statements." The country was a wilderness where the map calls it inhabited and cleared, "habité et défriché." This region corresponds to what was known as the Seven Ranges of Townships, which Congress, May 20, 1785, directed to be sold, under surveys by Thomas Hutchins; and this is the only foundation for the alleged settlement of them. There are various published maps of them (one by Mr. Carey, without date, is on paper with the water-mark of 1794). They are shown, as surveyed, on Melish's map of Ohio, given in fac-simile on another page. The "first town," or the "première ville" of the original map, is the Fair Haven laid out by the Ohio Company. Gallipolis was built on higher ground, four miles below (McMaster, ii. 146). Howe (p. 180) gives a view of the village as prepared for the reception of the French, drawing it from the description of a man who helped to build it. Cf. map of Ohio Company purchase in Walker's *Athens County, Ohio*.

Massachusetts also held claims under her charter to lands in Western New York, as being beyond the grants to the Duke of York in Eastern New York. An agreement was reached at Hartford, Dec. 16, 1786, by which the proprietary rights to this territory were divided, but the jurisdiction was yielded to New York.¹

In 1788 Massachusetts sold her pre-emptive rights in these lands to a company, whose territory thus acquired became known as the "Phelps and Gorham Purchase."² In 1791 this company surrendered to Massachusetts its title to lands west of the Genesee River, and that State resold it to Robert Morris in the same year, and he in turn sold the greater part of the tract in 1792-93 to an association of Dutch capitalists called the "Holland Land Company," while what he retained became known as the "Morris Reserve."³

Robert Morris, also in 1790, bought of the Phelps and Gorham Company a large tract, which he sold in 1791 to an English company, headed by Sir Wm. Pulteney, and this became known as the "Pulteney Estate."⁴

On May 20, 1785, Congress passed the first ordinance respecting the method of disposing of the Western lands.⁵

South of the Massachusetts claim lay a region of less extent north and south, which was bounded easterly by about one half of the western bounds of Pennsylvania, and which retained that width through to the Mississippi. This was the claim of Connecticut, as included in her chartered rights under similar circumstances, as determined the rights of Massachusetts,⁶ and on Sept. 14, 1786, that State ceded all this territory, except

¹ James Sullivan's *Report to the Mass. Legislature*, and T. C. Amory's *James Sullivan*, i. ch. 8; *Report of Regents of the N. Y. Univ. Boundary Commission*, Albany, 1886, App. L; Hildreth, iii. 531, 541.

² Cf. map in Jeremy M. Parker's *Rochester* (Rochester, 1884), p. 44. Also O'Reilly's *Sketches of Rochester* (Rochester, 1838); *Hist. Mag.*, xv. 371; Amory's *James Sullivan*, i. 173; J. H. Hotchkiss's *Hist. of the Purchase and Settlement of Western N. Y.* (N. Y., 1848). The Phelps and Gorham deed from the Six Nations is in F. B. Hough's *Proceedings of the Commis. of Indian Affairs*, i. 160.

³ Cf. O. Turner's *History of the pioneer settlement of Phelps and Gorham's purchase, and Morris' reserve; preceded by some account of French and English dominion, border wars of the revolution, Indian councils and land cessions, [etc.] [With Appendix]* (Rochester, 1851), and the same author's *Pioneer history of the Holland purchase of western New York; embracing some account of the ancient remains; a brief history of the confederated Iroquois—a synopsis of colonial history, and a history of pioneer settlement under the auspices of the Holland company; including reminiscences of the war of 1812, etc.* (Buffalo, 1849). The personal recollections of Thomas Morris, and how he carried out Robert Morris's obligations to extinguish the Indian title in 1797, are given in *Hist. Mag.*, 1869, p. 367. Cf. *Indian Treaties* (Washington, 1826); Stone's *Red Jacket* (Albany, 1866). A preliminary report of the Holland Company, Peter Stadnitski's *Voorafgaand Bericht*, was published at Amsterdam in 1792. The advantages of the region were also set forth alluringly in Capt. Van Pradelle's *Reflections offertes aux Capitalistes de l'Europe* (Amsterdam, 1792). Several maps of the tract bought by the Holland Company were issued by J. and R. Ellicott in 1800. Frederik Muller & Co., Amsterdam, 1884, advertised these and some original drawn maps in their *Topographie et Cartographie Ancienne*, p. 79. Conover's *Early Hist. of Geneva* (Geneva, 1880) gives the detailed history of a part of this Massachusetts claim, called "The Gore."

⁴ Various early descriptions of the Genesee region are included in the *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, vol. ii., giving some that had been printed at the time, like Capt. Charles Williamson's *Description of the settlement of the Genesee Country* (N. Y., 1796, 1799), by an agent of the Pulteney Estate, and Robert Monro's *Description of the Genesee Country* (N. Y., 1804). Cf. also *Description of the Genesee Country, its rapidly progressive population and improvement* (Albany, 1798), and Judge William Cooper's *Guide in the Wilderness, or the History of the first settlements in the western counties of N. Y.* (Dublin, 1810). There is more or less about these early settlements in such early travellers as Crèvecoeur, Bigelow, Stansbury, Darby, and Dwight. (Cf. *The Library of Cornell University*, July,

1883.) There is a map of the Genesee lands, 1790, in *Doc. Hist. N. Y.*, ii. 1115. A map of Western New York in 1809 is given in the *Doc. Hist. N. Y.*, ii. 1188.

⁵ *Journals*, iv. 520; Duane's *Laws of the U. S.*, i. 563. The early cessions of the States, together with the later Louisiana purchase, and the Oregon region, and that portion of the northwest territory north of the Massachusetts cession, which was acquired by the treaty of 1782-83, without being within the limits of any of the original States, constitute what is known as the Public Lands, or Public Domain, west of the Alleghanies, prior to the conquests of the Mexican War. The essential cyclopædic treatment of all the methods of surveying, partitioning, granting, and administering all this property of the government is the large volume known as Donaldson's *Public Domain*. Under the heads of "Public Lands" and "Land" in the index of Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue of Government Publications*, indications will be found of the vast amount of official documentary material pertaining to the subject. The government have at different times codified its laws on the subject, as in *Laws, Treaties, and other documents* (1810); *Laws, resolutions, treaties, etc.* (1828); *General public Acts, etc.* (1838), to which may be added W. W. Lester's *Decisions in Public Land Cases, etc.* (Philad., 1860-70); H. R. Copp's *Public Land Laws* (Washington, 1875); J. B. Lewis's *Leading Cases on Public Land Laws* (Washington, 1870); and the references in Jones's *Index to Legal Periodicals*, p. 298. Further fundamental references are the *Amer. State Papers, Public Lands*; and the index of Benton's *Debates*. (Cf. his *Thirty Years*, i. ch. 35.) A condensed history of the public lands, by Worthington C. Ford, is in Lalor's *Cyclopædia* (ii. 460-479), and he refers to the most complete record of legislation in the *Report of the Land Commission (Ex. Doc. 47, part iv., Ho. of Rep. 46th Cong., 2d session)*; and to the principal views on disputed methods of management as embodied in the works of Hamilton, John Adams, Webster, Clay, and Calhoun. The first thirty or more years of the land system (1800-1832) is epitomized in Sumner's *Andrew Jackson* (ch. 9); and a general survey is given in Shosuke Sato's *Hist. of the Land Question in the U. S.* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies). Cf. also Von Holst's *Constitutional Law, 179-182*; and Barrows's *United States of Yesterday and of Tomorrow*, ch. 7.

⁶ There was this difference, however: the Massachusetts original charter had been annulled by royal authority, and a new charter substituted, which did not include these western limits. It had not been done in the case of Connecticut, though similar abridgments had been imposed on all the other colonies claiming these Western lands. The States, after the Declaration of Independence, insisted on their original bounds.

the western end of it, which became known as the "Western Reserve,"¹ jurisdiction over which, to the general government, was not yielded till 1800. This concession of a reserve to the demands of Connecticut was strongly opposed at the time, and met the disfavor of Washington, but Congress seemed anxious to obliterate all claims for the rest of the territory, and acceded to the agreement.²

The cessions made by South Carolina and Georgia at the South finally brought, in 1802, all the territory beyond the mountains between Florida and the Lakes, and westward to the Mississippi, within the jurisdiction of the Union.³

There were two men among the surveyors appointed under the ordinance of 1785, General Rufus Putnam and General Benjamin Tupper,⁴ who were to do much towards shaping the future of these Ohio regions. It was a New England movement, which these two men directed in part, and associating with them some of the soldiers of the war, they organized a company in Boston, March 3, 1786,⁵ for the purpose of gathering Continental certificates and putting the scheme on a working financial basis. Later, Putnam, General Samuel H. Parsons, and Dr. Manasseh Cutler were chosen directors. Upon Cutler devolved the managerial duty, and he went to New York⁶ to negotiate for the purchase of a tract of land. A contract⁷ was made for lands on

¹ The first party to occupy the Western Reserve landed at the mouth of Conneaut Creek, July 4, 1796. John Barr, in *Nat. Mag.*, Dec., 1845; Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 37. On Presqu'isle, 1794, see 2 *Penna. Archives*, vi. 627.

² Sparks's *Washington*, ix. 178; *State Papers, Public Lands*, i. 97; Jas. A. Garfield's *Discovery and Ownership of the Northwestern Territory and Settlement of the Western Reserve* (no. 20, Western Reserve and Northern Ohio Hist. Soc. Papers, 1874); Col. Charles Whittlesey's *Origin of the title of the Western Reserve* (*Ibid.* no. 32); W. S. Kennedy's *Hist. of the Western Reserve* (Hudson, O., 1856); Harvey Rice's *Pioneers of the Western Reserve* (Boston, 1883); histories of *Trumbull and Mahoning Counties* (Cleveland, 1882), ch. 7; of *Geauga and Lake Counties* (1878); of *Ashtabula County* (1878); a paper by J. H. Kennedy, "Ohio as a hospitable wilderness," in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Dec., 1886 (vol. xvi. p. 526). Five thousand acres of this reserve being granted to citizens of Connecticut, whose houses and property had been destroyed by the British during the war, became known as the "Ohio Fire Lands." The rest of the reserve was sold in 1795 for \$1,200,000, to constitute an educational fund for Connecticut. A map and description of *Northeastern Ohio* (1796), by John Heckewelder, was edited by C. C. Baldwin in the *Mag. Western Hist.*, Dec., 1884; and was then reprinted as *Tract 64* of the Western Reserve and Northern Ohio Hist. Soc. (Cleveland, 1884). Cleveland, the principal city in this region, was settled in 1796. For an account of it in 1880, see *Mag. Western History*, Dec., 1884; and in *Ibid.* Jan., 1885, p. 175, is an account of "General Moses Cleveland and Cleveland City." Cf. *Harper's Mag.*, March, 1886. The latest publication on the Reserve is the following: "Conn. Land Co. Hist. of the original titles of the lands in that part of Ohio commonly called the Conn. Western Reserve, by J. Perkins" (*Mahoning Valley Hist. Soc. Coll.*, i. 142). Cf. also the "Origin of land titles in the Connecticut Reserve," by J. Sherman, in the *Firelands Pioneer*, i. nos. 2, 5.

³ South Carolina made her cession Aug. 9, 1787. Cf. W. R. Garrett's *History of the South Carolina cession and the northern boundary of Tennessee* (Nashville, 1884, — being no. 1 of the papers of the Tennessee Hist. Soc.); *Journals of Congress*, iv. 771; *Public Domain*, 76. The Georgia cession, reported on July 15, 1788 (*Journals*, iv. 834), was not consummated till 1802, when her land disputes with the States were settled. Cf. Sato, p. 39; *Public Domain*, 99; Hildreth, v. 447, 473; Stevens's *Georgia*, ii. 468. Previous to this cession of 1802, Georgia had in 1795 given certain rights to land companies, which under them laid claims to large tracts of territory in the Yazoo country. The controversy over the validity of these grants fell to the United States, and was finally settled in favor of the companies or their representatives, in the Supreme Court in 1814. A good condensed statement of the history of the "Yazoo Frauds," as they were called, is given in Lalor's *Cyclopædia*, iii. 1127; and in A. H. Chappell's *Miscellanies of Georgia* (Columbus, Ga., 1874), part iii. ch. 7. Cf. for

details, Hildreth, iv., v., vi.; Schouler, ii. 74; Tucker, ii. 186; Kennedy's *Wirt*, i. 218; Garland's and Adams's *Randolph* (he was a violent opposer of the claims); Benton's *Debates*, iii.; *Statutes at Large*, ii. 235; iii. 116; Cranch's *Reports*, vi. 87; Peters's *Reports*, ii. 328. A *Report* of the secretary of the So. Carolina Yazoo Company (Charleston, 1791) examines the title of earlier grants, and gives the acts of South Carolina and Georgia appertaining. It shows at that time the relations of Dr. O'Fallon and Gen. Wilkinson to these lands.

The whole question of all these land cessions can be followed in Herbert B. Adams's *Maryland's influence upon the land cessions to the United States*, in the Johns Hopkins University Studies, 3d series, part 1, and also in the *Maryland Hist. Soc. Fund Publications*, no. 11. For contemporary documents, see references in B. P. Poore's *Descriptive Catal. Govt. Publications*, p. 1348; *Journals of Congress*, iv. 20, 68, 82, 100, 226, 231, 241; *Madison Papers*, i. 90-126; *Land Laws of the U. S.* (1810, 1817, by Albert Gallatin; 1828, by Mathew St. Clair); *Laws of the U. S.* (1815, p. 452). Cf. also Curtis (i. 291) and Towle (350) on the *Constitution*; Bancroft, vi. 277; Lalor's *Cyclopædia*, iii. 917.

Rives's *Madison*, i. 257-266, 444-464; Perkins's *Annals*, 236; Gannett's *Boundaries of the U. S.* (Washington, 1885), ch. 2; Shosuke Sato's *Hist. of the Land Question in the United States*, in Johns Hopkins University Studies (4th ser., nos. 7-9).

The great repository of material, not always as accurately prepared as one could wish, is *The Public Domain, its history with statistics, with references to the national domain, colonization, acquirement of territory, the survey, administration and several methods of sale and disposition of the public domain, with sketch of legislative history of the land, states and territories, and references to the land system of the colonies*. By Thomas Donaldson (Washington, 1884, — Ho. Ex. Doc. 47, part iv., 46th Cong., 3d session; Misc. Doc. 45, part iv., 47th Cong., 2d session; third ed., pp. 1343).

Reservations under the cessions are grouped together in the *Public Domain*, 82; and statements regarding the area of the several cessions are in *Ibid.* p. 86. Cf. McMaster, ii. 479.

⁴ *Journals of Cong.*, iv. 547.

⁵ The articles are in Walker's *Athens County, Ohio*, 43, etc. Cf. *Life of M. Cutler*, i. ch. 5.


⁶ Cutler's journal to New York and his reports are used by Walker, p. 53, and by Poole in his *N. Amer. Rev* article, 1876. The journal is printed in *Life of M. Cutler*, vol. i. ch. 6 and 7.

⁷ *Contract of the Ohio Company with the Hon. Board of the Treasury of the U. S. made by the Rev. Mr. Manasseh Cutler and Maj. Winthrop Sargent, Oct. 27, 1787*, pp. 4 (Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 301; Sabin, v. 18, 173) Cf. *Public Domain*, 164; Bancroft, vi. 284; Matthews' *Washington County, Ohio*, ch. 5. See the act authorizing the grant, in *Life of M. Cutler*, ii. 479.

the Ohio and Scioto,¹ and these purchases, paid for in certificates and army land-warrants, were followed later by others made by John Clevess Symmes and associates on the Ohio and Miami rivers.²

In 1788 the State of Pennsylvania made the purchase already referred to, which gave her a harbor on Lake Erie. These were the only sales before the organization of the land offices.³

The settlement of the Ohio Company was begun in 1788, by a body of New Englanders, who, floating down the Ohio from above, turned into the Muskingum River, and on a point formed by the junction of that river with the Ohio, and opposite Fort Harmar, which the government had already erected on the lower peninsula of the junction, laid the foundations of a town, and built a fort, which they called the Campus Martius. It was proposed at first to call the place Castrapolis,⁴ for the site was that of an ancient fortification of the



CINCINNATI IN 1810.*

¹ The Scioto purchase was a sort of bribe, linked in the legislation of Congress for the purpose of affording opportunities for private speculation, which might insure the success of the Ohio Company's project (*Life of Manasseh Cutler*, i. ch. 12). For this speculating organization, called the Scioto Land Company, in which Col. William Duer of New York was a leader, Joel Barlow went to Europe as an agent to induce immigration (cf. Todd's *Barlow*, ch. 5; Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 574), and the excitement created in Paris is shown in caricatures, of which one is given in fac-simile in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xiii. 82, called "Vente des déserts du Scioto par des Anglo-Américains."

Two of the advertising tracts of the company are noted in the *Brinley Catal.*, iii. 4579-80. A party of French immigrants came over in 1790 and founded Gallipolis; but their experiences were not calculated to invite many followers. There is an account in Volney's *Tableau du climat et du sol des Etats-Unis* (Paris, 1803); and Brissot de Warville's *New Travels* helped the project on.

² These lands were parcelled out by Symmes to others (Ford's *Cincinnati*; Albach's *Annals*, 479); and to Matthias Denman, from New Jersey, thus fell the tract on which is now the city of Cincinnati, who shared it with Robert Patterson and John Tilson. The latter had been a schoolmaster, and his little learning enabled him to induce his associates for a while to adopt as a name of the settle-

ment a fantastic polyglot combination, to signify that it was a town (*ville*) opposite (*anti*) the mouth (*os*) of the Licking River (*L.*) — *Losantiville*. The newly formed Society of Cincinnati finally gave occasion for a less grotesque but hardly more satisfactory appellation. Cf. Francis W. Miller's *Cincinnati's beginnings: missing chapters in the early history of the city and the Miami purchase, chiefly from hitherto unpublished documents* (Cincinnati, 1880), where one of Symmes's land-warrants is given in fac-simile; Henry A. and Kate B. Ford's *Hist. of Cincinnati* (Cleveland, 1881); Burnet's *Notes*, 33, 47; *Cincinnati Pioneer*, 1873-1875, ed. by J. D. Caldwell; *Amer. Hist. Rec.*, Nov., 1872; Henry B. Teetor on "Israel Ludlow and the naming of Cincinnati," in *Mag. West. Hist.*, July, 1885, pp. 251, 394.

Daniel Drake's *Notices concerning Cincinnati* (Cinn., 1810) is a topographical account of no use for historical data, and is now very rare. Thomson (*Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 345) says he knows of but three copies, — there is one in the Philadelphia Library, and another in Harvard College library. Drake's *National and Statistical View or Picture of Cincinnati and the Miami Country* is the chief-est early repository of material (Thomson, no. 346. Cf. references in McMaster, i. 517).

³ Cf. Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 538.

⁴ *Belknap Papers*, i. 493.

* Fac-simile of a cut in Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 217. There is a view in Lieut. Jervis Cutler's *Topog. Descrip. of Ohio* (Boston, 1812). Cf. cuts in Lossing's *War of 1812*, p. 476, and Ford's *Cincinnati*, p. 56, where is also (p. 37) a view of Fort Washington, built on the site of Cincinnati in the summer or early autumn of 1789; and a plan of the town in 1815 (p. 68).

mound-builders; but the settlers bore in remembrance the sanction of Marie Antoinette upon their recent struggles for independence, and compacted from her name that of Marietta for the town.¹

¹ The story of the inception and early growth of the settlement has been often told: in such general works as Bancroft, McMaster (i. 514), Blanchard's *North West*, Howe's *Hist. Coll. of Ohio*, p. 572, and the histories of Ohio, like James W. Taylor's *Hist. of Ohio, 1650-1787* (Cincinnati, 1854), etc.

Two contemporary tracts are of interest: Solomon Drown's *Oration at Marietta, Apr. 7, 1789, in commemoration of the settlement formed by the Ohio Company* (Worcester, 1789), and *Oration delivered at Marietta July 4, 1788, by the Hon. James M. Varnum; Speech of his Excellency Arthur St. Clair, and proceedings of the inhabitants* (Newport, 1788).

The earliest of the most successful local antiquaries was Dr. S. P. Hildreth (notice of him by Chas. Whittlesey in *Mag. West. Hist.*, ii. 81), who published at Cincinnati in 1848 his *Pioneer History: being an account of the examination of the Ohio Valley, and the early settlement of the North-Western Territory, chiefly from original Manuscripts, containing the papers of Col. George Morgan, those of Judge Barker; the Diaries of Joseph Buell and John Matthews, the records of the Ohio Company, &c.* In 1852 he published at Cincinnati his *Biographical and Historical Memoirs of [35 of] the early Pioneer Settlers of Ohio*; and he was a frequent contributor to the *American Pioneer*; and some of these papers relating to the early settlements in Ohio were printed separately (1844) as *Original Contributions of the American Pioneer* (Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, nos. 550, etc.). Another early and painstaking writer, of less local familiarity, was James H. Perkins, who published his *Annals of the West at Cincinnati* in 1846, which was revised and enlarged by J. M. Peck (St. Louis, 1850), and was again greatly extended by James R. Albach (Pittsburg, 1857, pp. 451, 461, 473). Cf. Thomson's *Bibliog.*, nos. 10,917, 921). Mr. Perkins printed his "Fifty Years of Ohio" in the *North American Review*, xvii., July, 1838 (also in *Hesperian*, iii. 205, and in *Memoirs and writings of J. H. Perkins*, ii. 366), where is also (ii. 329) a paper on the "Settlement of the North West Territory" from the *N. Amer. Rev.*, Oct., 1847.

For treatment more nearly monographic, see Walker's *Athens County*, p. 21; Israel Ward Andrews' *Washington County and the early settlement of Ohio*, and his paper on "The Beginning of the Colonial System of the United States in Ohio," in the *Archæological and Historical Quarterly*, vol. i., June, 1887; E. C. Dawes's *Beginning of the Ohio Company, read before the Cincinnati literary club, June 4th, 1881* (Cincinnati, 1882); *Western Reserve Hist. Soc. Papers*, no. 6; *Mag. West. Hist.*, Jan., 1887, by W. Barrows; and the list of the early settlers under Putnam, given in *Ibid.*, Jan., 1885, p. 253.

We have some records of travels in this region at the time of the settlement: Col. John May's journal in the *N. E. Hist. and Genæal. Reg.*, Jan., 1873, and Jan., 1876; Thomas Wallcut's journal in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* xvii. 174; journal of some emigrant families across the mountains from New England to Muskingum in 1788, in *American Pioneer*, ii. 112, etc.; letters from Capt. Lawrence Butler (1784-86) in the App. of the *Memoirs of Jos. Cradock*; and Cutler's journal, used in the *No. Am. Rev.*, Oct., 1841, and given in the *N. E. Hist. and Genæal. Reg.*, 1860-61, vols. xiv. 104, 234, 364, and xv. 45, and in the *Life of Cutler*, i. 391. The papers of Cutler were for a while in the hands of Dr. E. M. Stone of Providence, from whom they were recovered, and upon them was based an illustrated paper by Alfred Mathews on "The earliest settlement in Ohio" (*Harper's Magazine*, Sept., 1885), and the *Life, Journals, and Correspondence of Manasseh Cutler* (Cincinnati, 1888, two vols.), by his grandchildren, Wm. Parker Cutler and Julia Perkins Cutler. A son of Dr. Cutler gave a brief sketch of him in the *N. E. Hist. and Genæal. Reg.* (vii. 297), and there are references in the *Mag.*

West. Hist., Oct., 1886, p. 856. Cf. A. P. Peabody on Cutler in the *New Englander*, xlv. 319. To Dr. Cutler is ascribed the authorship of an advertising tract, intended to entice immigrants to the Western lands, *Explanation of the map of the Federal lands, confirmed by the treaties of 1784 and 1786* (Salem, 1787, — Brinley, iii. 4545); Thomson's *Bibliog.*, no. 299, who says the map itself is not known; but Sabin, v. 18, 175, noticing a second ed., 1787; connects a map with it. Stevens (*Hist. Coll.*, i. 1405) says there was no map). The tract is reprinted in the *Life, etc. of Cutler*, ii. App. C. It was in this tract that Cutler predicted the navigation of the Ohio by steamboats. Cf. *Mag. West. Hist.*, 1885, p. 258, where the early history of navigation on the Ohio and the beginnings of the movements of produce from Fort Pitt to New Orleans is traced. The first successful steamboat on the Ohio was the "Orleans," of 200 tons, in 1811-12. *Amer. Pioneer*, i. 68, 156, and elsewhere. It was in 1786 that John Fitch, working on his idea of a steamboat, refused to sell his invention to Gardoqui, the Spanish envoy; and, with the aid of a Dutch watchmaker in Philadelphia, began his first practical experiments on the Delaware, and, in their recesses, the members of the Federal Convention looked on as the experiments continued. Cf. the references in McMaster, i. 435, where he notes something of the controversy of Fitch with James Rumsey, who was experimenting at the same time, in another way, on the Potomac. Cf. Scharf and Westcott's *Philadelphia*, iii. 2166; and the lives of Fitch by Thompson Westcott (*Philad.*, 1867), and by C. Whittlesey in Sparks's *American Biog.*, xvi. 83. Cf. Collins's *Kentucky*, ii. 174; Shaler's *Kentucky*, 175; Parton's *Franklin*, ii. 550; Watson's *Annals of Philad.*, etc. See, on the Rumsey-Fitch controversy, Preble's *Steam Navigation*, and the note in Stevens's *Hist. Collection*, i. no. 756, upon a copy of Rumsey's *Short Treatise on the Application of Steam* (*Philad.*, 1788). This tract is reprinted in the *Doc. Hist. N. Y.*, ii. 1012. It was originally published as *A Plan wherein the power of steam is fully shown* (Jan. 1, 1788). There are in the same volume (*Doc. Hist. N. Y.*) the controversial pamphlet relating to the priority of Fitch, called *The Original Steamboat* (*Philad.*, 1788).

Of the leader of the settlers there is, by Mary Cone, a *Life of Rufus Putnam; with extracts from his journal, and an account of the first settlement in Ohio* (Cleveland, 1886). Cf., by the same writer, the "First settlement of Ohio," in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, vi. 241; and a paper by Alfred Mathews, with a portrait of Putnam, in the *Mag. West. Hist.*, Nov., 1884, p. 32. There are other accounts of him in Hildreth's *Pioneer Settlers* (with portrait); in *Harper's Monthly*, lxxi. 552 (with portrait); in Temple's *North Brookfield*, pp. 398-431; and in Walker's *Athens County* (ch. 2). Sparks (*Sparks MSS.*, liv. 6) has a letter from Putnam (1816) to Gen. William Shepard, relating to the settlement. His letter to Fisher Ames, setting forth (1790) what he conceived to be the interest of the Western country to remain a part of the Union, is in Manasseh Cutler's *Life, etc.*, ii. App. A.

General Parsons is also commemorated in Hildreth's *Pioneer Settlers*.

The first white child born in Ohio is traced in the *Mag. West. Hist.*, Dec., 1884, p. 119; and the first house built, in *Olden Time*, i. 85. The first pioneers on the Ohio, the cabin and clearing of the Zane family, near the mouth of Wheeling Creek, 1770, are commemorated by Isaac Smucker in *Mag. Western Hist.*, ii. 326.

The name Ohio was eliminated by the French from the Indian name of the river, *Youghiogony* (Bancroft, final revision, vi. 125).


Jacob Burnet's *Notes on the Early Settlement of the North-Western Territory* (Cincinnati, 1847) relate to a period somewhat later than we are now considering (Thomson's *Bibliog.*, nos. 142, 143). See portrait and sketch of

While the final cessions of the States were pending, Congress at intervals discussed the future of this great domain, but for a while little progress was made except to establish that Congress could divide the territory as might seem best. Nathan Dane came forward with a motion for a committee to plan some temporary scheme of government. A committee on this point reported (May 10, 1786) that the number of States should be from two to five, to be admitted as States according to Jefferson's proposition, but the question of slavery in them was left open.¹ Nothing definite was done till a committee — Johnson of Connecticut, Pinckney of South Carolina, Smith of New York, Dane of Massachusetts, and Henry of Maryland — reported on April 26, 1787, "An ordinance for the government of the Western territory," and after various amendments it was fairly transcribed for a third reading, May 10th.² Further consideration was now delayed until July.

It was at this point that Manasseh Cutler appeared in New York, commissioned to buy land for the Ohio Company in the region whose future was to be determined by this ordinance, and it was very likely, in part, by his influence that those features of the perfected ordinance as passed five days later, and which has given it its general fame, were introduced.³



RETURN JONATHAN MEIGS.*



MANASSEH CUTLER.†

Judge Burnet in the *Mag. West. Hist.*, April, 1887 (i. 467, 537). The *Notes* were enlarged upon letters originally published in the *Transactions of the Ohio Hist. Society* (vol. i. part 2). Cf., in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, a paper by John T. Short and Samuel C. Derby on the *Indian, French, and English towns in Ohio* (not yet issued).

¹ *Journals*, v. 79.

² This form of it was first published by Peter Force in *National Intelligencer*, Aug. 26, 1847. It is also given in *Western Law Journal*, v. 529; Donaldson's *Public Domain*, 150; *St. Clair Papers*, ii. 608; and *Life of M. Cutler*, ii. App. D.


³ The question of the authorship of the ordinance had been made prominent by Webster in his speech on Foot's Resolution in 1830 (*Works*, iii. 264, 277; vi. 552), when he ascribed the drafting to Nathau Dane, and Dane in a letter, March 26, 1830, upheld Webster's statement (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, x. 475). Cf. his *General Abridgment and Digest of Amer. Laws*, Boston, 1823-24; a letter (which has been held to settle the question in favor of Dane) to Rufus King in *N. Y. Tribune*, Jan. 31, 1855, or in Spencer's *United States*, ii. 202, and one to J. H. Farnham 'in

N. Y. Tribune, July 18, 1875). Benton and Hayne disputed Webster's assertions at the time, and Edw. Coles joined with them, in his paper (1856) on the ordinance, in supporting the claim of Jefferson. Meanwhile Peter Force, in 1847, had printed the ordinance as it was left May 10, 1787, showing it to be greatly different from the ordinance passed July 13th. In 1872, the Rev. Dr. Jos. F. Tuttle, in a paper (May 16, 1872) before the N. Jersey Hist. Soc. (*Proc.*, iii. 75), first presented the claims of Cutler for the introduction into the ordinance of the clauses for the exclusion of slavery and for the support of education. In sustaining this view, Dr. Tuttle produced extracts from Cutler's diary while in attendance upon Congress. Bancroft (vi. 286) points out some misconceptions of Cutler on the doings of Congress, then sitting with closed doors. More extensive and thorough use of the same diary was made by William F. Poole in a paper read before the Cincinnati Literary Club, Dec. 21, 1872, which was printed in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1873, p. 161, as "The man who purchased Ohio." He later elaborated his views in the *No. Amer. Review*, April, 1876, and in the separate reprint of this last paper, *The ordinance of 1787, and Dr. Manasseh*

* After a cut in *Harper's Mag.*, lxxi. p. 560. He was one of the earliest settlers of Marietta.

† After a cut in *Harper's Magazine*, lxxi. p. 555. Cf. the engraving in the *Life of Cutler*, p. 1. A portrait of Cutler by Lakeman is in the Essex Institute, Salem, and another is owned by Dr. Torrey, of Beverly, Mass.

On July 9th the bill was referred to a new committee, of which a majority were Southern men, Carrington of Virginia taking the chairmanship from Johnson; Dane and Smith were retained, but Richard Henry Lee and Kean of South Carolina supplanted Pinckney and Henry. This change was made to secure the Southern support; on the other hand, acquiescence in the wishes of Northern purchasers of lands was essential in any business outcome of the movement. "Up to this time," says Poole, "there were no articles of compact in the bill, no anti-slavery clause, nothing about liberty of conscience or of the press, the right of *habeas corpus* or of trial by jury, or the equal distribution of estates. The clause that 'religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged,' was not there." These omissions were the New England ideas, which had long before this been engrafted on the Constitution of Massachusetts. This new committee reported the bill, embodying all these provisions except the anti-slavery clause, on the 11th, and the next day this and other amendments were made. On the 13th, but one voice was raised against the bill on its final passage, and that came from Yates of New York.¹



CAMPUS MARTIUS, 1798.*

Cutler as an agent in its formation (Cambridge, 1876). It may be a question if the influence of Cutler should stand so apart as Poole makes it (cf. Gay's *United States*, v. 110), and his critics have thought other influences combined with Cutler's New England views to give the ordinance its final shaping (*St. Clair Papers*, i. 122; H. B. Adams in *The Nation*, May 4, 1882). The latest presentation of the influence of Cutler is in the *Life, etc. of M. Cutler*, i. ch. 8. Bancroft (vol. vi. 287, etc.), with references to the original files in the State Department, does not mention Cutler's influence, but lets it appear that the new form was a growth by imitation of the Bill of Rights and other exemplars. It is to be remembered that all Massachusetts people had been familiar with the points of the ordinance in question, from their discussion and adoption of them in the constitutional convention of that State in 1780. Cf. Emory Washburn in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, viii. 294; Charles Deane in *Ibid.* xiii. 299; Alex. Bullock's *Centennial of the Mass. Constitution*.

¹ The ordinance is printed in the *Journals of Congress*, iv. 752; *Public Domain*, 153; *U. S. Land Laws*, 356; *St. Clair Papers*, ii. 612; *Life of M. Cutler*, ii. App. D; Poore's *Federal and State Constitutions*, i. 429; *Mag. Western Hist.*, Nov., 1884, vol. i. p. 56; Albach's *Annals*, 466; Cooper and Fenton's *Amer. Politics*; Holmes's *Parties*; Curtis's *Constitution*, i. 302; Towle's *Constitution*, 360; Tucker's *United States*, i. App., etc., etc. Sato (p.


94) gives a condensed statement of its provisions. For treatment, beside the general histories, see Hildreth, iii. ch. 48; Judge Cooley's *Michigan*, p. 127; H. B. Adams's paper in the *Maryland Hist. Soc. Fund. Publ.*, no. 11, p. 60; I. W. Andrews in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Aug., 1886, and in the *Amer. Hist. Assn. Papers*, ii. 38; John Eaton in *Education*, Feb., 1887, vol. vii.; Farmer's *Detroit*, p. 85; a paper by B. A. Hinsdale in *Ibid.*, July, 1887; Edward Coles's *Hist. of the Ordinance in Pa. Hist. Soc. Papers* (Philad., 1856); W. P. Cutler's *The ordinance of July 13, 1787, for the government of the territory northwest of the river Ohio. A paper read before the Ohio state historical and archaeological society, Feb. 23d, 1887* (Marietta, Ohio [1887]), and in the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, June, 1887; *Olden Time*, ii. 277; and references in Lalor's *Cyclopædia*, iii. 31; Poole's *Index*, and Thomson's *Bibliog. of Ohio*, no. 933. Sato (p. 98) quotes some of the chief eulogies of the document, like that of Webster (*Works*, iii. 263), Story (*Commentaries*, iii. 187), Curtis (*Constitution*, i. 306), etc. It gave Congress no power to dispose of lands and set up new States, but the power was assumed (*Federalist*, nos. 38, 42, 43; Story's *Constitution*, iii. 184, of first ed.). On its relation to slavery, see Wilson's *Rise and Fall of the Slave Power*, vol. i. ch. 3, and Madison's *Letters, etc.*, iii. 154. On its relation to education, see Barrows's *United States of Yesterday, &c.*, ch. 9, and Knight's *Federal Land Grants*.

* Reduced in fac-simile from a cut in the *American Pioneer*, March, 1842, where the fort is described. In *Ibid.*, May, 1842, is a view of the court-house and jail built in 1798. Cf. the view of the fort in the *Columbian Mag.*, ii. 646, Nov., 1788, and the compiled view in *Mag. West. Hist.*, Dec., 1884, with a paper by Alfred Mathews; others in Lossing's *Field-Book of the War of 1812*, p. 37, and in Howe's *Hist. Coll. Ohio*, 509.

Poole intimates that it was the promise of the governorship of the territory under the ordinance which induced St. Clair, then President of Congress, to lend it his countenance.¹ The promise, if such it was, was fulfilled, and St. Clair became the first governor of the territory.²

Not long after the war ceased, streams of disbanded soldiers, mainly from Virginia, were flowing into Kentucky across the mountains, and a few years later there were frequent flotillas of immigrants to the regions on both sides of the Ohio, floating down the river past Fort Harmar. Col. Higginson, in ch. 17 of his *Larger History*, pictures with his accustomed skill the great Western march of the people from the beginnings at Marietta.³

As early as 1784-85 there were the beginnings of a movement towards detaching the region south of the Ohio from Virginia, and giving it the organization of an independent State; and there being no printing-press beyond the mountains, the documentary appeals were circulated among the people in manuscript. The



cession by Virginia, consummated March 1, 1784, had embraced only the region north of the Ohio, and the territory of Kentucky, claimed both by Virginia and New York, never came into the public domain of the United States. The hardy frontier spirit of the people in this region soon impressed, by tale and amplification, the seaboard States as belonging to a people almost as savage as the Indians, whom they were trained to fight.⁴ But the attitude of the settlers was at first one of suppliancy and caution, in their representations to the parent State. Virginia was inclined to throw the burden of decision upon Congress, and between the two

¹ This view is combated by the editor of the *St. Clair Paper*; and by W. W. Williams in his "Arthur St. Clair and the ordinance of 1787," in the *Mag. of West. Hist.*, Nov., 1884.


² Cf. Isaac Smucker (*Mag. of West. Hist.*, Jan., 1885, p. 207) on the successive administrations of the territory.

³ Cf. pictures in Schouler, i. 225; McMaster, ii. 573.

⁴ *Belknap Papers*, i. 493.

NOTE TO ABOVE PLAN. — From a plate in the *Columbian Magazine*, November, 1788. It is described: "The fortification is all of hewn timber. It is more than thirty feet above the high banks of the Muskingum, and only 159 yards distant from that river, with a beautiful natural glacis in front. The city consists of one thousand house-lots, of ninety by one hundred and eighty feet, with spacious streets intersecting at right angles."

the movement proceeded slowly and gave time for a bold spirit to be aroused. There were some among the settlers, like James Wilkinson, who began to stir the popular mind with talk of secession and independence. The rumors of what Jay proposed as regards the navigation of the Mississippi River were good breezes to fan the flame. Wilkinson sought to see what he could do with Spain, and going down the river on a produce




MARIETTA, OHIO, 1803.*

boat to New Orleans, he effected a private treaty of trade with the Spanish authorities. Attempts were made by threats of independence, to coerce Congress into signifying its willingness to receive the new State. If we may trust Wilkinson, General Carleton, who was become Lord Dorchester, and now commanded in Canada.

* From Harris's *Journal of a Tour in 1803*. The original plans of Marietta, as surveyed by Rufus Putnam, are in the college library at Marietta.

sent one Dr. Connally to the Kentuckians to offer assistance in wresting Louisiana from Spain, with the purpose that both Kentucky and Great Britain should share in the results. Wilkinson says he frightened the emissary off by a trick, and then organized a produce fleet of flatboats to move down the Mississippi, each flying the Kentucky flag and carrying a small cannon. In June, 1788, a committee of Congress finally reported a recommendation that Kentucky be set up as a State;¹ but there was a disposition to defer such a movement for better results until the new Federal Constitution went into operation. The correspondence of certain Kentuckians with the Spanish authorities went on, but probably without the concurrence of a majority of the settlers.² In Nov., 1788, Wilkinson and his friends were urging secession; but in a convention called to consider what action should be taken, any step of violence was not deemed wise, and gradually the coercive and independent party lost what hold it had on the people, and Kentucky waited as quietly as she could for the action of the first Congress in 1791.³



FIRST MILL IN OHIO.*

¹ *Journals*, iv. 819. Cf. Madison's reminiscences in 1819 (*Letters*, etc., iii. 131).

² The history of this Spanish imbroglio can be followed in Gayarré's *Louisiana under the Spanish Domination*; the histories of Kentucky and Tennessee; Gen. Wilkinson's *Memoirs*, including Clarke's deposition (ii. App. 5); Bishop Robertson's "Attempts made to separate the West from the American Union," in *Mag. West. Hist.*, March, 1885; Gilmore's *John Sevier*, ch. 6; Shaler's *Kentucky*, 132; Albach's *Annals*, 487, 739; Butler's *Kentucky*, ch. 11; Sparks's *Corresp. of the Rev.*, iv. 246; Warfield's *Kentucky Resolutions*, 28; Cable's *Creoles of Louisiana*, ch. 17; Claiborne's *Mississippi*, i. 247, etc.

³ Cf. I. W. Andrews in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Oct., 1887; Jameson's *Constitutional Conventions*, p. 157; Gannett's *Boundaries of the U. S.*, p. 109. Professor N. S. Shaler in the preface of his *Kentucky a pioneer Commonwealth* (Boston, 1885, "Commonwealth series") considers the new edition of Luther Collins's *Historical Sketches of Kentucky* (Cincinnati, 1847), namely, *The History of Kentucky by the late Lewis Collins, revised and brought down to 1874 by Richard H. Collins* (Covington, 1874, in two volumes), as the great storehouse of information concerning Kentucky history, with also accounts of the different books on Kentucky (i. 640). Filson's *Kentucke* has been elsewhere described (Vol. VI. p. 708). "It laid," says Shaler, "the foundations of Boone's enduring reputation as a hero of Western life," as depicted, for instance, in such books as *The first White Man of the West* (Cincinnati, 1850); J. B. Jones's *Wild Western Scenes* (new ed., Philad., 1881), and popular magazine papers like J. M. Brown's in *Harper's Monthly*, lxxv. 48. (Cf. *Poole's Index* and *Index to Harper's Monthly*, pp. 49, 225, 327.) Col. Boone's *Life and Adventures, written by himself*, was published at Brooklyn (1823; 2d ed., 1824; Providence, 1824, — all from the same type, says *Brinley Catal.*, iii. 485). This pretended autobiography was first given by Filson (see *ante*, Vol. VI. p. 708). It was also published as Boone's writing

in Cecil B. Hartley's *Life and Times of Boone* (Philad., 1860).

Alex. Fitzroy's *Discovery, Purchase, and Settlement of the Country of Kentucky* (London, 1786, — pp. 15, — Brinley, iii. 4592) is a rare tract.

Collins (i. 640) refers to William Littell's *Polit. Transactions in and concerning Kentucky* (Frankfort, Ky., 1806, — Sabin, x. 41,506; copy in Boston Athenæum). The earliest history of current reputation is Humphrey Marshall's *History of Kentucky* (Frankfort, Ky.), in 2 vols.: the first in 1812; the first and second again in 1824. (Cf. *Field, Indian Bibliog.*, no. 1018; R. Clarke's *Americana*, 1878, nos. 1980, 1981.)

A more compact treatise is Mann Butler's *Hist. of Kentucky to the Close of the Northwestern Campaign in 1813* (Louisville, 1834; Cincinnati, 1836).

The principal local histories going back to the pioneer days are Benj. Casseday's *Louisville* (Louisville, 1852) from the first surveys (1770) in the vicinity of the falls of the Ohio; and George W. Ranck's *Lexington* (Cincinnati, 1872; based on an historical address, 1879) — a town named by the earliest settlers in 1775, on hearing rumors of the fight at Lexington, in Mass. Cf. also James T. Morehead's *Address in commemoration of the first settlement at Boonesborough* (Frankfort, 1840), with an appendix of proofs and illustrations; Wm. C. P. Breckinridge's *Centennial Address, Breckinridge Co., Ky., on the site of Hardin's Old Fort, near Hardinsburg, Nov. 2, 1882* (Frankfort, Ky., 1882); and Col. John Mason Brown's *Centennial Address at Frankfort, Ky., Oct. 6, 1886* (Louisville, 1886) — beginning with the early pioneers of 1773; and also Rives's *Life of Madison* (ii. 72) for the early movement, and the *Memoirs of Gen. Jas. Wilkinson*. Cf. Daniel Drake's *Pioneer Life in Kentucky; a series of Reminiscential Letters to his Children. Edited with Notes and Sketch of his Life by his son* (Cincinnati, 1870); M. J. Spaulding's *Early Catholic Missions of Kentucky (1787-1827)* published at Louisville (*Field, Ind. Bibliog.*, no. 1467); and *Poole's Index*, p. 706.

* Fac-simile of the cut of the "Wolf Creek Mills in 1789," about a mile above its junction with the Muskingum, given in the *Amer. Pioneer*, March, 1843.

The great territory of the Northwest thus embraced what is at present comprised in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, with that portion of Minnesota between the upper waters of the Mis-



NOTE.—From Joseph Scott's *United States Gazetteer* (Philad., 1795), the earliest of such books published. In his preface the author says, "The maps I have drawn and engraved myself."

The early maps of this northwestern region are those named in the note attached to the map showing the divisions under the ordinance of 1784.

Of the Kentucky region after the map of Filson (see Vol. VI. 708), we have early distinct treatment in Fitch's map (1786); in that attached to Henry Toulmin's *Description of Kentucky* (Nov., 1792); J. Russel's in Winterbotham (1794); and that in John Melish's *Travels* (Philad., 1812). Mr. F. D. Stone (Penna. Hist. Soc.) draws my attention to *A map of the Rapids of the Ohio, and of the countries on each side thereof so far as to include the routes contemplated for canal navigation*, which gives a curious view of Louisville from near Clarksville, and was published at "Frankford, Kentucky, 1806."

Mississippi and Lake Superior. Ohio was the first State carved out of this great domain in 1802,¹ but the definition of her bounds² was not so accurate that future complications were precluded. The Ohio act of 1802, in defining the east and west line in the northern bounds, was based on Mitchell's map of 1755, which placed the line too far north; and in the controversy with Michigan, Ohio insisted on a line from the south end of Lake Michigan to the most northerly cape of Miami Bay, thus overlapping the claims of Michigan under her bounds of 1805. It remained unsettled till Michigan was admitted as a State, when she gave up her claim to Ohio, and took in recompense the remaining part of the northern peninsula.³

When, in 1800, the Northwest territory was divided, nearly on the present western bounds of Ohio, the western part became the territory of Indiana, from which the northern portion in 1805 became the territory of Michigan; and again, in 1809, its western portion was made the territory of Illinois, including a region to the north, between the longitudes of Mackinaw and Vincennes.⁴ Indiana, as at present bounded, was finally admitted in 1816.

Illinois became a State in 1818,⁵ and after this her territory north of Mackinaw was annexed to Michigan. The north line of Illinois was made to strike Lake Michigan 61 miles down the lake, in contravention of the ordinance of 1787, in order that she might have some ports on the lake, which it was thought would serve to bind her to the Northern States in case there was any disruption of the Union.⁶ The bounds of Michigan have suffered various changes from her first territorial limits, for a part of Illinois territory was joined to her in 1818; she was extended to the Missouri River in 1834, deprived of Wisconsin territory in 1836, and finally bounded as at present on her admission as a State in 1837.⁷

In 1824 Senator Benton endeavored to get legislation setting up the territory of Chippewa, west of Lake Michigan. Judge Doty, a leading advocate of a similar measure, was, in 1827, willing to call it Wisconsin. In 1830 some new efforts were made, with approval of the name of Huron. In 1836 that part of Michigan outside the present State of that name became the territory of Wisconsin,⁸ but in 1838 that part west of the Mississippi became the territory of Iowa. Some other slight changes of the bounds of Wisconsin were made on her admission as a State in 1847.⁹

The northern boundary of Florida by the royal proclamation of 1763 was the 31° N. lat., as at present.¹⁰ In 1768 West Florida was extended northward to the parallel (32° 25' N. lat.) of the mouth of the Yazoo River; and when, by the treaty of 1782-83, England ceded Florida to Spain, the latter power contended, though no bounds were mentioned, that Florida had these extended English bounds of 32° 30', and not the original Spanish bounds of the 31° N. lat. The treaty of Madrid, Oct. 27, 1795, confirmed the line of 31° N. lat., — Spain yielding the point, and also agreeing to allow the people of the United States the rights of deposit for merchandise at New Orleans. Spain, however, did not withdraw her troops from the Yazoo country till 1798.

Between 1796 and 1800, Andrew Ellicott¹² was the American commissioner engaged in marking this line of the treaty of 1795.

The United States never abandoned the claim that, by the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, "with the same

¹ There has been some discussion over the exact date of the admission of Ohio to the Union. Cf. Israel W. Andrews in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Oct., 1887, and in *Ohio Sec. of State Rept.*, 1879, p. 43-52; J. Q. Howard in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1887, p. 135; May, 1887; Isaac Smucker in *Mag. West. Hist.*, Feb., 1885, p. 308. Also see Hildreth, v. 445; Albach, 763; *Hist. Mag.*, xvi. 9.

² Gannett, p. 110.

³ Cf. on this controversy *Senate Docs.* 1835-36, iii. no. 211; *Rept. of Com.* 1835-36, ii. no. 380; papers by W. Duane in *Amer. Hist. Record*, i. 154; by W. Buell in *Mag. West. Hist.*, iii. 457; Cooley's *Michigan*, 214; Knapp's *Maumee Valley*, ch. 4.

⁴ These territorial bounds can be traced in Gannett, p. 111, etc. Cf. *Mag. West. Hist.*, Sept., 1886, p. 618.

⁵ Gannett, p. 113; *Legal Adviser*, vi. 101. On the Wabash country before 1800 see *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, May, 1887, p. 408, and the narrative of John Heckewelder's journey to the Wabash (1792) in *Pennsylvania Mag. Hist.*, xi. 466.

⁶ *Annals of Congress*, 1818, ii. 1677; Ford's *Illinois*, 22; Davidson and Struve, *Illinois*, 295. The northern line of Indiana had for a similar reason been put ten miles down the lake on the other shore.

⁷ Cooley's *Michigan*, ch. 8, and p. 219; Curtis's *Buchanan*, i. 358; Jameson's *Const. Conventions*, 185; Gannett, p. 113.

⁸ Gannett, 115; Reuben G. Thwaites' "Boundaries of Wisconsin" in *Mag. West. Hist.*, Sept., 1887.

⁹ Gannett, p. 115; M. M. Strong's *Hist. of the Terr-*


itory of Wisconsin, 1836-1848 (Madison, 1885). Minnesota territory was made out of the Iowa territory in 1849. Gannett, p. 119.

¹⁰ Cf. Vol. V. p. 615 for references; Fairbanks's *Florida*, p. 211.

¹¹ These were the bounds that England established for West Florida, when in 1767 she sent out Elliot to be the governor. Duane's *Laws of the U. S.*, i. 451.

¹² *Statutes at Large*, viii. 138.

Journal of Andrew Ellicott, late Commissioner of the United States, 1796-1800, for determining the Boundary between the United States and the possessions of His Catholic Majesty in America, containing occasional remarks on the Situation, Soil, Rivers, Natural Productions and Diseases of the Different Countries on the Ohio, Mississippi and Gulf of Mexico. 14 maps (Philadelphia, 1803). The line left the Mississippi on the 31° parallel, thence ran due east till it struck the Appalachian River, down that river to the mouth of the Flint River, and thence on a direct line to the source of the St. Mary's, and down that river to the ocean, thus embracing for Spain all the territory east of Mississippi and south of that line, except the island of Orleans (New Orleans), which belonged to the United States under the purchase of Louisiana. Ellicott pointed out how there was thus a part of the bank of the Mississippi alien territory, and how necessary the harbors of West Florida were to the United States. There had been a plan in John Adams's administration to annex Florida (Ellicott, p. 175); and Gallatin, in 1803, had advised the purchase of West Florida (Madison's *Letters*, ii. 179).



grant, the line established at the treaty at Greenville in 1795, together with the isolated cessions to the U. S. under that treaty along "the Maumee of the lakes," and in other places.

There was engraved by Weston, and published at Philadelphia, the surveys which Putnam made of the lands "north-west of the Ohio, and east of the Scioto River," which were "appropriated for military service." Cf. Hildreth, iii. 515, on the military posts in this region in 1788.

extent as when France possessed it," before her cession to Spain in 1763, she owned to the Perdido (the present western bounds of Florida), which had been recognized as the limits of Louisiana up to 1763.¹

In 1804 Congress established a customs district in the territory of Mississippi, including within its limits a portion of West Florida. Spain protested, and interfered with traders passing up and down Mobile Bay and River through her territory. In 1805 Americans living in West Florida rebelled, but the rising was soon suppressed. A revolution in Spain (1810) at last incited one in West Florida, and the people, assembling at Baton Rouge, declared independence, and Madison issued a proclamation (Oct. 27), and sent Gov. Claiborne of Orleans territory to take possession under the American construction of the Louisiana purchase, which he did, with the exception of Mobile.² Congress now, Jan. 15 and March 3, 1811,³ on the suspicion that England was preparing to seize Florida, passed secret acts authorizing the President, in his discretion, to take "temporary possession" of East Florida. Certain irregular military aggressions followed, and there was some intrigue, but all overt acts were disowned by the President, as the threatened war with England rendered prudence necessary.⁴

General Wilkinson finally, in 1813, got possession of Mobile, and it had already been established (April 14 and May 14, 1812) that the territory between the Perdido and Pearl rivers should belong to the Mississippi territory, while all west of the Pearl (as at present) should belong to Louisiana. In November, 1814, Jackson, then commanding in Mobile, dashed upon Pensacola and drove out a British force, which had taken possession in August, and reinstated the Spanish power, and then retired. Four years later (1818) Jackson finding that the Seminoles, whom he was fighting, had obtained aid from the Spaniards, again crossed the line, captured Pensacola, and hanged Arbuthnot and Ambrister, two English subjects who were active against him. Spain was powerless, and her minister in Washington at last, Feb. 22, 1819, signed the treaty which gave the Floridas to the United States at a cost of about \$5,000,000 (to be paid to American citizens having claims against Spain). Spain tried to induce the United States to refrain from recognizing the independence of Spain's American revolted colonies as a price of ratification, but failed, and Spain finally ratified the treaty in 1821.⁵

This territory which had been in dispute, between 31° N. lat. and the latitude of the mouth of the Yazoo, and extending from the Mississippi to the Chattahoochee River (the present eastern bounds of Alabama), became the original Mississippi territory in 1798 (*Statutes at Large*, i. 549). In 1804 this territory was extended northward to the southern bounds of Tennessee (*Ibid.* ii. 305). In 1812 the territory was given a frontage on the gulf by annexing to it those portions of the present States of Mississippi and Alabama south of 31° N. lat. (*Ibid.* ii. 734). Of this compacted territory, the western portion became the State of Mississippi, Dec. 10, 1817; and the eastern portion the territory of Alabama, March 8, 1817, and a State, Dec. 14, 1819.⁶

While Spain, in 1782-83, occupied both sides of the Mississippi from 31° N. lat. to its mouth, the United States and Great Britain declared in the Treaty of Paris that the navigation of the Mississippi from its source to its mouth was free to both nations. Spain denied that such provisions could be binding on her, and sought to levy duties on merchandise. Judge Cooley, however, in his *Acquisition of Louisiana* (p. 8), argues that, as such a right was yielded to Great Britain by the treaty of 1763, it necessarily passed with the transfer of dominion to the United States, and that France inherited the obligations of Spain.⁷

The decision, however, was an inevitable one in the near future, when at the close of the Revolutionary War England's assent to bounds of the States on the Mississippi was obtained,—that the country west of that river, and its free possession to the mouth, should belong to the United States. Early proposals to that end are on record.⁸ It was of more pressing importance to secure at least the eastern side of the Mississippi

¹ See map, *ante*, p. 530.

² *The impartial inquirer, being a candid examination of the conduct of the President in execution of the powers vested in him by Act of Congress, May 1, 1810* [with] *Reflections upon the invasion of West Florida. By a citizen of Massachusetts* [John Lowell] (Boston, 1811).

³ *Statutes at Large*, iii. 471-472.

⁴ Fairbanks, p. 253.

⁵ The treaty is in *Statutes at Large*, viii. 252. Cf. *Public Domain*, 108; *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, iv. 455, 530, 615. Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue* (1818-1819) will show various documents, including a Senate report, Feb., 1819, censuring Jackson, with accompanying papers, and a message of Monroe relative to the occupation by U. S. troops of Amelia Island. Benton opposed the treaty of 1819, because the Sabine was accepted as the bounds on Mexico, but he found little support (Benton's *Thirty Years*, i. ch. 6; also ii. ch. 42, 155). Cf., on the political aspects of the treaty, Hildreth, vi. 223, 658; Schouler, ii. 96; Sullivan's *Fam. Letters*, no. 50; Calhoun's *Works*, iv.; Von Holst, 336; Parton's *Jackson*, ii. 397; Claiborne's *Mississippi*; and J. L. M. Curry in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Apr., 1888.

Florida is the nearest land to the tropics which the United States possesses, though there have been efforts from time

to time having in view the acquisition of the West Indies, or parts of them. Cf. John W. Johnston in *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, March, 1886.

⁶ Cf. Gannett, 102, 103, 104; A. J. Pickett's *Alabama*, (Charleston, 1851); W. Brewer's *Alabama*, (Montgomery, 1872.)

⁷ Cf. *The speeches of Mr. Ross and Mr. Morris, in the Senate of the United States, the 24th of February, 1803, in support of Mr. Ross's resolutions relative to the free navigation of the river Mississippi and our right of deposit within the Spanish territories* (Philad., 1803), and Sparks's *Gouverneur Morris*, iii. 403; also Schuyler's *Amer. Diplomacy*, ch. 6.

⁸ Cf. *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, iii. 44; Bishop C. F. Robertson's *Amer. Rev. and the Acquisition of the Valley of the Mississippi* (St. Louis, 1834). The rival attempts of Spain after the Revolution to secure the upper Mississippi Valley are covered in the same author's *Attempts made to separate the West from the Amer. Union* (St. Louis, 1885). Cf. Judge Cooley's *Acquisition of Louisiana* for a good outline of the events, during which the Western settlers played fast and loose with the Union over the question of the free navigation of the Mississippi. On Hamilton's scheme to wrest Louisiana from Spain, see Lodge's *Hamilton*, 212.

from 31° N. lat. to its mouth. A portion of this, that is from 31° southward to the waterway which connects the Mississippi through Lake Pontchartrain with the Gulf, was held by Spain to be a part of Florida. The remaining portion constituted the island of Orleans, on which New Orleans was situated, and though also belonging to Spain was considered a part of Louisiana. The transfer of Louisiana by Spain to France by the treaty of San Ildefonso, Oct. 1, 1800, was a propitious act for the United States, as it turned out, though Jefferson had his misgivings at the time, in seeing Louisiana pass from a weak to a strong power. The first movement now suggested was to purchase of France this island of Orleans; and though Jefferson never pretended that the Constitution authorized an extension of the country by this means, the commercial necessities of the case were too overpowering to allow the purpose to be stayed by any constitutional disability.¹ Accordingly Monroe was sent to act with R. R. Livingston, then the accredited minister in Paris. The danger of war with England disposed Bonaparte, then first consul, to do more than sell the island of Orleans, and to offer the whole extent of the province. The money demanded would be helpful to France, and England, with her naval superiority, was more than likely to seize New Orleans if France retained it. Marbois, who had the confidence of Bonaparte, had been in the diplomatic service in America, and was now at the head of the French treasury. He was put forward to negotiate the sale, and he gives us reports of his interviews with the first consul. The price, 60,000,000 francs, and the satisfying of the French spoliation claims, estimated at \$3,750,000, was agreed upon. The treaty (April 3, 1803) was ratified by Bonaparte in May, 1803, and by the U. S. Senate in the following October.²

¹ See examination of this point in Henry Adams's *John Randolph*, p. 85, etc.; Judge Cooley's *Acquisition of Louisiana*, p. 15, etc. The necessity of the purchase is set forth in Adams's *Gallatin*, p. 307. Webster at a later day, while holding it unconstitutional, acknowledged the necessity (*Works*, i. 355; ii. 551). It is somewhat curious that a college exercise of Webster, written in 1800, on the advantage of extending the territory of the United States, has been preserved (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Oct., 1884, p. 224). Cf. David Ramsay's *Oration on the Cession of Louisiana* (Charleston, 1804), and Wm. Duane's *Report of a debate in the U. S. Senate, Feb., 1803, on the Mississippi Question* (Philad., 1803). The purchase was in fact quite within the implied constitutional powers which the Federalists had always contended for, and Gouverneur Morris and Hamilton were quite ready to acknowledge this. The tergiversation of Jefferson, as a strict constructionist, was too good an object of attack to be neglected; and many Federalists seemed to think it incumbent on them to show Jefferson what true strict construction was. The Federalist opposition was therefore in many ways very violent. Fisher Ames (*Works*, i. 323) wrote: "Now by adding an unmeasured world beyond the Mississippi we rush like a comet into infinite space. In our wild career we may jostle some other world out of its orbit; but we shall in every event quench the light of our own." Many affected to believe in the worthlessness of the territory, and alleged that the purchase was but a means adopted by Jefferson to aid Bonaparte in a critical moment. For such and other views, see Sullivan's *Public Men*, 230; *Memoirs of Manasseh Cutler*, ii. 138; *Life of Wm. Plumer*, 262; those of Josiah Quincy in *Life* by Edmund Quincy, 89, 205, 213; Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, 263. Cf. Hildreth, iii. 226. William Barrows, in his *United States of Yesterday*, etc. (Boston, 1888), gives some striking comparisons to induce an adequate conception of the acquired territory (ch. 1), and enlarges upon the Eastern jealousy of the West (ch. 11). Cf. Bishop Robertson's *Louisiana Purchase in its influence upon the American system* (Am. Hist. Assn. Papers, vol. i., N. Y., 1885); and *An Inquiry into the Present State of the Foreign Relations of the Union as affected by the late measures of administration* (Philad., 1806).

² The text of the treaty is in *Statutes at Large*, viii. 200; *Treaties and Conventions*, 266-286; and in the App. of Marbois. The bibliography of the subject is given in Gilman's *Monroe*, p. 262, where, in ch. 4, there is a succinct narrative of the negotiations. The French side is told in Barbé-Marbois's *Histoire de la Louisiane et de la cession de cette colonie par la France aux États-Unis de l'Amérique* (Paris, 1820). There is an English translation, said to be by Wm. B. Lawrence (Philad., 1830). Monroe considered Marbois's book to be friendly, but to be in error on some points. The official American publications are the *Amer. State Papers, For. Relations*, ii. 525-544, and the documents which Jefferson put forth as an *Account of Louisiana, being an abstract of documents in the offices of the Departments of State and of the Treasury* (Philad., 1803). Cf. index to Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*, and Benton's *Debates*, iii. On Jefferson's part, see his *Works*, iv. 431; Morse's *Jefferson*, ch. 14; Randall's *Jefferson*, iii. ch. 1 and 2; and Parton's *Jefferson*, ch. 64. A leading defence of his action is Algernon Sidney's (*pseud.*) *Vindication of the measures of the present administration* (Hartford).


For general references, see Lyman's *Diplomacy*, 107; Gayarré's *Louisiana, Spanish Dominion* (3d ed. of 1885, vol. iii.); Monette's *Mississippi Valley*; Albach's *Annals*, 771; Hildreth, v. 449, 478; Tucker's *U. S.*, ii. 171; J. C. Hamilton, vii. 604; Schouler, ii. 37-45, 249; McMaster, ii. 620; Von Holst, i. 183; ii. 548.

For more particular treatment of bounds, see Gannett, p. 19; Donaldson's *Public Domain*, 89-105, with documents; Sato's *Land Question*, 40, 45.

For more condensed monographic treatment, see Sparks's reviews of Marbois in *No. Amer. Rev.*, xxviii. 389, April, 1829, and xxx. 551, April, 1830; J. M. Peck in *Christian Rev.*, xvi. 555; *Atlantic Monthly*, xxxii. 301; Bishop Robertson in *Mag. West. Hist.*, i. 383; *Oneida Hist. Soc. Trans.*, 1881, p. 161; Judge T. M. Cooley's "Acquisition of Louisiana" in no. 3, *Indiana Hist. Soc. pamphlets* (Indianapolis, 1887); Lalor, *Cyclopaedia of Political Science*, i. 93. The right of annexation was henceforth considered by general acquiescence of all political parties to be within the powers of the federal government; and the movement could not fail to establish the opinion that there

NOTE TO MAP OF OHIO (*next page*).—From the map given in John Melish's *Travels in the United States, 1806-7, 1809-11* (Philad., 1812), showing the original grants. C. C. Baldwin (*Early maps of Ohio and the West*, Cleveland, 1875, p. 19) enumerates some of the earlier maps, like Fitch's, 1786; those in Kitchin's *Universal Atlas*, 1796; a MS. map by John Heckewelder, 1796, showing the southern banks of Lake Erie (and given in fac-simile in the *Mag. West. Hist.*, i. 110); a MS. map of the Western Reserve by Seth Pease, 1797; by Joseph Scott of Philad., 1795; by Jedediah Morse in the *Amer. Gazetteer*, 1797.

Chillicothe was founded by people from Virginia and Kentucky in 1796, and was the seat of government, 1800-1810. (Cf. *Harper's Mag.*, lxiii. 855; and the *Pioneer Record of Ross County, Ohio*, by Isaac J. Finley and Rufus Putnam.) Columbus, the present capital, was not founded till 1812 (*Mag. West. Hist.*, March, 1885, p. 411).



MICHIGAN

Part of INDIANA

Part of KENTUCKY

41

40

39

8

7

6

XX XIX

CA

TO THE S. E.

Grand R.

Rapids

Miami R.

Fort Duane

Fort Wayne

Portage & Miles

Wabash R.

Fort Adams

Texas T.

S. Marys R.

Fort Recovery

Fort L. or Amie

Piqua

Stanton

Urbana

Fort Mifflin

Livingston

Springfield

Eaton

New Lexington

Franklin

Ludlow

Dayton

Zenia

Miamis R.

Lebanon

Mumms R.

Hamilton

Colerain

Symmes R.

Milford

Cincinnati

Columbus

Westport

Lebanon R.

Williamsburg

Augusta

Limestone

Hanbridge

New Market

West Union

Manchester

Brandy

Chillicothe

Paris

Scioto R.

Alexandria

Portsmouth

Link Vado

Flowing

Fire

CA

Tarleton

Scioto R.

Walton R.

Miami R.

Rapids

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

Scioto R.

At the time of the Louisiana purchase there were joint claims of France and Spain to the territory lying west of the Sabine River,¹—France basing its rights upon the occupation by La Salle, and Spain upon the general extent of her Mexican possessions. The United States in acquiring Louisiana obtained the rights of France to regions west of the Sabine, which in the opinion of Jefferson were valid.² The question, however, remained in dispute till 1819, when the United States, in her treaty with Spain, using in the negotiations the map of John Melish, "improved to Jan. 1, 1818," abandoned all claims beyond the Sabine.³ This line was reaffirmed by a treaty with Mexico, then become (1821) independent, in 1828,⁴ and again after Texas acquired independence, by a treaty with that new commonwealth in 1838. Texas by this time was largely populated from the Southern States, and tenders to purchase the region had been made by the United States government in 1827 and 1829, but Mexico declined to sell.⁵ The American organizing spirit of the settlers finally made of that part of the joint territory of Texas and Coahuila, which was under American influence, a separate State of the Mexican dominion, and when Santa Anna in 1835 attempted to reduce its political con-

were powers implied, as well as expressed, in the Constitution.

Upon St. Louis and its relations to Louisiana, and its subsequent transfer under the treaty of 1803, see M. Tarver in *Western Journal*, ii. 71; *Illinois Monthly*, ii. 312, 355; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, v. 204; F. L. Billon's *Annals of St. Louis* (St. Louis, 1836); O. W. Collet on Pierre Laclède Liguest and the founding of St. Louis, in *Mag. West. Hist.*, Aug., 1885; and on the transfer of Upper Louisiana, by Collet, in *Ibid.*, May, 1885, p. 65.

The acquisition of Louisiana was the opportunity of Edward Livingston. He removed to New Orleans, and proceeded to adjust the old laws of France and Spain to the new conditions, forming what is known as the Livingston Code. Cf. C. H. Hunt's *Life of Edw. Livingston* (N. Y., 1864), and L. L. Hunt's *Mrs. Edw. Livingston* (N. Y., 1886). Cable's *Creoles of Louisiana* (N. Y., 1884,—ch. 20) describes the condition of New Orleans at the time of the acquisition. Wilkinson was now put in command at New Orleans (*Memoirs*, ii.; histories of Louisiana by Gayarré and Martin).

The principal descriptions of Louisiana during these years are:—

Baudry de Loziers' *Voyage à la Louisiane, 1794-98* (Paris, 1802), and *Second Voyage* (Paris, 1803), in two vols.

In 1796, General V. Callot was sent by Adet, the French minister to the United States, to explore and report upon the territory watered by the Mississippi and its branches. When Callot died, in 1805, his results had been printed both in French and English, the latter translation being made under the author's eye. The sheets were unused till 1826, when most of them were destroyed; but such as were reserved were published as *Voyage dans l'Amérique septentrionale, avec un atlas de 36 cartes, etc.* (Paris, 1826), and as *A Journey in North America* (Paris, 1826,—see Sabin, iv. 14,460-61).

F. M. Perrin du Lac's *Voyage dans les deux Louisianes et chez les nations du Missouri, par les États-Unis, l'Ohio et les provinces qui le bordent en 1801, 1802 et 1803; avec un aperçu des mœurs, des usages, du caractère et des coutumes religieuses et civiles des peuples de ces diverses contrées* (Paris, 1805); and abridged in English, *Travels through the Two Louisianas and among the Savage Nations of the Missouri* (London, 1807).

C. C. Robin's *Voyage dans l'intérieur de la Louisiane, etc.*, 1802-1806 (Paris, 1807).

Berquin-Duvallon's *Vue de la colonie espagnole du Mississippi, ou des provinces de Louisiane et Floride occidentale en l'année 1802* (Paris, 1803); and an English translation, *Travels in Louisiana and the Floridas, in the year 1802, giving a correct picture of those countries.* [Anon.] *Transl. from the French, with notes, &c.*, by John Davies (New York, 1806).

H. M. Brackenridge's *Journal of a voyage up the Missouri* in 1811 (Baltimore, 1816, 2d ed.), and his *Views of Louisiana, containing geog., statistical, and hist. notes* (Pittsburg, 1814; Baltimore, 1817).

Amos Stoddard's *Sketches hist. and descriptive of Louisiana* (Phil., 1812).

Wm. Darby's *Geog. Description of the State of Louisiana* (Philad., 1816).

In 1804, Congress had set up that portion of Louisiana south of 33° N. lat. as the territory of Orleans; and in 1812 its limits were restricted on the north to 31°, when it was admitted as the State of Louisiana, with the Pearl River as its bounds on Florida. The trans-Mississippi region north of 31° was for a while the district of Louisiana, an adjunct of the territory of Indiana; and so continued till 1805, when it became a separate territory, which after 1812 was called Missouri Territory. From this the region south of 36° 30' was taken in 1819 to constitute the territory of Arkansas, and, with somewhat curtailed limits, it became the State of Arkansas in 1836. The region still farther north became the State of Missouri in 1820. From this time till 1834 the more northerly parts were not under local jurisdiction, but at this last date they were added temporarily to the territory of Michigan, and remained so till the creation of the State of Michigan in 1836. The later divisions of the States bordering on the Mississippi River, in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota, has been already mentioned. Gannett's *Boundaries of the United States* gives the definite bounds of all these States.

¹ As to the counter-claims in the last century, see H. H. Bancroft's *No. Mex. States*, i. 625-26, with references.

² The western boundary of Louisiana was the Rio Bravo del Norte or Rio Grande, if we allow that La Salle, in taking possession at the Bay of St. Bernard, carried rights to the great river which was midway between his post and the nearest Spanish settlement at Panuco.

³ An attempt had been made to settle the dispute in 1805 (*President's Message*, Dec. 6, 1805; *Amer. State Papers, Foreign Rel.*, ii. 662-65). In 1818, J. Q. Adams, as Secretary of State, proposed for the first time to extend the line on the 41° parallel to the Pacific; but the terms finally agreed upon, Feb. 22, 1819, were to follow the Sabine River to 32° N. lat., thence due north to the Red River, thence up the Red River to 100° meridian, thence due north to the Arkansas River, thence to the source of that river. They were led to suppose that this carried the line to 42° N. lat., whence the line went due west to the Pacific. Later surveys showed that the source was far south of 42°; and so, by an alternative provision of the treaty, the line was run due north till it struck 42°. The line between the N. W. corner of the Indian Territory and the S. E. corner of Idaho is now obliterated (*Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, iv. 455, 530, 615, or Monroe's message, Feb. 22, 1819; Luis Onís's *Memoir upon the negotiation between Spain and the U. S.*, Balt., 1821). The correspondence of Secretary Adams and the Spanish minister, Don Luis de Onís, between July 9, 1817, and March, 1818, accompanies the President's message of March 14, 1818. Among these, the letter of Adams, March 12, 1818, presents fully the American claims as to boundaries, supported by historical evidence. Long was after this sent to explore this region, and his *Account* was published at Philad., 1823, in two vols.

⁴ *Statutes at Large*, viii. 374; *Treaties and Conventions*, 185.

⁵ H. H. Bancroft, *Mexico*, v. 155, and references.

dition to one of greater dependence on the central government, a revolution followed, and on March 1, 1836, a declaration of independence was promulgated.¹ Gen. Houston, in April, led a small band of Texans against Santa Anna's much larger force, captured the Mexican President, and wrung an acknowledgment of independence from him, and opened the way for regular diplomatic relations with the United States, which however, in 1837, refused to entertain the Texan proposals for annexation, while they acknowledged her independence.² The course of politics in the United States, however, soon built up a Southern party of annexation, which readily found Northern adherents; and the scheme was formulated, or, as its opposers contended, a plot was devised, which, after being defeated by the Senate of Tyler's time,³ was consummated in Polk's administration.⁴

The movement towards annexation had been for some time gathering impetus,⁵ and party lines became sharply drawn,—the South and its sympathizers deeming the representation that it would give them in Congress necessary to offset the growing preponderance of the North. In the North the opponents divided themselves into those who would preserve that preponderance, as destined to exterminate slavery, who held the measure to be beyond the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, and who deprecated it as a step to war with Mexico and further conquest. Calhoun was the leader of the aggressive annexationists.⁶

The final annexation complicated the question of bounds. The successors of Santa Anna did not agree to his recognition of Texan independence, and it was a dispute in any event whether the limits of Texas on the Mexican side should be the Nueces River or the Rio Grande, still farther to the west.⁷ Beyond the

¹ Of the separate histories of Texas (on the name of Texas, see *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1882, p. 145; and H. H. Bancroft's *No. Mexican States*, 391), covering its pre-annexation days, the chief is H. Yoakum's *Hist. of Texas*, 1685-1846 (N. Y., 1856), in two vols. Others of less importance are by N. D. Maillard (London, 1842); J. M. Morphis (N. Y., 1874); and H. S. Thrall (N. Y., 1876). The best account of the disruption from Mexico is in H. H. Bancroft's *Mexico*, v. ch. 7. An address by an actor of the times, Ashbel Smith, *Reminiscences of the Texas Republic* (Galveston, 1876), makes no. 1 of the Publ. of the Hist. Soc. of Galveston. There are various papers on the history of Texas during its republic days in the *Texas Almanac* for 1859, and in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*: vol. ii., the Alamo (p. 1) and Houston (p. 577); iii., in 1836 (May); iv., San Jacinto (p. 32); viii., San Jacinto (p. 55); ix., the colonization (p. 157); xi., the republic (p. 38); xi., Houston's Indian life (p. 401); xii., the diplomacy leading to annexation (p. 101),—not to name others, and Reuben M. Potter is the author of many of them. The career of Sam. Houston is closely connected with the theme. Cf. C. Edward Lester's *Sam. Houston and his Republic* (1846), written with Houston's privacy; a *Life of S. H.* (N. Y., 1855); William Cary Crane's *Life and select literary remains of Sam. Houston* (Philad., 1885), in two vols., formed with the aid of Houston's papers, and embodying his messages, etc., as President of Texas. Another personal narrative is *Col. [David] Crockett's exploits and adventures in Texas; together with a topographical, historical, and political view of Texas. Written by himself. The narrative brought down from the death of Col. Crockett to the battle of San Jacinto, by an eye-witness* (Philad., 1836). Other contemporary records are: Henry Stuart Foote's *Texas and the Texans* (Philad., 1841), in two vols., to the end of the Texan revolution; W. Kennedy's *Rise and Progress of Texas* (London, 1841; N. Y., 1844). Cf. also *A Texas scrap-book. Made up of the history, biography, and miscellany of Texas and its people* (New York [1875]); and Benton's *Thirty Years' View* (i. ch. 144-5). There are also contemporary observations in C. Newell's *Hist. of the Revolution in Texas* (N. Y., 1838), and in *The origin and true causes of the Texas insurrection* (Philad., 1836).

² Cf. the message of President Jackson, Dec. 21, 1836, on the political, military, and civil condition of Texas, in *Doc. 20, 24th Cong., 2d sess.* (Washington, 1836). Van Buren sent in a message on the subject, Sept. 30, 1837. The conservative revolt from any spirit of acquisition is well shown in Dr. W. E. Channing's *Letter to Henry Clay* (Boston, 1837), which the Mexican papers were glad to translate and publish (Mexico, 1837).

³ Cf. *Messages* of May 31 and June 3, 1844; and the *Report of Com. on Foreign Affairs*, Feb. 4, 1845; and Theo.

Sedgwick's *Thoughts on the annexation of Texas* (N. Y., 1844); and C. J. Ingersoll's *View of the Texas Question* (Washington, 1844).

⁴ The varying views of the public at the time came out in the Congressional speeches of Archer, Bayly, Benton, Giddings, Kennedy, Merrick, Potter, Rives, Rusk, Tilden, Weller, Wiley, Woodbury,—not to name others, for which see Benton's *Debates*. For documents, see index to Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue*.

⁵ *Niles's Reg.*, lxii. 138; Benton's *Thirty Years*, ii. ch. 24; Von Holst's *History*, ii. ch. 7; Yoakum's *Texas*, ii.; Lester's *Sam. Houston*; Jay's *Review of the Mexican War*; S. J. May's *Reminiscences of the Anti-Slavery Conflict*; Goodell's *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*.

⁶ Cf. Benton's *Debates*, xii. 764; his *Thirty Years*, ii. ch. 135, 138-142, 148; and Roosevelt's *Benton*, ch. 13; Von Holst's *History*, ii. 551, 585, and his *Calhoun*, 222; Calhoun's *Works*, iv.; *Niles's Reg.*, lxvi. 172, 230; Tucker's *U. S.*, iv. 232, 329; L. G. Tyler's *Tylers*, ii. 250, and his paper in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, June, 1882, p. 377. The constitutional argument in opposition found its strongest presentation in Webster (Benton's *Debates*; Webster's *Speeches*; Curtis's *Webster*, ii. 233, 247, 253). J. Q. Adams had attacked the project early and late (Von Holst, ii. 603; *Debates*, xiii., xvi.; his *Memoirs*, xi.). The anti-slavery front is depicted in such books as Wilson's *Slave Power*; Greeley's *Amer. Conflict*, ch. 12; George W. Julian's *Polit. Recoll., 1840-1882* (Chicago, 1884), and the numerous anti-slavery writings of that and of later days. In general, on the political aspects of the movement, see Benton's *Debates*, xv., etc.; *Niles's Reg.*, lxvi.; Von Holst, ii. and iii.; Draper's *Civil War*, i. ch. 22; Schurz's *Clay*, ii. ch. 24, 25; Parton's *Jackson*, iii. 654; Sumner's *Jackson*, 355; the speeches of all the leading political characters, like Clay, Calhoun, Choate (S. G. Brown's *Life of R. Choate*, 3d ed. 149), Winthrop (*Addresses*, i.), not to name others. Tucker and Gay are the only considerable general histories of repute which come down late enough. The popular periodical treatment will be reached through *Poole's Index*, p. 1296; the large number of Congressional documents through Poore's *Desc. Catalogue*, p. 1376. The resolutions in Congress to annex and admit Texas are in *Statutes at Large*, v. 797; ix. 108. Some of the more essential documents are in the *Statesman's Manual*, Donaldson's *Public Domain*, 121; and those bearing on constitutional relations are in Towle, p. 367, etc. There is no good key to the numerous pamphlets which the discussions elicited. One of the earliest surveys among such is Veto's *Thoughts on the proposed Annexation of Texas*, originally published in the *N. Y. Evening Post*, and later separately.

⁷ The Texas government, Dec. 19, 1836, had announced the Rio Grande as its bounds on Mexico.

Nueces, however, Texas had not established practical jurisdiction. The attempt of the United States to take military occupation of the country up to the Rio Grande brought on the Mexican War, as was evidently hoped that it would.



BOUNDS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI.*

* The 49th parallel was, by the convention of 1818, made the northern boundary west of the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains, which are indicated by the line of crosses (xxxxx); thence to salt water, by the treaty of 1846; and finally determined, as run among the islands, out to the ocean by the arbitration of the German emperor in 1872. The purchase of Louisiana (1803), as covering the territory west of the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains, left the bounds on the Spanish possessions somewhat uncertain till the Florida treaty of 1819 settled the line as beginning at the Gulf of Mexico, thence passing up the Sabine River along the dotted line to the Red River, which it followed, and then turning due north on the line (— · — · —) to the Arkansas River, thence to its source, from which it ran due north to the 42° N. lat., and thence to the Pacific. The annexation of Texas (1845) included the territory between the Sabine and the Rio Grande, and up the latter to its source, and thence due north to an affluent of the Arkansas, out of which, by purchase from Texas, the United States added portions to other States, as the map shows. The narrow strip between the Indian Territory and New Mexico was retained as public lands. The treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848) added the region south of 42° and west of the upper Rio Grande and the meridian line from its source, and north of Rio Gila and the connecting lines from its mouth to the Pacific, and from its source to the Rio Grande. The strip between Rio Gila and the present bounds on Mexico (— · — · —), stretching from the Colorado to the Rio Grande, constituted the Gadsden purchase (1853). Maps showing the territorial acquisitions and changes in boundaries are numerous: in Donaldson's *Public Domain*, Walker's *Statistical Atlas, Census of 1870*; McMaster's *United States*, ii.; Fisher's *Outlines of Universal History*; H. E. Scudder's *Hist. United States*, 279; Alexander Johnston's *United States*, 167; *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Oct., 1886, p. 333; *Journal Amer. Geog. Soc.*, xiv. (1882); *Bulletin*, no. 3, accompanying a paper by General E. L. Viele on the "Frontiers of the United States,"—not to name others. These maps not infrequently fail to correspond with each other in minor particulars, as in including Oregon in Louisiana (McMaster's is far wrong in the bounds of Oregon), the making of Kentucky a part of the Public Domain, the extension of Louisiana to the Perdido River; and unless the scale is large, the projection at the Lake of the Woods and the Pennsylvania triangle are often overlooked.

For general treatment of the subject see S. W. Stockton on "The areas and political divisions of the United States, 1776-1876," in the *Statistical Atlas of the Ninth Census*, and B. A. Hinsdale's "Bounding the Original United States," in *Mag. Western History*, Sept., 1885, p. 412; and of course the government publications of Donaldson and Gannett.

Texas had undertaken her revolt from Mexico with little or no financial resources,¹ except so far as her public lands could be pledged for revenue and she could collect import duties. To meet these loans she reserved these public lands at annexation, and losing her duties, the settlement of the future bounds which she should have as a State secured to her a sum of \$10,000,000 from the United States in compensation for lands which she claimed by a northerly extension of her territory, and which she abandoned under the Congressional Boundary Act of Sept. 9 (consummated Dec. 13), 1850. New Mexico had been occupied during the war by Gen. Kearny,² and was now set up as a territory, with bounds on the State of Texas fixed by the 32° parallel of N. latitude and the 103° meridian, while a strip between 36° 30' and 37° N. lat., and lying between the Indian Territory and New Mexico, was also included in the cession.³

The annexation under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo⁴ added to the United States the territory of California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, the westerly portions of New Mexico and Colorado, and the southwesterly part of Wyoming, and necessitated a new boundary line on Mexico, running from the Pacific easterly in an irregular way, mainly in the direction of the 33d degree of north latitude, till it reached the Rio Grande, then to the Gulf of Mexico.⁵

At the time of the acquisition of Louisiana there was no exact knowledge of the headwaters of the Mississippi. The French had best known the upper valleys, both of the Mississippi and the Missouri, and the original authorities are given by Margry.⁶ After the occupation of Louisiana, the United States government dispatched an expedition under Zebulon Montgomery Pike to discover the springs of the great river.⁷

¹ W. M. Gouge's *Fiscal Hist. of Texas*.

² This tended to complicate the boundary disputes with Texas. Cf. Webster's letter to Gov. Bell, Aug. 5, 1850, in *Works*, vi. 479.

³ *Public Domain*, 135, and Gannett, p. 105. The creation of Colorado in 1861 and of Arizona in 1863 has diminished its original territory.

⁴ Feb. 2, 1848. *Statutes at Large*, ix. 922.

⁵ The particular definition of this line (Gannett, p. 22) was marked on a copy of a *Map of the United Mexican States. Revised ed., published at N. Y., 1847*, by J. Disturnell, annexed to the treaty. What is called the Gadsden Purchase, being mainly the southern watershed of the Rio Gila (the Mesilla Valley), was also obtained from Mexico, Dec. 30, 1853, *Statutes at Large*, x. 1031, completing the bounds on Mexico as at present established. Cf. Gannett, 22; H. H. Bancroft's *Mexico*, v. 652; *Report of the secretary of war communicating the report of Lieut.-Col. [J. D.] Graham on the subject of the boundary line between the United States and Mexico* (Washington, 1852), and the *United States and Mexico boundary surveys* (Washington, 1857-59), in 3 vols. The difficulties of running the new line are explained by General E. L. Viele in the *Amer. Geog. Soc. Bulletin*, 1882, no. 5, who states that, after its rectification by the Gadsden purchase, it was marked with extreme precision. Upon the line as marked by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the commissioners of the two countries could not agree (*Public Domain*, p. 136).

The most useful of the maps of the New Mexico region, and on the routes from Fort Leavenworth to Santa Fé, thence to Fort Smith, is that in Josiah Gregg's *Commerce of the Prairies or a journal of a Santa Fé trader* (N. Y., 1844). On the contributions to geographical knowledge by the early Santa Fé traders, see *Hist. of Kansas*, 4^o (Chicago, 1883), p. 54, etc. Lt. W. H. Emory's *Map of Texas*, 1844, was published by the War Department.

George W. Kendall's *Texas Santa Fé Expedition* (N. Y., 1844) has a map of the region between the 19° and 38° parallels and the 91° and 103° meridian.

⁶ *Découvertes*, etc., vol. vi. McMaster (ii. 153) notes the condition of knowledge at the end of the eighteenth century.

⁷ His narrative was published as *An account of expeditions to the sources of the Mississippi, and through the western parts of Louisiana, to the sources of the Arkansas, Kans, La Platte, and Pierre Juan rivers; performed by order of the government of the United States during the years 1805, 1806, and 1807. And a tour through the interior parts of New Spain, in 1807. Illus. by maps and charts. With Appendices and Atlas* (Phila., 1810), in two volumes; and republished as *Exploratory Travels*, etc. (London, 1811). There are also French and Dutch versions (Paris,

1811-1812; Amsterdam, 1812). Cf. *Life of Pike*, by Henry Whiting, in Sparks's *Amer. Biog.*, 2d series; *Minnesota Hist. Coll.*, i. 368; and *Hist. of Kansas*, large quarto (Chicago, 1883), p. 50.

A later exploration is recorded in the travels of Giacomo Constantino Beltrami, *La découverte des sources du Mississippi et de la Rivière Sanglante. Description du cours entier du Mississippi. Observations sur les mœurs, etc. de plusieurs nations indiennes*, etc. (Nouvelle-Orléans, 1824), or in the English version, *Pilgrimage in Europe and America, leading to the discovery of the sources of the Mississippi and Bloody river; with a description of the course of the former and of the Ohio* (London, 1828). Cf. *Minnesota Hist. Soc. Collections*, 1867, p. 13.

Of later record are the books of Henry R. Schoolcraft: *Narrative Journal of travels through the northwestern regions of the United States, extending from Detroit through the great chain of American Lakes, to the sources of the Mississippi River in the year 1820* (Albany, 1821). In an official expedition of the government, authorized in 1832, he traced the origin of the Mississippi in Itasca Lake, and published at New York, in 1834, his *Narrative of an expedition through the upper Mississippi to Itasca Lake, the actual source of the Mississippi River*. His final book was his *Summary Narrative of an Exploratory Expedition to the sources of the Mississippi River in 1820, resumed and completed by the discovery of its origin in Itasca Lake in 1832* (Philad., 1854-1855). Cf. his *Indian Tribes*, i. 147, 148. The report and map of Lieut. J. Allen, who accompanied Schoolcraft, is in *Exp. Doc. no. 323, First session, 23d Congress*. (Cf. Warren's *Pacific R. R. Rept.*, p. 27.) See references in Allibone, ii. 1952; Duyckinck, ii. 152. Schoolcraft fantastically formed the name thus: VERITAS CAPUT. The more detailed report (1845, with map dated 1836-37) of Jean N. Nicollet, on the hydrographical basin of the Upper Mississippi, shows that there are feeders of Lake Itasca, which may be deemed the ultimate sources of the great river. Nicollet's report and map is in *Senate Doc. no. 237, 26th Cong., 2d sess.*, 1843. The original larger map had been published the previous year; and Warren (p. 41) calls it "one of the greatest contributions made to American geography." Still further detailed examinations, as made (1855-56, and 1875-76) by the engineers of the U. S. lake survey and the surveyor-general of Minnesota, show that the principal feeder broadens into a small lake, called Elk Lake, and it is this lake that Capt. Willard Glazier visited at a later day (1881), and claimed to have first discovered in it the source of the Mississippi (*Royal Geog. Soc. Proc.*, Jan., 1885). The claim is considered audacious. Cf. *The Sources of the Mississippi, their discoveries, real and pretended, a report by James H. Baker*

The complications of the northern boundary of the U. S. from the Bay of Fundy to the St. Lawrence River have been elucidated in another place.¹

It seems to have been by ignorance rather than by the lack of current information that the treaty of 1782-83 carried the line from Lake Superior to the Lake of the Woods along a waterway, since it was fully known at that time that a height of land interrupted such a passage.² It was also before long suspected that the source of the Mississippi was not as high up as the 49° parallel, which was assumed by the treaty of 1782-83. Pickering, in a memoir which he presented to Jefferson (*Life of Pickering*, iv. App. B) after the Louisiana purchase, contended that the true line should be on the parallel of the said source. This would have been a surrender of a large territory to Canada. The Louisiana purchase, in 1803, broke up conclusions which the American agents in London had reached as to running this line.³ By the Treaty of Ghent (1814) commissioners were to decide, among other points, on the line intersecting the Great Lakes, running west from the point



ZEBULON MONTGOMERY PIKE.*

where the 45° parallel touched the St. Lawrence to Lake Superior; and this line, thus finally established by a decision dated at Utica, N. Y., June 18, 1822,⁴ was of importance as giving the islands along its course to one power or the other.

Commissioners appointed under the same treaty to continue the line across Lake Superior to the northwest corner of the Lake of the Woods failed to agree.

In 1818 a convention with Great Britain, recognizing the fact that the northwest corner of the Lake of the Woods might be distant from the 49° parallel, provided that the line from that corner should run due north or south, as was required, till it struck that parallel, and thence westward on that parallel to the crests of the Rocky, or Stony, Mountains.

By the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842,⁵ the line across Lake Superior and up that agreed upon among several waterways to a portage, and thence down a stream to the Lake of the Woods, and across that lake to a point fixed at the northwest corner (49°, 23', 55" N. lat.), and then south to the 49° parallel and along it westerly to the mountains, was settled upon.

to the *Minnesota Hist. Soc.* (St. Paul, 1857), with a list of books, documents, and maps illustrating the matter. See especially *Mag. West. Hist.* (March, 1887), by Alfred J. Hill; various papers in *Science*, vol. viii. and ix. 418; the *Bull. Amer. Geog. Soc.*, 1886, p. 143; and Henry D. Harrower's *Captain Glazier and his Lake* (N. Y., 1886).

¹ See *ante*, p. 171.

² This is shown on various maps of nearly that date, and had got into compilations, such as the map of the *Historisch-geographische Calendar für 1784*, published at Leipzig.

Cf. letter of Benjamin Frobisher, April 10, 1784, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Oct., 1887.

³ *Brit. and Foreign State Papers, 1819-20*, p. 158. This treaty, which Jefferson discarded, provided for a line to be run the shortest distance between the N. W. corner of the Lake of the Woods and the source of the Mississippi. The map in the London ed. (1809) of Lewis and Clarke shows such a line. A British surveyor had as early as 1798 discovered that this source was below 48°.

⁴ Given in Gannett's *Boundaries of the U. S.*

⁵ Gannett, p. 17.

* From an engraving by Gimbrede, in the *Analectic Mag.*, vol. iv.

Thus after sixty years of delay and negotiation, the line was finally established from the Bay of Fundy to the Rocky Mountains.¹

A candid student must recognize the fact that what is known as the Oregon question,² or the controversy over the line from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific, did not embody claims on the part of any nation that were beyond dispute,³ and that it reasonably invited a settlement by compromise.

The Spanish claim undoubtedly went back farthest, if we consider that the voyages of Cabrillo and his successors, beginning in 1543, and extending in some cases as high as 54° north latitude, can be counted as carrying the rights of discovery.⁴ The Spaniards made, however, no settlements above 42°, the present northern bounds of California. If the Spanish maritime explorations of 1774-1775 gave their real title to the coast,⁵ the voyage of Drake in 1580 must pass for only a transient affair, and the more accurate examinations of Captain Cook (1778) came too late to serve the English. Still, when the Spaniards seized British vessels in Nootka Sound in 1789, Spain, in becoming (Oct. 28, 1790) a party to the Nootka Convention,⁶ by which England and Spain agreed to trade on the coast side by side and to respect each other's settlements, recognized some sort of an English right, either of possession or of might.



LAKE OF THE WOODS.*

* This was the condition when the United States began to establish her claim, unless, as was rather whimsi-

¹ No necessity of marking this line from the Lake of the Woods westerly arose for many years, and it was not till 1872-74 that it was done by a joint commission of the two countries. The northwest corner of the Lake of the Woods as designated in the treaty of 1782 was established in 1825 by the commissioners under the Treaty of Ghent. At this point the line dropped due south, a distance of 26 miles, to a point in the lake where it struck the 49° parallel, and thence was run by the commissioners due west to the summit of the Rocky Mountains. The American documents appertaining are in the *44th Cong., 2d sess., Senate Ex. Doc. no. 41*, and the large *Report*, with maps of A. Campbell & W. J. Twining (1878). The atlas is entitled *Joint maps of the northern boundary of the U. S. from the Lake of the Woods to the summit of the Rocky Mountains* (Washington, 1878). The history of the running of this line by the astronomer of the British commission, Capt. S. Anderson, Royal Engineers, is given by him in the *Journal of the Royal Geog. Soc.*, 1876, vol. xlvi. p. 228, with a map; and at less length in the *Geog. Mag.*, 1876, p. 139. Cf. *Globus*, xxv. (1876), p. 187.

² The bibliography of the Oregon question has not been treated monographically, but the material is centred in a few general records, — such as the list of authorities prefixed to H. H. Bancroft's *North West Coast*, vol. i.; in the foot-notes of vol. ii., particularly to ch. 15-17, with some comments on pp. 414-16; the index to Poore's *Descriptive*

Catalogue, the index of Benton's *Debates*, particularly for the numerous speeches, most of them delivered in 1845-46, — and there is a list of many such in H. H. Bancroft's list. The popular expression can easily be traced through the references in *Poole's Index*, p. 947. Barrows's *Oregon* gives a rather scant list of authorities. The various theories as to the origin of the name Oregon — Carver first using, and it being doubtful whether he invented it, or adapted it from some source, Spanish or Indian — are most succinctly stated in a long note, with references, in H. H. Bancroft's *Oregon*, pp. 17-25. The most elaborate development of any theory is by Prof. Josiah D. Whitney in his *Names and Places* (Cambridge, 1888), p. 28, where he contends that it is unquestionably the Spanish *orejon*, big-ear, as applied to Indians who stretch their ears in ornamenting them. Dr. J. H. Trumbull (*Mag. Amer. Hist.*, iii. 36) says it is not of Spanish origin. Cf. H. B. Staples's *Origin of the names of the States* (Worcester, 1882). There is a bibliography of Carver, by John Russell Bartlett, in the *Book Mart*, June, 1886, and in J. C. Pilling's *Sionan Languages*.

³ *No. Am. Rev.*, Jan., 1846; R. C. Winthrop's *Address*, etc.

⁴ Cf. Vol. II. p. 444; Greenhow's *Oregon and California*, pp. 86-126.

⁵ H. H. Bancroft's *No. West Coast*, ii. 318.

⁶ Given in App. of Greenhow; *Annual Reg.*, xxxii. 285; *Recueil des Traités*, 2d ed., iv. 492.

* This is sketched from a *Map of Part of Keewatin, shewing Dominion land surveys to 1876* (Ottawa, 1877). The international boundary, running down Rainy River, crosses the lake by the broken line, and then drops due south to the 49° parallel, which it strikes within the lake, and thence runs due west.

cally urged by D. C. Murdock in his *Our True Title to Oregon* (Georgetown, 1845), the American claim was



MERIWETHER LEWIS.*

really based on the territorial extension to the Pacific under the Charter of Virginia! In 1792 a Boston ship, the "Columbia," Captain Robert Gray, being then on the second voyage round the world made by an American vessel,¹ entered and explored the River of the West, and called it from his ship the Columbia River.² The United States interpreted this exploration of the river as giving, under the laws governing rights of discovery, a claim to the whole valley of the river; but for so vast a region there was needed the claim of farther exploration and occupation, — to come in due time. It was not till the next year (1793) that Vancouver, who was on the coast at the time of Gray's entry into the Columbia, made the explorations that the British held to increase their claim.³ In the same year (1793) Alexander Mackenzie crossed overland from the Canada side, touching the coast near where Vancouver had examined it, but all north of the Columbia River Valley; and the Hudson Bay Company were at about this time pushing their fur-traders through the region north of 49°, but they were not exploring in any public capacity.⁴

In 1800 Spain had ceded to France all her rights to the territory west of the Mississippi, and whether this included the country beyond the Rocky Mountains has been a question in dispute without much ground on the affirmative side; and whatever the claim that France acquired,⁵ she in turn ceded it, in 1803, by the name of Louisiana, to the United States.⁶

To make good the claim of discovery, and perhaps to connect it with the new purchase of Louisiana, the expedition of Lewis and Clarke (1804–1806) traversed the country from the Mississippi to the mouth of the Columbia.

The authentic full narrative finally appeared in *History of the expedition*

¹ The first was in 1683 — *United Service*, Feb., 1883, p. 164; Preble's *American Flag*, 2d ed., 300.

² H. H. Bancroft's *No. West Coast*, i. ch. 7, 8, 9, 10; his *Brit. Columbia*, pp. 6–15; *Mem. Hist. Boston*, iv. 208. The widow of Capt. Gray in 1846 presented to Congress a petition for a pension, because of his services. Cf. *20th Cong. 1st sess. Ho. Rept.*, no. 456.

³ H. H. Bancroft's *Brit. Columbia*, ch. 1; his *No. West Coast*, i.; George Vancouver's *Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, 1790–95*, London, 1798, in 3 vols.; and the leading British presentations of their claims.

⁴ John Dunn's *Oregon Territory* (London, 1844; Philad., 1845).

⁵ Cf. Parkman's *La Salle*, 289.

⁶ The map given by Marbois extends the same color over Oregon as over the territory of Louisiana, and bears as a legend, stretching from the Pacific to the Gulf of Mexico, "Accroissement des États-Unis par le traité et par ses effets." J. Q. Adams, in 1819, in securing his treaty with Spain, when he got the 42° parallel to be recognized by that power as extending the boundary to the Pacific, did not hold that the Louisiana purchase had secured it (*Memoirs*,

* After a print in the *Analectic Mag.* (1815), vii. 329, engraved by Strickland from a drawing by St. Memin. It was believed at the time of its publication to be the only likeness of Lewis existing, and the drawing belonged to his companion, Gov. Clarke. There is a sketch of his life in Jefferson's Works, viii. 480. Cf. Albach's *Annals of the West*, 755.

*Mountains*¹ and down the River Columbia to the Pacific Ocean, 1804-5-6. Prepared for the Press by Paul Allen (Philad., 1814), in two volumes. The work was begun by Lewis, and after his suicide was carried on by Nicholas Biddle, with the aid of Clarke, deriving some material from journals of subordinate officers,² and from George Shannon, one of the party. Paul Allen gave it its last supervision, and received from Jefferson a memoir of Lewis, to be added.³ Perhaps the best of the later summaries of the work of the expedition is in H. H. Bancroft's *North West Coast* (vol. ii. ch. 1-3), with a note on the site of Fort Clatsop, p. 55 and p. 65, a reproduction of the explorers' map. Cf. his *British Columbia*, p. 74, where he refers for maps of their route to Wheeler's *U. S. Geol. Survey, Progress Report, 1872*.⁴ Capt. Geo. M. Wheeler, in his *Report upon the Third International Geog. Congress at Venice, 1881* (Washington, 1885), p. 465, gives the long list of government explorations west of the Mississippi, which have been conducted since Lewis and Clarke, and down to 1879.⁵ The history of such explorations and surveys (1800-57) is told by Warren in the *Pacific R. R. Reports*, vol. xi.⁶ The Index to Poore's *Descriptive Catalogue* will guide to the different governmental publications. The best of the more detailed summaries will be found in H. H. Bancroft's *N. West Coast* (vol. ii.) and in his *British Columbia*.

The treaty which Monroe negotiated in London in 1806 would have confirmed the line westward on the 49° so far as the mountains only, if it had been confirmed. The delay was helpful to the United States.

The founding of the American fur-trading settlement of Astoria, in 1811, began to strengthen the American claim;⁷ for, though that post was taken by the British in the war of 1812, at the conclusion of peace the property was restored, with the special understanding that it carried no recognition of the American title to the country.⁸ The next step in the struggle for occupation was an agreement by the United States and Great

try; observations made in a voyage to the mouth of the Red River, and from thence ascending that river, the Black River, and the Washita River, . . . extracted from the journals of William Dunbar and Doctor Hunter. It was reprinted in New York (1806) and in London (1807) as *Travels in the interior parts of America* (Field, *Ind. Bibliog.*, no. 926; Poore's *Descriptive Catal.*). Cf. *Amer. State Papers, Military Affairs*, vol. i.

The official communication of Lewis, together with some private letters of Clarke, make up *The Travels of Capts. Lewis and Clarke from St. Louis by way of the Missouri and Columbia rivers to the Pacific Ocean* (London, 1809. Cf. Field, no. 927). This publication was reprinted as *An interesting account of the voyages and travels of Captains Lewis and Clark in 1804, 1805, 1806. By William Fisher, Esq.* (Baltimore, 1812), and as *The Journal of Lewis and Clarke*, at Dayton, O., 1840. Fisher also published *New Travels among the Indians of North America, being a compilation, partly from Lewis and Clark, etc.* (Philad., 1812, — Brinley, iii. 4,682).

¹ These mountains were early called the "Shining Mountains," or "Mountains of Shining Stones," or "Bright Stones" (Carver, 1778), and then the "Stony Mountains," the last being the designation on Arrowsmith's *Map of North America*; but he changed the name in his edition of 1802 to "Rocky." Jefferson in his instructions to Lewis and Clarke called them "Stony Mountains;" but those explorers in their *Report* (1804-1806) adopt the name "Rocky" (Josiah D. Whitney's *Names and Places—Studies in Geog. and Topog. Nomenclature*, Cambridge, 1888).

² Among them Patrick Gass's *Journal of the voyages and travels under Lewis and Clarke, through the interior parts of North America, 1804-6. With notes.* Editions were issued at Pittsburgh, 1807, 1808; London, 1808; Philad., 1811, 1812 (Field, nos. 595-597). A French version was published at Paris, 1810.

³ It had an appendix, which was omitted in the English reprint, *Travels to the source of the Missouri River, etc.* (London, 1814), in one large quarto, and republished in three octavos (London, 1815). There was also an edition in two vols. at Dublin in 1817, with the English title. The edition in Harper's Family Library (1845-47 and later) purports to be revised by A. McVicar, with a map containing "a glaring error," as Lt. Warren says, "of a range of mountains running east and west between the Missouri and Yellowstone rivers."

⁴ There is a summary of the Oregon part in Bulfinch's *Oregon and El Dorado* (Boston, 1866), which H. H. Bancroft (*N. W. Coast*, ii. 31) rudely condemns. There is

more or less comment in the *Pacific R. R. Repts.* (i. 160; xi. 17; xii. 234).

⁵ Of later travels, mention may be made of those of Maj. Z. M. Pike, 1805-7 (Philad., 1810); Maj. Stephen H. Long, 1819-20 (Philad., 1823); Capt. B. L. E. Bonneville, 1832 (Washington Irving's *Rocky Mountains*, Philad., 1837); the parties sent out by John Jacob Astor (Washington Irving's *Astoria*, N. Y., 1849). Lt. J. C. Frémont made his explorations in 1842 (*Senate Doc. no. 243, 27th Cong., 3d sess.*); again in 1843-44 (*Sen. Doc. no. 174, 28th Cong., 2d sess.*), and again in 1845-46 (*Senate Misc. Doc. no. 148, 30th Cong., 1st session*), with a map at its date (1848), the most accurate of the region between the 104° meridian and the Pacific. Frémont has begun the publication of his *Memoirs of my life; including five journeys of western exploration, during the years 1842, 1843-4, 1845-6-7, 1848-9, 1853-4. With a sketch of the life of Senator Benton, in connection with western expansion, by Jessie B. Frémont. A retrospect of fifty years, covering the most eventful periods of modern American history.* Vol. i. (Chicago, 1887). The final explorations before the acquisition of California were those of Maj. Emory from Fort Leavenworth to San Diego, in California, in 1846-47 (*Sen. Ex. Doc. no. 71, 30th Cong., 1st sess.*), not without some hard fighting with the Mexicans; and various other military reconnaissances about this time increased our knowledge of the region of the Mexican borders (Warren's *Report*, p. 52, etc.). The great interior, closed Salt Lake basin was first made known by the explorations of Bonneville (1832-36), and confirmed by those of Frémont (1842-44). (Cf. J. D. Whitney's *Names and Places, Cambridge, 1888*, pp. 22, 45, who complains of Irving's editing of Bonneville; and Warren's *Report*, p. 34.)

⁶ *Reports of Explorations and Surveys to ascertain the most practicable and economical route for a railroad from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean, 1833-56, vol. xi.* (Washington, 1861), which includes a *Memoir to accompany the map of the territory of the U. S. from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean giving a brief acc. of the expeditions since 1800, by Lieut. G. K. Warren, 1859.* The maps accompanying the *Memoir* are reproductions of that in Winterbotham's *History* (1796), of Rector and Roberdeau's map (1818), of Finlay's map (1826), and of Bonneville's map (1837).

⁷ Cf., on the Winship settlement just before, H. H. Bancroft's *No. West Coast*, ii. 135.

⁸ Cf. H. H. Bancroft's *No. West Coast*, ii. 291, 335. Canning, then one of the British government, regretted the restoration (Stapleton's *Canning*, ii. 73). We have three accounts of this expedition, which was conducted by Astor, as the "Pacific Fur Company." The *Astoria* of Wash-

Britain, by a convention in 1818,¹ jointly to occupy the territory for ten years.² The United States government now sent out another exploring expedition under Long.³

The Florida treaty of 1819,⁴ by determining the bounds that have already been mentioned, had the effect of yielding to the United States all claims that Spain had to the Pacific coast above 42° N. latitude, including the rights which she had shared with England by implication in the convention of Nootka Sound. The President now, in 1822, in a message to Congress, examined the claims of foreign governments to territory upon the Pacific, as narrowed by the claims of Spain being thus ceded to the United States. The first of these foreign governments to come to an agreement with the United States was Russia, which in 1821 had claimed jurisdiction south to 51°;⁵ but later, by a treaty, April 5-17, 1824, agreed with the United States that she would not push settlements below 54° 40' N. lat., while the United States would not offer to occupy any position north of that latitude.⁶ This meant nothing more than that Russia withdrew from the contest, for the next year (1825) she came to similar terms with Great Britain.⁷

As the time approached for the expiration of the ten years' joint occupancy, both England and the United States prepared for a renewal of the controversy,⁸ and this resulted in a re-agreement on the old convention, Aug. 8, 1827 (*Statutes at Large*, viii. 360), with the provision that it could be terminated by either party giving twelve months' notice.

The policy which the United States soon after developed was one in which Great Britain could hardly compete, and this was to possess the country by settlers, as against the nomad occupancy of the fur-trading companies, directed from Montreal. By 1832 this movement of occupation was fully in progress.⁹

By 1838 the interest was renewed in Congress, and a leading and ardent advocate of the American rights, Congressman Linn of Missouri, presented a report to the Senate and a bill for the occupation of Oregon, June 6, 1838 (*Niles's Reg.*, lv. 139). A Report made by Caleb Cushing,¹⁰ coming from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, respecting the territory of Oregon, accompanied by a map, was presented in Jan. and Feb., 1839 (*Niles's Reg.*, lv. 139). It was not till 1842 that the movements of aggression began to become prominent in politics, and immigration was soon assisted by Frémont's discovery of the pass over the Rocky Mountains at the head of the La Platte. The Democratic party so pressed the extreme American view of carrying the territory as high as the Russian line of 54° 40', that it became a party rallying-cry, and was used strenuously in

ington Irving, who is charged by H. H. Bancroft (*No. West Coast*, ii. 138, 169, 222, 247) with having resorted to plagiarism and sycofancy to a plutocrat, with more or less of the adornment of fiction in telling the story. Bancroft (*No. West Coast*, ii. ch. 7, 16, with references, p. 236) tells the story of Astoria and the American fur trade. The subject also makes a chapter (viii.) in Barrows's and other general accounts of Oregon. On Astor himself, see Par-ton's *Life of Astor* (N. Y., 1865), and his *Famous Americans of recent Times*; Hunt's *Merchant's Mag.*, xi. 153; Hunt's *Amer. Merchants*, ii. 337.

The other narratives of the Astor enterprise are Ross Cox's *Adventures on the Columbia River* (London, 1831; N. Y., 1832); and Alexander Ross's *Adventures of the first settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River* (London, 1849), and as illustrated in his *Fur Hunters of the Far West* (London, 1855), in two vols. (Field, *Indian Bibliog.*, 377, 1325, 1326).

¹ *Statutes at Large*, viii. 248; *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, iv. 348; Greenhow, App.

² Cf. references in H. H. Bancroft's *No. West Coast*, ii. 295, 338; and for the negotiations in London, Rich. Rush's *Residence at the Court of London, 1817-1825* (London, 1872).

³ S. H. Long's *Acc. of his exped. in 1819-20, compiled by E. James* (Philad., 1823), in two vols.; and H. H. Bancroft's *No. West Coast*, ii. 342. Pike in 1806, and Long in 1819, were the earliest to create that Great American Desert between the Valley of the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains, where now are teeming States. Cf. Barrows in the *Mag. West. Hist.*, June, 1885, p. 113; his *U. S. of Yesterday*, etc., ch. 6, and his *Oregon*, 106, 337; and *Hist. of Kansas*, 4^o (Chicago, 1883), p. 54. There is something of the old notion left in Gen. W. B. Hazen's "Great middle region of the U. S." in *No. Amer. Rev.*, Jan., 1875.

⁴ *Statutes at Large*, viii. 252; *Treaties and Conventions*, p. 788.

⁵ Stapleton's *Polit. life of Canning*, iii. 114.

⁶ *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, v. 432, 471; *Federal and State Constitutions*, ii. 1482.

⁷ By this treaty the easterly bounds of Alaska were determined, and it was with these bounds that Alaska was

purchased for \$7,200,000 by the United States, under the treaty signed at Washington, May 29, 1867. Cf. H. H. Bancroft's *Alaska*; Donaldson's *Public Domain*.

⁸ The statement of the opposing claims at this time is given in H. H. Bancroft's *No. West Coast*, ii. 368. A special committee of Congress made a Report in 1826 (19th Cong., 1st sess. *Ho. Rept.*, no. 35). President Adams covered the points in a message of Dec. 12, 1827, with annexed documents. Albert Gallatin made the American counter statement (*Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.* v. 670; and Gallatin's later tracts, *Letters on the Oregon Question*, Washington, 1846, and *The Oregon Question*, N. Y., 1846, — the last reprinted in Henry Adams's *Gallatin's Writings*). The American case in 1826, as embodied in the second report to the House of Representatives, May 15, 1826, is also given in Stapleton's *Canning*, ii. 87-110, where will also be found (ii. 110) Addington's presentation of the British case, May 10, 1826. Canning's instructions to the British commissioners, May 31, 1824, and the protocol of the twentieth conference of those commissioners, June 29, 1824, with Rush, is given in Stapleton's *Geo. Canning*, ii. 76-87. The British statement is in the *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, v. 665. On May 17, 1826, Canning wrote to Liverpool: "It is a most perplexing question, and there are difficulties both in maintaining and abandoning our claim in argument." E. J. Stapleton's *Some official Corresp. of Geo. Canning* (London, 1887), ii. p. 55.

⁹ This early life of the pioneer settler is illustrated in the *Transactions of the Oregon Pioneer Association* (Salem, 1875, etc.), and in the *Proceedings of the Pioneer and Hist. Soc. of Oregon* (Astoria, 1875, etc.). Cf. F. F. Victor on the pioneers in the *Overland Monthly*, xiii. 38, 122, and the general histories. Two of the leading pioneers' experiences are told in J. B. Wyeth's *Oregon, or a short History of a long Journey to the Pacific* (Cambridge, Mass., 1833); and Hall J. Kelley's *Hist. of the Colonization of the Oregon Territory* (Worcester, 1850), and his *History of the settlement of Oregon* (Springfield, 1868). The map in Schoolcraft's *Indian Tribes*, iii. 200, shows the emigrants' road down the Lewis fork of the Columbia River.

¹⁰ Cf. also *No. Amer. Rev.*, Jan., 1840.

the election by which Polk became President and in the early years of his administration. Benton's *Debates* and the regular records of Congressional proceedings are filled with speeches for and against a termination of the joint occupancy, with ulterior chances of conflict.¹ Calhoun, in 1845, took the position that the tide of immigration was solving the difficulty, and it was best to wait that issue, and not force a conflict.²

The close of the controversy came in the treaty of 1846, determining the 49th parallel from the mountains to the sea as the bounds, the British government yielding their claim that the Columbia should mark the bounds between the point of contact of that parallel with its upper waters.³ The treaty provided that the line on the 49° N. lat., having struck sea-water, should follow the middle of the channel dividing Vancouver's Island from the main, and thence proceed through the middle of Fuca Straits to the Pacific. There happened to be in the channel a cluster of islands, some of considerable size, with more than one navigable passage through them, and a dispute inevitably arose here as to the passage along which the line should be run. The Americans contended for the deepest and broadest, Canal de Haro, which gave them nearly all the islands. The British contended for the directest and most frequented, Rosario Strait, which gave them the same advantage. To avoid conflict, it was determined to occupy the principal island jointly, pending negotiations, and small military camps of both nations possessed in this way opposite ends of San Juan Island after 1859. After the American civil war was over the two countries addressed themselves to



THE SAN JUAN BOUNDARY.*

a settlement, and it was finally agreed to leave the dispute to the arbitration of the German Emperor, who in

¹ Fifty, and probably more, of these speeches were separately printed. H. H. Bancroft (*Oregon*, i. ch. 14) traces the Congressional aspects of the controversy during this period. The documentary sources most available are *Niles's Register*, vol. lxiv.-lxvi.; Benton's *Debates*, xv., xvi.; the *Statesman's Manual*, iii.; and *Correspondence relative to the negotiations . . . subsequent to the treaty of Washington, 1842* (London, 1846). Buchanan was Polk's Secretary of State. (Cf. Curtis's *Buchanan*, i. ch. 20.) Rufus Choate had arraigned (March 21, 1844) Buchanan's views before he took office (Choate's *Works*, ii. 173; S. G. Brown's *Life and Writings of R. C.*, 3d ed., ii. 119).


² Calhoun's *Works*, iv. 238, 260, 479, 513; v. 414, etc.; Von Holst's *Calhoun*, ch. 9. No settlement of the question

having been attempted by Webster in the treaty of 1842, he had been hastily accused of a willingness to trade off Oregon for the fisheries. Barrows (p. 231) vindicates him. His position is seen in his *Works*, ii. 322; v. 60, 63, 70, 294; *Private Correspondence*, i. 215, 230; Curtis's *Webster*, ii. 173, 257; Lodge's *Webster*, p. 265.

The political aspects and personal relations can also be followed in Schurz's *Clay*, ii. 280; Coleman's *Crittenden*, i. 236; L. G. Tyler's *Times of the Tylers*, ii. ch. 15; Smith's *Cass*, ch. 33; R. C. Winthrop's *Speeches*; Benton's *Thirty Years' View* (i. ch. 5, 20, 37; ii. ch. 112, 114, 143, 156-159, 170); Roosevelt's *Benton*, ch. 12.

³ The treaty is in *Treaties and Conventions*, 375, and in *Federal and State Constitutions*, ii. 1484. Cf. H. H. Ban-

* From Barrows's *Oregon*.



1872 gave his award in favor of the American claim.¹ This was in 1872, ninety years from the treaty of 1782, involving nearly a century of contests, all along the line from the Bay of Fundy to the Pacific, — in which deceit, bravado, and an overreaching spirit characterized the negotiations more or less on both sides, during which open war was at times imminent. One thing is apparent through it all: that the British claims which caused trouble were almost invariably afterthoughts, — devices to recover compensation for something previously lost.

It remains now to characterize some of the principal treatments of the Oregon controversy, beginning with those that were made during the progress of the dispute.

The chief writer on the American side was Robert Greenhow, the librarian of the Department of State, who in the first place prepared, on the instigation of Mr. Linn, in 1840, a *Memoir historical and political of the No. West Coast (26th Cong., 1st sess., Sen. Doc. 174)*, which was later elaborated into his *Hist. of Oregon and California*.² Perhaps the best condensed statement of the American claim, made at the time, is in a speech of John A. Dix.³

The official presentation of both sides is in *The claim of the United States as stated in the letters of Calhoun and Buchanan, with the counter-statement of Pakenham* (London, 1816).

On the British side, the public documents and *Hansard's Debates* give the guiding views; while a good condensed statement of the dispute is in the *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1845, and a Canadian view in Dent's *Last Forty Years* (ii. ch. 11); but the leading statement is that of Travers Twiss in *The Oregon Question examined in respect to facts and the law of nations* (London, 1846).⁴

Almost all the considerable historical treatments of the question have been on the American side. The fullest information can on the whole be got, with ample references, from H. H. Bancroft's *North West Coast and Oregon*, the former work going specially into the points in dispute, and the latter telling better the story of colonization. William Barrows's *Oregon, the struggle for possession* (Boston, 1884), one of the "Commonwealth Series," is given entirely to the varying aspects of the long contest, and he exactly formulates the American claim (p. 213, etc.), and in ch. 28 he summarizes the negotiations from 1803 down. The book is in parts graphically written, particularly in the portrayal of the efforts to acquire additional rights by colonization, though probably overwrought as to the influence of Whitman; but it is the best account we have of the potency of family life in conquering a wilderness. It is not altogether skilful in construction, and by repetition is made larger than was necessary, and in some respects his historical knowledge is open to criticism.⁵

croft's *No. W. Coast*, ii. 410; and on the reception of the treaty by the citizens of Oregon, his *Oregon*, i. ch. 21.

The English ministry seem to have accepted the proposition of Mr. Wm. Sturgis, of Boston, in a pamphlet, *The Oregon Question* (Boston, 1845), as a basis for the negotiations, and this proposition was to follow the 49° N. lat. to the sea, and thence, skirting the coast of Vancouver's Island, by the Fuca Straits to the Pacific.

¹ The American claim is amply set forth in a Senate document, no. 29, of Feb. 22, 1868, entitled *The Northwest boundary. Discussion of the water boundary question: geographical memoir of the islands in dispute: and history of the military occupation of San Juan island. Maps* (Washington, 1868), which was prepared for the Department of State by Archibald Campbell. A summary of its argument is given in *Putnam's Mag.*, Sept., 1870. Cf. also Barrows's *Oregon* (p. 301).

The British view is in the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1864. Cf. Matthew Macfie's *Vancouver Island and Brit. Columbia* (Lond., 1865), p. 28.

² Boston, 1844, 1845, 1847; London, 1844; N. Y., 1845, — the ed. of 1847 having some important additions. The introductory portion was printed separately as *The Geography of Oregon and California* (Boston, N. Y., 1845). Tucker's *Hist. of Oregon* (Buffalo, 1844) is said by Bancroft to be largely based on Greenhow.

Greenhow was involved in some controversy with Thomas Falconer, on the British side. The *Quarterly Review* (1845-46) had questioned Greenhow's fairness. Falconer touched

the question in his *Discovery of the Mississippi and the South West, Oregon and North west boundaries of the U. S.* (London, 1844), and more pointedly in his *Oregon Question, or a Statement of the British Claims* (London, N. Y., 1845, — three eds.). Greenhow printed a brief *Answer to the Strictures of Thomas Falconer on the History of Oregon and California*, which was followed by Falconer's *Reply to Greenhow's Answer, with Greenhow's Rejoinder* (Washington, 1845).

³ *Speeches*, i.; Morgan Dix's *Gen. Dix*, i. 197. Without enumerating the less important American presentation, it is enough to refer to Wyndham Robertson's *Oregon, our right and title* (Washington, 1846).

⁴ Reprinted as *The Oregon territory, its history and discovery; also the treaties and negotiations between the U. S. and Great Britain, for the settlement of a boundary line* (N. Y., 1846). Alexander Simpson printed *The Oregon Territory, claims thereto of England and America considered* (London, 1846).

⁵ Of less importance is W. H. Gray's *Hist. of Oregon, 1792-1849* (Portland, O., 1870). The more condensed statements of the question, by J. D. Woolsey in the *New Englander*, xxxii. 530, and by J. H. St. Matthew in the *Overland Monthly*, vi. 297, may be noted.

The most careful of the foreign examinations of the question, apart from the English, is by Von Holst (vol. iii. ch. 2, 6, 8, 10), who particularly follows the tortuous course of events in Congress.

NOTE TO MAP ON THE PREVIOUS PAGE. — Reproduced from Barrows's *Oregon*.

POSTSCRIPT. — Since this section was completed there has been published B. A. Hinsdale's *Old North West, with a View of the Thirteen Colonies as Constituted by the Royal Charters* (New York, 1888), which gives a succession of his- torical maps and a list of authorities cited.

II.

THE PORTRAITS OF WASHINGTON.

By the Editor.

THE earliest considerable study which was made of the subject was by Henry T. Tuckerman in *Putnam's Monthly* (vi. 337); repeated, with some enlargements, in Irving's *Washington* (vol. v. App.); and still further extended in *The Character and Portraits of Washington* (New York, 1859).¹ Though not aiming at the exhaustive enumerations which have characterized later books, this treatise remains the only treatment of the subject done with literary skill. It includes an examination of the descriptive authorities on the personal appearance of Washington, — a study which may be supplemented by the account in G. W. P. Custis's *Recollections of Washington* (N. Y., 1860), ch. 25; by R. S. Greenough on the "Expression of Washington's Countenance," in *Old and New* (v. 221); by Wm. J. Hubbard on a "National Standard for a likeness of Washington," in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.* (Feb., 1880); and by Isaac J. Greenwood's "Remarks on the Portraiture of Washington," in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.* (ii. 30), which has particular reference to the effects upon Washington's expression from his false teeth. There is a running account of the Washington portraits in Griswold's *Republican Court*, p. 351, etc. Griswold supposes his own collection of over sixty engraved likenesses, published in Washington's lifetime, to be the largest then made. The favorite profile has been unquestionably Houdon's, with Stuart's canvases for the full face, and probably Trumbull's for the figure. G. W. P. Custis (*Recoll.*, p. 520) says that the figure in Trumbull's equestrian picture is "the most perfect extant," but in another place (p. 481) he says that Lozier's engraving of a picture by Cogniet, which follows Stuart's head, gives Washington's figure "best of all," but Mason objects to this figure. The peculiarities of Washington's figure were that he was shallow through the chest (as shown in Houdon's statue), did not grow small at the waist, had long legs, and very large hands, — Lafayette called them the largest he had ever seen on a human being. He weighed between 210 and 220 pounds, and measured six feet precisely when dead, but stood a little higher in his prime. Griswold (*Republican Court*, App.) groups together the descriptions of Washington's person, made "by some contemporary foreigners." An attempt was made in *Science* (Dec. 11, 1885) to run together the features of leading likenesses in a composite photograph.

In 1860 there was a chapter on the portraits included in Custis's *Recollections*, with an appendix by the editor of that book, Mr. Lossing. The most elaborate treatise, however, to include not only well-authenticated life portraits and sketches, but everything for which authentication has been claimed, is Elizabeth Bryant Johnston's *Original Portraits of Washington, including statues, monuments, and medals* (Boston, 1882). Incidental mention is made in this book of engravings of the more celebrated pictures or other representations; but the most extensive record of such memorials, excluding lithographs and woodcuts, is in William S. Baker's *Engraved Portraits of Washington, with biographical sketches of the Painters* (Philad., 1880). This has been supplemented by the same author's *Medallic portraits of Washington; with historical and critical notes, and a descriptive catalogue of the coins, medals, tokens, and cards* (Philadelphia, 1885).

The following condensed statement respecting the portraits of Washington is largely based on these books; they will be referred to by *T.* for Tuckerman; *J.* for Johnston; *B. eng.* and *B. med.* for Baker on engravings and medals respectively. The Johnston book is not in all parts free from obscurity and palpable errors.

There is only one pre-Revolutionary likeness whose claim is undisputed, and another about which there is much question. It has been sometimes mentioned that when Washington visited Boston in 1756 this latter likeness was made by Copley, but there is no positive proof of it.²

¹ Some points of the Washington portraiture are more fully treated by Mr. Tuckerman in his *Book of the Artists* (N. Y., 1867).

² A miniature on ivory, which has been said to represent him at twenty-five, is held by some to be this Copley likeness, and it is now among the W. H. Huntington collection in the Metropolitan Museum of Fine Arts in New York. It was first made known by an engraving by Demare in Irving's *Washington*, in 1856, and is given also in *T.*, *J.*, pl. ii, Susan F. Cooper's *Mount Vernon* (N. Y., 1859),

and *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, xii. 552. On the strength of the testimony of Rembrandt Peale that this miniature was painted by his father, C. W. Peale, in 1777, the early date connecting it with Copley has been questioned by *J.* and denied by *B.* (*Eng.*, 12, and *Med.*, 122), Lossing, and others. It is stated on the Irving engraving to have been given by Washington to his niece Harriet, and to have descended in her family. It will be mentioned again.

There is a picture in the possession of Mr. Geo. B. Chase, of Boston, of which he gives the following account: It

The pre-Revolutionary picture about which there is no doubt is one painted unquestionably by C. W. Peale, at Mount Vernon, in 1772, representing Washington in the uniform of a colonel of the Virginia militia, the small study for the head of which is now owned by Mr. Chas. S. Ogden, of Philadelphia, and shows that at some subsequent period the uniform of it had been changed to the Continental buff and blue. The large picture is now owned by Gen. G. W. C. Lee.¹ Rembrandt Peale remarks that the likeness of this picture resembles more strongly his own latest life-picture than any intermediate portrait.² A copy of this picture was made by A. Dickinson, from which an engraving was made in 1833, and this copy is also the original of the engraving given by Custis. It differs materially in expression from the heliotype. Sparks engraved from a copy by Chapman. C. W. Peale is said to have painted a miniature at the same time (*J.*, p. 17).

Charles Wilson Peale, an American, b. 1741, d. 1827, is said to have painted Washington fourteen times from life, beside making many copies of these originals, more or less varied in accessories. *B. eng.* gives forty-eight different engravings after C. W. Peale, and the engraving in the *Columbian Mag.*, Jan., 1787, is said to



WASHINGTON.

(From the *Impartial History, etc.*, London ed., 1780.)

have been a combination of traits of the pictures by C. W. Peale and Pine, by the engraver I. Trenchard. C. W. P. is said to have painted some heads of Washington in the pictures of Chas. Peale Polk, his nephew, one of which was painted for Arthur Lee (*J.*, p. 16). The uncle's assistance is denied by Hart.

Peale joined the American camp under Washington in the summer of 1776, as a captain of volunteers, and at this time painted a miniature, and also a half-length of Washington for Hancock.³ It is only known through

hung for many years before 1876 in the St. James Theatre in London, at which date it was sold at auction as a portrait of Washington by J. S. Copley, and bought by Mr. Thomas Inglis. It was finally bought by Mr. Chase at a sale of Inglis's pictures in Boston in April, 1883. It has been considered to be in that painter's early style, by Mr. Augustus T. Perkins, the student of Copley, who learned from Miss Mary Copley, daughter of the painter, that her father had painted a picture of Washington. It shows the head and shoulders, and so nearly resembles in features the Valley Forge picture of C. W. Peale that it is at once sug-

gested that it is a copy — perhaps by Copley — of some one of Peale's copies of that painting.

¹ The gorget which Washington is represented as wearing is the same now owned by the Mass. Historical Society. (Cf. their *Proc.*, vol. iv. 45.)

² A large heliotype of it is given in *F.*; and *B. eng.* notes six different engravings of it, some of which will be found in Sparks's *Washington*, in Irving's *Washington*, in *T.*, in Lossing's *Washington*, and G. W. P. Custis's *Recoll. and Private Mem. of Washington* (N. Y., 1860).

³ Sparks's *Corresp. of the Rev.*, ii. 201, 207.

an engraving made of it by J. Norman, a Boston engraver, which represents a full-face bust, in uniform, surrounded by an oval, surmounting a pedestal inscribed "Temperance, Prudence, Fortitude, Justice," and showing emblems of war on either side. It is inscribed "B. Blyth, Del.," and was published, March 26, 1782, by John Coles, Boston (*B. eng.*, p. 26). The only copy noted is in Cambridge, Mass. (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xx. 188), and of this fac-similes have been made. The inscription says that Hancock then owned the original, but a statement has been made that Hancock gave a portrait of Washington to D'Estaing in 1779.¹ An engraving in the *Universal Mag.* (London), with the ribbon of the commander-in-chief across the breast, seems to have followed this Norman (1782), as does the outline print by Holder in Lavater's *Essay on Physiognomy*.²

There is another engraving by Norman in the Boston ed. (1781) of *The Impartial Hist. of the War in America* (vol. ii.), representing Washington at full length, leaning on a cannon, which is in most respects a reproduction of an engraving in the London ed. (1780) of the same book (p. 221), which is classed among the fictitious likenesses by *B. eng.* (p. 197). A copy in part of the London print is herewith given, as a specimen of the contemporary prints before authentic likenesses were commonly known in Europe.

It is stated by Lossing that the miniature already referred to as having been painted when Washington was twenty-five years old was really made for Mrs. Washington between October and December, 1777,—one of the sittings, at least, having been given at a farm-house near Skippack, in Pennsylvania, at the moment Wash-



WASHINGTON.

(From *Andrew's History*.)

ington received the news of Burgoyne's surrender. Of this, the same writer says, Peale made several copies. It may be a question if the pencil sketch by Peale, mentioned later as having been made in 1787, was not really connected with these sittings in 1777, and the date of 1787 an alteration, as it bears some appearance of being.

Peale began at Valley Forge in 1778, and finished in Philadelphia in 1779, a full-length for the State of Pennsylvania, which was wantonly destroyed in 1781. The artist made a mezzotint engraving of it, which was issued with some varieties of the plate. One is in the Huntington Collection in New York. Peale reproduced this picture several times, with some change in the posture and accessories. A first copy was made for Nassau Hall, at Princeton, and it still belongs to the college, within a frame in which there had been a picture of George the Second, which was destroyed by a cannon-ball during the battle of Trenton. It shows the battle

¹ Greene's *Greene*, ii. 144.

² There is a grotesque rendering of Peale's picture in *The Weatherwise and Bickerstaff's Almanac*.

of Princeton going on in the left distance, and just behind Washington, who stands towards the right of the picture, Gen. Mercer is represented as dying, while supported by his attendants.¹

In a second copy the attitude of Washington was changed, and he is made to lean on a cannon, and behind is a horse and servant, instead of the dying Mercer. This was sent (1780) to Europe in the same vessel with Henry Laurens, and was captured by the British, and the picture is now at Quidenham Park, Norfolk, the seat of the Duke of Albemarle.²

A third copy was sent by Lafayette to France, and this is said to be the picture now in the Smithsonian Institution, and it is also said that from this copy Wolff made his engraving. There seems to be discordant statement respecting a copy or copies associated with Lafayette, for a copy bought by the French government is said to be at Versailles, and to have been engraved by Wolff. There is in Harvard College library a bust engraving bearing the same general character, which is marked "Dessiné par Bonnier d'après un tableau fourni par M. le Marquis de la Fayette. Gravé par Chevillot."³ It is reproduced in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1888.

There are a fourth, fifth, and sixth examples of this 1778-79 picture: one of these (*Catal. Hist. Portrait Exhib.*, No. 445) is owned by H. P. McKean, of Philadelphia, bought out of the Peale Museum; and the last by the Boudinot family (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec., 1885, p. 156).

Peale painted in 1778 a miniature for Lafayette, which was sent abroad, and was the first (as *B. eng.* thinks) authentic likeness to become known in Europe. He made several copies, among which may be the one in Independence Hall, Philad., and one (heliotyped in *J.*, pl. ii), which shows the military garb and blue sash, which is said in one place in that book to belong to W. F. Gill, and in another to Mrs. Wm. F. Brand, of Emmon-ton, Md.

In 1783 he painted for the State of Maryland a full-length, representing also Lafayette and Tilghman and the army at Yorktown, — which has not been engraved. In the same year is placed the Harrison bust portrait, and one belonging to Admiral L. M. Powell, of Washington.⁴

In 1784, between July and November, he painted a whole-length for the State of Virginia, which is not now known, — being the one sent to Houdon. It was not used by that sculptor, as he preferred to come to America and model from life. That State owns, however, a bust portrait, which is in the Capitol library at Richmond.

In 1786 he is said to have painted a head for his own gallery, and the one now in the Patent Office Museum at Washington.

There is in the library of the Penna. Hist. Society an outline pencil sketch (said to have been made for reproduction in a mezzotint), which was sold by Rembrandt Peale to C. A. Smith, in 1848, and was given to the society in 1868 (*J.*, 13). There is some doubt about the third figure in the date "1787," and *B. eng.*, 12, gives it 1777, and thinks it resembles the miniature ("At the age of twenty-five"), which he assigns to that year. There is said to be but a few copies known of the consequent mezzotint, and this is reproduced by John Sartain in H. W. Smith's *Andreana* (Philad., 1865). As here given it closely resembles what *J.*, pl. v, gives as the James Peale picture, and has little resemblance to the engraving of the original pencil sketch, which is reproduced herewith. The cut which is given in Noah Webster's *Spelling Book* for 1789 is also said to follow this mezzotint.

C. W. Peale's last picture was made in Sept., 1795, when Washington gave a sitting, at which his sons Raphael and Rembrandt and his brother James all worked at the same time. C. W. Peale kept his canvas for his own gallery, and it now belongs to the Bryan collection in the New York Historical Society. Rembrandt Peale speaks of it as being good about the eyes, with a characteristic turn of the head, and adds that few copies of it have been made, though there is said to be more than one at Charleston, another in poor condition in the Department of State, and one belonged to Dr. W. K. Gilbert of Philadelphia. Of the picture or drawing made by Raphael Peale nothing is known.

I find mention made of other likenesses by C. W. Peale, copies of some of his originals, but of which of them is not stated. One of these was a bust portrait, which long hung at Mount Vernon, and was sent by Mrs. Washington to Mr. Van der Legen, and is now, or was recently, owned by Henry Van der Legen, of Crefeld. Another was given by John Quincy Adams to Botta, and belonged afterward to Frederick de Peyster of New York. One, in a dress of black velvet, was (?) in the National Museum at Philadelphia.⁵ James Peale, a younger brother of C. W. Peale, is said to have taken advantage of being present (*J.* says, in 1786) when Washington was sitting to his brother, and to have painted a miniature on ivory for a snuff-box, which now belongs to the Washington Grays, an artillery company of Philadelphia. H. B. Hall had made a private plate

¹ There are woodcuts of this copy in Lossing's *Field-Book*, ii. 37, or in earlier editions, ii. 244, and in *Potter's Amer. Monthly*, July, 1875.

² A copy of it was made in 1874, which is now in the Massachusetts Historical Society's gallery; and from this copy a heliotype is given in their *Proceedings*, xiv. 159. (Cf. *Ibid.* xiii. 324, 376.)


³ Another French picture by Le Paon, representing Washington before a tent, said in the engraving by Le Mire to have belonged to Lafayette, presents the same character-

istics as does a bust portrait engraved by Angus in 1785 for Andrews' *History of the War* (vol. ii., London), and a print in the *Historical Mag.*, vol. iv. (1792).

⁴ T. Hollowell engraved a military portrait, in an oval resting on a panel of the Yorktown surrender, and dated May 21, 1794, which professes to be "peint d'après nature à Philadelphie par N. Piche en 1783" (*Hist. Mag.*, viii. p. 50).

⁵ There is said to be a print in the *Monthly Military Repository*, N. Y., 1796-97, which I have not seen.

of this picture. James Peale painted also, about the same time (1788), a two-thirds picture from life for David C. Claypoole of Philadelphia, the editor who was selected by Washington to print his *Farewell Address* in the *Daily Advertiser*. This "Claypoole picture" represents Washington in uniform, with a black horse



behind him, held by a groom. It was bought by the late James Lenox, together with the manuscript of the address, and was engraved by John Sartain (private plate) for an edition of the *Farewell Address* printed by Mr. Lenox in 1850.¹ The picture painted by James Peale in 1795, already referred to, now hangs in Independence Hall.

The picture which Rembrandt Peale painted by his father's side in 1795 has not been engraved, unless H. B. Hall's engraving is from the original; but he is said to have painted ten pictures from it. He thought his

¹ The picture is now in the Lenox Library, and is shown, after Sartain's engraving in *F.*, pl. v, and in the *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1888, p. 103.

own work was more faithful in the lower part of Washington's face, and his father's in the upper, and he says that there was an agreement for each to give special attention to these parts respectively, as the sitting was not to be protracted, to afford time for equal detail in all parts. Of the early productions, one is said to have been destroyed in the war of 1812; one was taken to France as a gift to Lafayette; a third was given to one of Washington's brothers, and is now owned by Dr. N. C. Washington, of St. Louis; and a fourth was given by Washington to H. W. de Saussure, of the U. S. mint, and this one has been engraved by Edwin.

After many attempts to paint a more satisfactory likeness by a combination of points or traits from his own or other pictures (and he is said to have made sixteen such eclectic portraits) this artist finally produced the picture which gives the Rembrandt Peale type of the Washington portraits, and which he frequently reproduced, with variations of costume, some in a civilian's and some in military dress. He was at work upon this prototype in 1823-24. G. W. P. Custis said of it that it gave Washington's complexion "rather more bronzed than his natural coloring, which was fair, though considerably florid." The first picture represented Washington in civic dress, and it is given in heliotype in *J.*, pl. xvii. Congress bought it in 1832 for \$2,000, and it is now in the Vice-President's room in the Capitol. The artist gave the head a military dress on another canvas, and this he frequently copied, and it seems to be the model of Chappel's equestrian picture of Washington. He made in the year before he died his seventy-fifth copy of this picture for John A. McAllister, of Philadelphia.¹

The military bust picture was repeated in his large canvas called "Washington before Yorktown," which he painted in 1825. The picture also includes portraits of Lafayette, Hamilton, Knox, Lincoln, and Rochambeau. It was offered to Congress, but the necessary appropriation was not made, and it was on the painter's hands when he died in 1860. After another failure to secure its purchase by Congress, it was given in 1873 to the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, and now hangs in the Banquet Hall at Mount Vernon.²

Various letters of R. Peale on portraits of Washington, written in 1834, 1845, etc., are in the *Mag. of American Hist.*, v. 129, etc., and one written in 1854 is in the *Chicago Herald*, Jan. 22, 1888; and beginning in 1854, and repeating it in all the principal cities in later years, he delivered a lecture on his recollections of Washington and his portraits, which has not, I think, been printed, though given in part in *The Crayon* and in *B. eng.* He was the painter of Washington from life, the longest to survive.

John Trumbull was the only painter of Washington from life, beside C. W. Peale, who had served with him in the war; but Trumbull's pictures of him were made after the war, unless sketches of his person, which he is supposed to have made in Cambridge, were used by him, when he was in Amsterdam in 1780, in making a picture which is still preserved in that city, having been painted for De Neufville, who was Trumbull's host at the time. It represents Washington standing near a river, in a somewhat overwrought heroic attitude. It was engraved in 1781 at London by Valentine Green (*J. C. Smith's Brit. Mezzotint Portraits*, ii. 592), and was somewhat generally accepted as a picture of Washington, till later and better prints became known. Trumbull does not mention it in his *Autobiography*.³

Trumbull had his first sittings from Washington in 1790, when he painted the large picture, now in the City Hall, New York, which represents him in military dress, standing by a white horse, while in the distance the British are seen evacuating the injured city. It has not been engraved. At the same time he painted a full-length, of cabinet size, for Mrs. Washington, which is now owned by Edmund Law Rogers of Baltimore. Rembrandt Peale used to say that Trumbull's cabinet pictures were his best, though his likeness was "feeble."

What Trumbull called his best picture was one that was painted in 1792, at the instance of the municipality of Charleston, S. C., though they did not accept it, preferring to have a less spirited and more quiet likeness. This picture represents the evening before Trenton, just as the sun was setting, with Washington's attendant holding his white horse behind his own figure. Judging from the heliotype in *J.*, pl. x, the canvas must be in rather poor condition. It is in the gallery at Yale University. Trumbull took the picture with him to London, when he went there as the secretary of legation to John Jay; and while there, under Trumbull's supervision, it was engraved (1796) by Thomas Cheeseman, in what is held to be the best plate of any of Trumbull's pictures.⁴

The picture which Charleston finally secured also shows Washington at full length, with a white horse behind him, turned so that his tail is towards the spectator, and the city of Charleston is in the distance.⁵

¹ Engravings of one of the civic-costumed replicas (differing in detail from the heliotype in *J.*) are in Irving's *Washington*, vol. v., and in *J.* There is also an engraving in F. B. Hough's *Washingtoniana* (Roxbury, 1865). Both are by H. B. Hall. A. B. Walter made a large plate of it, and a large lithograph is in the *Monuments of Washington's Patriotism*.

² The original study for the picture is in Independence Hall. There is a heliotype of it in *J.*, pl. xviii. It has been engraved by R. Metzgeroth. Rembrandt Peale also himself drew this characteristic head twice on a lithographer's stone, once in 1827 and again in 1856, and A. B. Walter made a mezzotint engraving from the earlier one.

³ It was followed in the print, engraved by J. Le Roy, in D'Auberteuil's *Essais Historiques* (1781, vol. i. 214).

⁴ It was re-engraved by Daggett in the English translation of *Botta* (New Haven, 1834), and the bust is given as engraved by A. B. Durand in the *Nat. Port. Gallery*, and is also in Headley's *Washington*, and in the London ed. of Upham's *Washington*. There was a large mezzotint of the entire picture published in Philadelphia in 1845; and a French print of the head only by A. Blanchard, published at Paris. It has been reproduced on medals (*B. Med.*, pp. 111, 152). The bust is given in the engraving in *T.*, i.

⁵ It is described in Charles Fraser's *Reminiscences of Charleston*. It was restored in 1880, in Boston (*Mass. Hist.*

Trumbull also painted, in 1793, the bust portrait in civic costume which is now at New Haven. It is engraved in *Harper's Mag.*, lxiii. p. 337, and in Johnston's *Yorktown Campaign*, p. 73. One of Trumbull's bust pictures was given by Andrew Craigie to Harvard College in 1794, and hangs in Memorial Hall. A cabinet picture of 1794 hangs in the Patent Office at Washington. A panel miniature is in the National Museum.

Washington appears also in portrait in Trumbull's historical pictures of "Trenton," "Princeton," "The Surrender of Cornwallis," and the "Surrender of his Commission at Annapolis," which are in the Trumbull Gallery at Yale, while the last two are repeated much larger in the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington. These pictures have been engraved, — that of the Annapolis scene is given in Irving's *Washington*. There are not over twenty-five prints after Trumbull's portraits, and some of them are very poor; those by Cheeseman and Blanchard are among the best.¹

There are two types of Washington's head more familiar to us than either of those which have been mentioned, and these are the full-face *presidential* head of Stuart and the *military* profile of Houdon. Stuart himself says that he painted two originals of Washington beside his first one, "rubbed out," as he said, and he made twenty-six copies; but his recollections of his reduplications were certainly inadequate, though some of the very many copies now existing and alleged to be Stuart's own are very likely the work of other artists, for among others there may be mentioned Vanderlyn's full-length copy in the House of Representatives at Washington; J. W. Audubon's in the Department of State; Rembrandt Peale's in the possession of the Washington Grays of Philadelphia; and Walter Ingalls' in the State House at Concord, N. H. Of all Stuart's portraits, only two are in military dress, — that in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and the original study for it in cabinet size; the others are in civic velvet with ruffles and sometimes with lace. The Stuart head has been frequently used in medals.²

Washington gave his first sitting to Stuart in 1795, and Stuart in 1823 said that after he had made five copies of it, which had passed out of his hands, he became dissatisfied with the original, and rubbed it out. This statement is not accepted by Rembrandt Peale, who says that Stuart sold it to a vagabond artist named Winstanley, who took the picture to England, where it was bought by Samuel Vaughan. Mason contends that there is no evidence of this, and that the Vaughan picture is a copy of the one destroyed. The picture in Vaughan's possession, whichever it may be, was engraved by T. Holloway for Hunter's translation of Lavater's *Physiognomy* (4th ed. in English). From Vaughan's hands it passed to Jos. Harrison, by whom it was returned to Philadelphia, and it is now in the possession of the Harrison family. It was also engraved by W. Ridley in the *European Mag.*, March, 1780, of which engraving there is a fac-simile in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, xi. 90 (Feb., 1884). There are engravings also by Ensom (London, 1822) and Mackenzie, which differ as much as those of Ridley and Holloway do.

Stuart records that at this time he had a great many orders for copies, but the only known copies of this 1795 picture, or of pictures resembling it, are these: one made for Col. John Eager Howard, of Baltimore, now belonging to Mrs. Benj. Chew Howard; one for J. (?) Vaughan, which was taken to England; one which now belongs to Mrs. Anna R. Reilly, of New Haven, great-granddaughter of Gen. Edward Hand; one belonging to Mr. F. R. Rives, of New York, which formerly belonged to Professor Tucker, of the University of Virginia; one which had been owned by Gen. Henry Lee, and is now the property of Thomas H. Morris, of Baltimore. This is the best statement to be made from the various data given by the authorities, and does not include the so-called Gibbs picture, which is called the best of the replicas, and has become from its merit the most famous of this first group of Stuart's portraits of Washington. It is said to have derived a part of its distinctive merit from having been touched from life. It was painted for Col. George Gibbs, of Rhode Island, who, after he acquired a set of the five Presidents painted by Stuart, sold it to his sister, the wife of William Ellery Channing, from whom it has passed to her son, Dr. Wm. F. Channing, of Newport. A. B. Durand is said to have pronounced it a better picture than the so-called Boston Athenæum head.³

All this first group of Stuart's pictures show the right side of the face; and unless there is some confusion in the names, Mason does not recognize the Howard, Rives, and Morris pictures as copies by Stuart. What is called Stuart's "first Washington," owned by the Rev. B. R. Betts, who received it from Michael Little, is engraved in *The Curio*, 1837, p. 34. It represents him standing, uncovered, in uniform, with one hand on the hip and the other on a spy-glass upon a table.

Stuart now successively painted, from sittings, two other portraits, which show the left side of the face, — one the full-length, known as the "Lansdowne," and the other the head merely, known as the "Boston Athenæum picture"; and all his later copies were made from one or the other of these paintings. The original of

Soc. Proc., xix. 247; R. C. Winthrop's *Addresses*, 1878, etc., p. 285; *Orderly book of Sir John Johnson*, p. 254; *Charleston Year-book*, 1883, p. 162), and is heliographed in *F.*, pl. xi.

¹ A private plate by H. B. Hall of a bust-picture in uniform is given in Bushnell's *Crumbs for Antiquaries*. Trumbull's picture is also given in such popular books as Headley's *Washington and his Generals*, and in Lossing's *Life of Washington*.

² *B. Med.*, 41, 67, 68, 93, 102, 112, 139, 161, 174. Miss Jane Stuart, daughter of the artist, furnished a paper on her father's portraits of Washington to *Scribner's Monthly*, July, 1876.

³ There is a heliotype of it in *F.*, pl. xv; a photogravure and a steel engraving by C. Burt in Mason's *Stuart*, and the latter is also in Gay's *Pop. Hist. of U. S.*, vol. iii. The original picture is at present in the library of the Long Island Hist. Society.

the full lengths is the one made for the Marquis of Lansdowne, and represents Washington standing by a table, with the right hand extended. This, with some variety in the accessories, constitutes the favorite full-length of the Presidential portraits. At the sale of the Lansdowne effects this original was bought by Samuel Williams, and it was exhibited at the Philadelphia Exhibition in 1876 by its owner at that time, Mr. J. D. Lewis, of England.¹

While Stuart had the Lansdowne in hand, he made a copy for Mr. William Constable, and a half-length (Stuart made few), which Constable gave to Gen. Hamilton. The Constable full-length is sometimes said to have been touched from life, and is in better condition than the Lansdowne, and is now owned by his descendant Henry E. Pierrepoint, of Brooklyn, N. Y. It has been copied in oil, once in half-length (1841) for the city of Hudson, N. Y.; once at full-length (1845) for Salem, Mass.; and perhaps oftener. The head was engraved by Langier in 1836, as a part of a design by Cogniet, including a horse in the background, though the print says that it was made after the Boston Athenæum head.²

The Hamilton half-length, which represents Washington seated, with a river and vessels in the background, now belongs to Alexander Hamilton, of New York, who says that Washington gave it to Gen. Hamilton; but Stuart's bill to Constable shows that he paid for two pictures, one a full-length and one a half-length.

The Lansdowne was also reproduced by Stuart for Mr. Bingham, — the picture now in the Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia. It is signed *G. Stuart, 1796*, and Hart thinks it was originally painted for Bingham.

Respecting the Gardner Baker copy there is a strange story told. It was entrusted by Thomas Laing to Winstanley, the painter, to be sent to the White House in Washington; but he sent a copy instead, and this changeling is the picture now seen in the East Room. He is said to have taken the Stuart original to England, and there is held to be some ground for the belief that a full-length reproduction of the Lansdowne owned by the late Russell Sturgis, of London, is the purloined picture.

Stuart, in 1822, made a picture of the Lansdowne type of head, but showing Washington seated at a table with papers, for W. D. Lewis (d. 1881), which is now, or was recently, at Florence Heights, New Jersey; and also one of three-quarters length, which is owned by Mrs. Joseph Tuley, of Winchester, Va.

A variation of the Lansdowne type, in which the figure is thought to be better drawn, is placed in a posture which has given it the name of the "Teapot picture." The prototype of this variety is the one painted for Peter Jay Munro, which in July, 1845, was bought by James Lenox, and is now in the Lenox library (Stevens's *Lenox*, p. 154), and has been engraved by Sartain for Lenox's edition of *The Farewell Address* (1850).³

Of this "Teapot" type are the replicas by Stuart in the state-houses at Newport, Providence, and Hartford. The one at Newport is considered the better of the two in Rhode Island (Mason's *Newport*, 289). The Hartford picture was engraved in the *Columbian Mag.*, and again by Illman and Pilbrow.

In 1810 Stuart used the Lansdowne head in a cabinet full-length in military dress, the ownership of which passed from Isaac P. Davis to Ignatius Sargent, and now belongs to the latter's heirs. It was the study of a large canvas which he painted for Samuel Parkman, who gave it to the town of Boston. It hung for many years in Faneuil Hall, where its place has been taken by a copy made by Miss Jane Stuart, while the original, for safer keeping, has been transferred to the Museum of Fine Arts. It is known as "Washington at Dorchester Heights," the background showing the British ships leaving Boston harbor.⁴

It is from a coarse copy of Nutter's engraving of the bust of the original Lansdowne that what is best known as "Pitcher Portrait of Washington" was produced. Various copies of these exist (*J.*, p. 105), and the picture is sometimes found cut from the front of the vessel and framed. It is reproduced in *J.*, pl. xxii, and in Lossing's *Home of Washington*, p. 364. There is a less known Pitcher picture, which was made from a small painting, as Miss Stuart says, sent over for this purpose by Stuart to his nephew, Edw. C. Newton, in England (*J.*, p. 106). The profile by Mrs. Wright, and other pictures of Washington, are also found on pitchers of the early part of the century.

The latest of Stuart's pictures from life is that known as the "Boston Athenæum head," which he painted in 1796, finishing the head alone. He is charged with not completing the picture in order to have an excuse for not surrendering it to Washington, who was content with, or perhaps accepted in lieu, a copy, which is supposed

¹ It was engraved in line by Heath, soon after it reached England, the legend on it crediting the original to *Gabriel Stuart*, and Heath's engraving has been the one usually followed by later engravers, and pl. xii. in *J.* is after this print. Heath also engraved in stipple the bust only, which is in Ramsay's *Washington* (London, 1807). The Lansdowne picture, either in full length or the bust only, is found in Marshall's *Washington* (London, 1804), French translation of Ramsay (Paris, 1809), Pitkin's *United States* (1828), Hinton's *United States* (1831 and Amer. ed. 1834), in C. R. Edmond's *Washington* (London, 1835), in the Philadelphia ed. (1858) of the *Farewell Address*, and in Mrs. C. M. Kirkland's *Washington* (N. Y., 1869), and very likely in various other books, where it may not be easy to say whether some copy of the Lansdowne, or even the Boston

Athenæum head, may not be the original of the engraving: *Cf. Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1888.

² A later engraving of the head is in Irving's *Washington* and in *T. Cf. Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xi. 229; *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1880, p. 143.

³ There is also an engraving by A. H. Ritchie in the same book, and Mr. Lenox's Appendix would lead one to infer that they are from the same picture, though the position of the sword hand is different in the two engravings. *Cf. Mag. Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1888; John N. Norton's *Washington* (N. Y., 1860).

⁴ It was copied by M. A. Swett, and this copy was engraved on a large plate by Kelley, in 1836. There is a mezzotint by H. S. Sudd (*B. eng.*, p. 141). There is a heliotype from the original in *J.*, pl. xiv, and a large woodcut from the original in the *Mem. Hist. Boston* (iii. 98).

to be the one bought of William Temple Washington in 1868 by the late Hon. J. V. L. Pruyn, of Albany. This is engraved in *The Curio*, Sept., 1887. The unfinished original was bought in 1832 by some gentlemen for the Boston Athenæum, and it is now on deposit in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.¹ Washington Allston called it "a sublime head." Rembrandt Peale considered the features inaccurately drawn, and the character "heavily exaggerated." In the many copies which Stuart made of it, he always completed the figure, and among these copies may be named one made for Josiah Quincy in 1810, now at Quincy; one for Mrs. C. H. Richardson, of Louisville, Ky., of which several copies exist in the West; one for Mrs. Peter, of Lexington, Ky.; one in the Corcoran Gallery of Washington, D. C.,—formerly by Col. John Tayloe; and one for Daniel Carroll, of Doddington Manor. There is some question if Stuart himself copied the picture which belonged to Madison, and was later the property of Edward Coles, of Philadelphia.

Beside the copies already mentioned, made by Stuart of his leading pictures, he made many others, and mostly, if not altogether, of the Athenæum painting, which he kept in his possession. While the Lansdowne head looks away from the spectator, the eyes of the Athenæum head follow you. There may be errors in the following additional list of the Stuart presidential pictures: either that the Lansdowne type is followed in some, rather than the Athenæum head (Mason, p. 91, says that after 1791 Stuart copied only the Athenæum head), or that the copies were not made by Stuart, or that, in the confusion arising from change of ownership between the records, which have been depended on, the same picture may be mentioned twice. In public places, I find note of one in the old hall of the House of Representatives in Washington, which was painted for Gen. Chestnut of South Carolina; another, given by Thomas J. Bryan to the New York Historical Society; a third, belonging to the Philadelphia Club, and earlier owned by Peter A. Brown; a fourth, made for Solomon Etting, of Baltimore, and now in the Maryland Historical Society; one in the Penna. Academy of Fine Arts, given by Paul Beck in 1845; and two in the State library at Richmond,—one said to have been completed as to accessories by Dunlap, and the other painted for Samuel Myers.

Of those in private hands, I note the following:—

Mrs. William [Emily W.] Appleton, formerly belonging to her grandfather, Jonathan Mason.

William H. Appleton, of New York, painted for Charles Brown in 1800, and owned by Mr. A. since 1861, having previously been owned by Z. C. Lee, of Boston.

William Buchler, of Harrisburg, on panel, formerly owned by Samuel D. Frank.

George Blight, of Philadelphia, painted for James Oliver, of Canton, 1798; later owned by James Blight. This portrait was for a while in China, and is supposed to be the original of the Chinese glass copies. There are various copies of this Blight picture.

Col. J. Schuyler Crosby, formerly with Col. Henry Rutgers, and said to have been completed by another hand, and now owned by Mrs. J. T. Cooper.

T. Jefferson Coolidge, of Boston: one of a series of five Presidents, painted by Stuart, 1810–1815, for Col. Geo. Gibbs,—the Washington is on panel. Another set was partly burned in Washington in 1851.

Mrs. Dahlgren, widow of Admiral Dahlgren, of Washington, formerly the property of Robert Gilmor of Baltimore, and said to be the last copy painted by Stuart (1825).

Judge John Hoye Ewing, of Washington, Pa.

Robert J. Fisher, of York, Pa., said to have been finished by Stuart upon a sketch by a pupil.

Nutter's engraving, published in London in 1798, purports to follow an original belonging to J. S. DeFrança. Jas. Greenleaf, of Allentown, Pa., said to have passed to a Mr. Felton.

C. C. Pinckney, presented, it is said, to Washington, now owned by Judge Horace Gray.

Dr. Herbert Norris, of Philadelphia, once owned by William Rawle, and painted in 1798.

John T. Montgomery, of Philadelphia, earlier owned by Gilbert Robertson, and painted for John Simpson.

Peter McCall, perhaps once belonging to James Gibson, and now owned by Jane Byrd McCall; said to have been dimmed by cleaning.

F. Law Rogers, of Baltimore.

Edmund L. Rogers, formerly belonging to Robert Barry, of Baltimore.

Gen. Benjamin Smith, of North Carolina, now or lately owned by Mrs. Moore, of Wilmington, N. C.

A full-length cabinet picture, owned by George F. Meredith, of London.

Francis Lightfoot Lee, 1797, given to Lt.-Gov. Samuel Phillips, of Andover, Mass.

¹ There is a heliotype of this head in *Œ.*, pl. xiii, and a photogravure in Mason's *Stuart*, p. 103. Most of the line engravings give the bust complete and in civic costume. Such is one of the best of the smaller engravings, that of A. B. Durand for Sparks's *Washington* (vol. ii.). The engraving by Joseph Andrews in 1843 was an excellent one; but the plate was destroyed in the Boston fire of 1872. Thomas B. Welch engraved it in 1852, under Thomas Sully's superintendence. A good engraving by H. B. Hall is in Irving's *Washington* and in *T.*, and an etching by him in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, Jan., 1880, vol. iv. H. Wright Smith engraved the picture in 1860, published at Boston,

and there are imprints of his work at Philadelphia in 1875 and 1879. The most famous of the larger engravings is that by Marshall in 1862.

Other engravings are numerous,—such as G. R. Hall in Lossing's *Home of Washington*: and it is a pretty constant accompaniment of the popular lives and histories, like J. A. Spencer's *Hist. U. S.*; Patton's *Hist. Amer. People*, etc. The print of Giuseppe Longhi (1817), which has been a popular one in Europe, and a good deal followed, seems to have embodied traits of both Stuart's and Trumbull's heads. It was reproduced in Germany by Longhi's pupil, G. G. Felsing, in 1824. (Cf. Snowden's *Medals*, pl. iii.)

Col. Thomas H. Perkins, of Boston, owned by Augustus T. Perkins, and made for Cumberland Williams, of Baltimore.

Edward Shippen, of Philadelphia, inherited from Joseph Shippen.

S. M. Shoemaker, of Baltimore, 1798, painted for Moor Falls.

Gen. William P. Hunt, of New Jersey, now in the A. T. Stewart gallery. It is on an unusually large canvas, and was copied by Sully for the Penna. Hist. Society.

The late Russell Sturgis, of London, once owned by his uncle, James Sturgis.

Mrs. Walm, of Philadelphia, painted for Joseph Thomas.

Dr. Alfred Wagstaff, of New York.

Robert C. Winthrop, of Boston, formerly owned by Gen. William McDonald, of Baltimore.

Many of the engravings after Stuart have been already mentioned. Baker says that nearly one half of all existing engravings follow Stuart, and Johnston says that they are five times as numerous as those of any other painter. All of the standard and popular lives have adopted it, solely or with others, — Aaron Bancroft, Marshall, Weems, Corry, Ramsay, Sparks, Guizot, Irving, etc.¹

Stuart is said to have allowed that the Houdon bust was superior to his canvas, and the only representation that was better, and he traced the defects of his own to the poorly fitting false teeth which Washington wore, having first used such in 1789. Houdon was forty-four years old, when he came over in Sept., 1785, to see Washington, and spent two weeks at Mount Vernon. The story of the statue which he made is told in Sherwin McRae's *Washington, his person as represented by the artists: The Houdon statue, its history and value. Published by order of the Senate of Virginia, 1873* (Pub. Doc., Richmond, 1873). This may be supplemented by a paper in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1880, p. 101. The statue was completed in 1788, but not received in Richmond till the Capitol was ready to receive it, in 1796. Houdon took measurements of Washington's body and a mould of his face, — not of the whole frame, as sometimes said. From this mould he took a plaster mask, which he carried to France with him. He also left a plaster bust at Mount Vernon. This was entrusted to Clark Mills in 1849, who reproduced it and left the copy at Mount Vernon, appropriating the original, which in 1873 he gave to Wilson Macdonald, from whom it passed to his daughter. There is a photograph of this in *J.*, pl. xxv, and a woodcut in Lossing's *Home of Washington*, p. 177.

A shrunken gutta-percha bust, whitewashed, which is also preserved at Mount Vernon, is said by Lossing to have been run in the original plaster mould; but Johnston says it was made from the Houdon plaster by a German artist, and not by Houdon himself. A cut of the Houdon mask is in Lossing's *Home of Washington* (p. 398), and a careful copy is preserved in the mint at Philadelphia. Mills used the bust for his statue of Washington, and an "original combination portrait" was engraved in 1864, of which the features were said to have been taken from the Houdon bust. The mask taken by Houdon to Paris was in 1861 in the possession of Pettrick, a sculptor of Rome, having been bought at the sale of Houdon's effects. It is now owned by W. W. Story, who says that Houdon, though following it closely, made it weaker.²

Houdon is said to have designed a small equestrian statue, from which a German sculptor, perhaps Rauch, executed a model belonging to the Hon. George Young, of Edinburgh. There is a small model, thought to be by Houdon, in the Metropolitan Museum of Fine Arts, N. Y. (*Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, xii. 553).

The rest of the life portraits and sketches of Washington may be treated in classes: —

First of the large portraits: — William Dunlap, when scarce more than a lad, drew Washington in pastels at

¹ Before 1800, beside instances already referred to, the Stuart likeness was given in Scott's *U. S. Gazetteer*, 1795; in the Philadelphia continuation of Hume (1798). The earliest American engraving to attract notice was C. Tiebout's in 1800. A. Doolittle engraved it in the *Connecticut Mag.*, January, 1801. It appeared in Bisset's *George the Third* (Philad., 1811); in Alden's *Ephitaphs* (1814); in the first American edition of *Rees's Cyclopaedia* (1821). It was selected for the *National Portrait Gallery* in 1834, and has been repeatedly employed since. The characteristics are the favorite ones for the large wall-prints, like that of P. F. Rothermell (1852), engraved by A. H. Ritchie; the large military figure before Mount Vernon, painted by T. Hicks, and engraved by H. W. Smith; and the equestrian picture by John Faed. Baker must be consulted to complete the list of engravings. There is a large number of them in the Boston Athenæum.

² There are plaster casts of the Houdon statue in the Capitol at Washington, and in the Boston Athenæum. Casts in bronze were made in 1856, and later by W. J. Hubbard, and are in the Military Institute, Lexington, Va.; in North Carolina; in South Carolina; in the Central Park Museum, New York; in St. Louis; and in Richmond, Va. A bust of the Houdon mould was made for Rufus King, and, passing

through the hands of Oliver Wolcott and H. K. Brown (who used it in his statue), came about 1854 into the possession of Hamilton Fish. There are other copies by Miller, with drapery added. It was also used by Deville, a French artist in making busts, some of which were brought to this country by Leutze. A medallion by Houdon was brought many years ago from France by T. W. Griffeth, and was recently in the family of D. B. Latimer, of Baltimore. The Houdon head has been the one usually followed in medals (*B. Med.*, 41, 51, 52, 61, 67, 68, 82, 86, 93, 102, 112, 123, 133, 134, 139, 140, 151, 152, 162, 174, 179, 190, 201), and the best use of it is considered to be the Independence medal struck about 1850. (*Ibid.* p. 32. Cf. Snowden's *Medals of Washington*, p. 20.)

J., pl. xxiv, gives a heliotype of the entire statue. Baker notes but one engraving to show the full figure, and that is a poor print by Parker. The woodcut in Lossing's *Home of Washington* is poor. Of the profile bust there are several good engravings in Sparks's *Washington*, by A. B. Durand; in the abridged ed. by Storms; in Delaplaine's *Repository*, by Leney, 1814; in the *Nat. Port. Gallery*, 1834; in Irving's *Washington*, by Hall, repeated in Tucker's *erman*.

his headquarters at Rocky Hill, near Princeton, in 1783. It is crude, and has little merit. Dunlap gave the original to John Van Horn, who had interceded for the sitting.¹

Another artist to paint Washington while at Rocky Hill was a Quaker, (?) Joseph Wright, who made on panel a cabinet picture, showing Washington with short, undressed hair and in military garb, which was owned by Francis Hopkinson, and finally passed to his great-granddaughter, Mrs. Annie H. Foggo, of Philadelphia. With this as a study, Wright, in 1784, painted a likeness which Washington presented to the Count de Solms. Of the same year is a half-length, in uniform, with the right hand on a sword, showing a full face, which is signed "J. Wright, 1784," and which formerly belonged to Mrs. Elizabeth Powell, and has been later owned by Samuel Powell and John Hare Powell, of Newport, R. I.² Another half-length by Wright (1784) was given to the Mass. Hist. Society by Israel Thorndike (*Proc.*, ii. 25). One which belonged to William Menzies was different in dress, and of this there is an engraving by J. A. O'Neill, in the privately printed *Addresses of the City of New York to George Washington* (N. Y., 1867).

Crawford was struck with what he thought must be the correct proportions of Wright's picture (Tuckerman's *Book of the Artists*, 309).

Robert E. Pine, an English artist, a pupil of Reynolds, came to America in 1783,³ and in 1785 spent three weeks at Mount Vernon and painted a picture, which is one of the least pleasing of the well-studied portraits of Washington, the head being, as Rembrandt Peale said, too small and badly drawn. The picture is now in Independence Hall, having been left to the city of Philadelphia by Benjamin Moran. Other accounts say that it is not now known, though it is said to have been in the possession of the Hopkinson family in Philadelphia (*Putnam's New Monthly Mag.*, Oct., 1855, vol. vi.). Pine painted at the same time a duplicate for himself, and this was bought, in 1817, in Montreal for Henry Brevoort, and now belongs to the estate of his son, the late James Carson Brevoort, of Brooklyn. It is said to have been retouched from life in 1787.⁴

When Washington visited Boston in 1789, as President, and attended an oratorio in King's Chapel, a Dane, Christian Gùlagher, placed himself in a pew behind the pulpit, so that he got a fair view of Washington, and sketched his features. He is said later to have destroyed this sketch, but Johnston (p. 57) believes a picture exhibited in New York in 1832 to have been based upon it. As Washington proceeded on his journey to Portsmouth, Gùlagher followed him, and succeeded in getting a sitting. The portrait thus made came into the hands of Dr. Jeremy Belknap, and in 1858 was the property of his grandson, Edward Belknap, who caused it to be engraved by Marshall for the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, iii. 309. It is a stiff, unpleasing picture, and is reproduced in Lossing's *Diary of George Washington* (N. Y., 1860), and in *J.*, pl. ix.

Edward Savage, an artist of no great merit, induced the authorities of Harvard College⁵ to request Washington to sit for his portrait, which in Dec., 1789, he was engaged in painting in New York City (*Hist. Mag.*, ii. 247); and in Aug., 1791, Savage had already deposited it in the philosophical room of the college. It hangs at present in Memorial Hall. It is a bust picture, in military garb, with the badge of the Cincinnati on the lapel of the coat. The face is rather hard, with almost no sensibility, and as a likeness it met the approval of Josiah Quincy, who as a young man remembered Washington, and described him as having the look and air of a country gentleman whose life had been passed remote from cities (E. Quincy's *Life of J. Quincy*, p. 50). Savage engraved this portrait in stipple, and published it in London in Feb., 1792; and the same plate, slightly retouched about the hair, etc., accompanied *Washington's Monuments of Patriotism* (Philadelphia, 1800).⁶ Perhaps from life, but probably from his first picture, Savage painted, not long after, a cabinet picture, which he kept himself, and which is now owned by his descendants in Fitchburg, Mass. He also, in 1790, painted a Washington for John Adams, which is now at Quincy. If the engraving of it may be believed, he also painted a sitting Washington, holding a plan upon a table; for two plates of such a picture, much larger than those already mentioned, were published in London, one of them in 1793, known to be by Savage, and perhaps the other was. It professes to be the Harvard picture, but only the head is the same (*B. eng.*, p. 76). There were prints of this, large and small, issued at Providence in 1800 and thereabouts, and the same was used in Winterbotham's *View of the U. S.* (N. Y., 1796). It is very likely, however, that Savage, in saying, in the inscription under the original plate, that it followed the painting made for Harvard College, only intended to imply that the head followed that painting, which it resembles, but not closely. A picture, which, with an accompanying likeness of Martha Washington, has come down as the work of Joseph Wright, too closely resembles this Savage engraving in nearly every respect, except that the eyes follow the spectator, to have been an independent picture, unless, for everything but the head, the two artists followed a

¹ A mezzotint engraving by Augustus Robin, from the original then owned by Dr. Samuel C. Lewis, of New York, was published by Elias Dexter in 1868. A heliotype of this engraving is given in *J.*, pl. iii.

² Cf. Tuckerman; Mason's *Newport*, 291. It was engraved in *The Century*, Nov., 1887 (vol. xxxv. p. 1). The Rocky Hill picture is said to belong to Mrs. Wm. Biddle (*Philad. Exhib. Catal.*, 1888.)

³ Cf. account of him in *Putnam's New Mo. Mag.*, Oct., 1855 (vol. vi.).

⁴ This copy was engraved by H. B. Hall for Irving's *Washington*, and appears also in the Mt. Vernon ed. (1876) of Irving and in Tuckerman. A redrawing of it by Chapell was engraved by G. R. Hall, in 1856. It is given in heliotype in *J.*, pl. xiv. A letter of Washington, dated May 16, 1785, is given fac-simile in J. A. Spencer's *Hist. U. S.*, vol. ii.

⁵ President Kirkland's letter and Washington's reply are in Sparks's *Washington*, x. 64.

⁶ There was an engraving of it also in the *Philadelphia Monthly Mag.*, 1798.

common prototype. This alleged Wright picture hung for a time in Gardner Baker's museum in New York. It then came into the possession of William Lang, and descending through his son, William Baily Lang, was recently sold by the latter's daughter to Mr. Clarence W. Bowen, of Brooklyn (*Mag. Amer. Hist.*, April, 1887, p. 352). It bears on the coat the badge of the Cincinnati Society, which the Savage engraving does not have, while the Harvard painting does have it. At the close of the last century there was hardly a picture more popular than Savage's, but its popularity suddenly ceased after the new century began.¹

Savage also engraved another plate, which was for a while popular, called "The Washington Family," representing the President, his wife, his adopted children, and his negro servant around a table, on which lies a plan of the new Federal city, which is engaging their attention. The original canvas has been in the Boston Museum since 1840. He issued a large print of the picture in London in 1798 (heliotype in *J.*, pl. vii), and made a second plate of it, with some difference in the rosette of the hat on the table.²

In December, 1791, Archibald Robertson, a Scotchman, spent some weeks in the executive mansion in Philadelphia, and made in the first place two miniatures, one on ivory and the other in water-colors, which the artist retained, and they are now owned by his granddaughters in Philadelphia and New York. There are photographs of them in the N. Y. Hist. Society, and Dudensing executed an engraving from the ivory one, which was published by Dexter in New York in 1866. Robertson used these as studies for a large picture, which he was commissioned to paint for Earl Buchan, and which in 1792 was sent to that nobleman. Robertson also painted in oils a half-length cabinet picture on a marble slab (1792), which was owned by Mrs. M. M. Craft, of New York, when the heliotype in *J.*, pl. iii, was made. In 1796 he painted from the same studies two miniatures, which were given by Washington as wedding gifts to his wife's granddaughters, and are now owned by E. L. Rogers, of Baltimore, and Mrs. Beverly Kennon. Baker gives four engravings, which resemble but do not profess to follow Robertson's head.

One Williams, in 1794, painted a disagreeable, feeble picture for the Washington Lodge of Freemasons at Alexandria, in which Washington is bedizened after a repulsive fashion.³

Adolph Ulric Wertmüller, a Swede, is supposed to have had a sitting from Washington for a picture which he painted in 1795, though G. W. P. Custis seems inclined to discredit the story (*Recoll.*, p. 520). He was the painter of several pictures, which have a look different from all other supposed likenesses. Rembrandt Peale calls it a "German aspect," and said it made Washington a "dark-complexioned man," which he was not. His first picture, which was a bust portrait in civil dress, was given to Mr. Cazenove, of Switzerland, and was later owned by Chas. Augustus Davis, of New York.⁴ The same head, of cabinet size, and with a military dress, was given by Washington to Baron von Warhendoff, and is now, or was lately, owned by the widow of Dr. Cornelius Bogart, of New York. It has been engraved by Buttre. A third picture, in civil dress, was in Paris in 1858, when it was copied by Mrs. Archer Anderson, of Richmond. A fourth, in civil attire, was painted for Amos Slaymaker, and is now owned by the Penna. Hist. Society. A fifth, similarly dressed (1797), is in the Department of the Interior, having been bought by the United States in 1878 from the representatives of Mrs. Lawrence Lewis. A sixth, a full-size bust portrait, closely resembles the Davis picture, and is now owned by Benj. F. Beale. A seventh belongs to John Wagner, of Philadelphia.

Of the miniatures of Washington, not already named in speaking of artists who also painted large pictures, the earliest is one by Labatut (1782), now owned by Miss E. F. Watson, of New York, and given in *J.*, pl. xvi. It is on ivory, and was given by Washington to C. C. Pinckney. It is said to follow Stuart.

A miniature painted by John Rammage in 1789 is not now known. He is said to have had a sitting of two hours, and that the picture was intended for Mrs. Washington.

Walter Robertson, in 1794, painted a miniature from life, though some doubt has been expressed upon his having had a sitting. It represents Washington in uniform, with a black neckerchief, — an unusual neck-cloth for him, — and was engraved by Robert Field in 1795.⁵

Mr. P. A. Peticolas painted a miniature on ivory in 1796, which, having been bought from the artist's grandson by John Taylor Johnston, passed in 1876 into the hands of F. C. Sayles, of Pawtucket, R. I.⁶

¹ During the short period of its favor, it was the picture selected for the *Official letters of Washington* (Boston, 1796); the *Domestic Letters* (N. Y., 1796); the spurious *Epistles* (N. Y., 1796); the *Philad. Monthly Mag.* (1798); the *Washingtoniana* (Baltimore, 1800); the *Legacies of Washington* (Trenton, 1800); the *Memory of Washington* (Newport, R. I., 1800). After this there was a long interval before Savage's head again attracted attention. It was engraved by O'Neill in 1865, for the *Washingtoniana*, published at New York by Dexter, and again by Buttre, the same year, for the *Washingtoniana*, published by Woodward (Roxbury, Mass.), and edited by F. B. Hough. The O'Neill print is also to be found in John G. Shea's facsimile edition of *An Address from the Roman Catholics of America to George Washington* (London, 1790). There is a heliotype of the Harvard picture in *J.*, pl. vi.

² It has been engraved of late years by Sartain. Two

other "Washington Family" pictures have since been more or less popularized by engravings: one by F. B. Schell, engraved by A. B. Walter; the other by Alonzo Chappel, engraved in 1867 by H. B. Hall.

³ It is engraved in Sidney Hayden's *Washington and his Masonic Compeers*, and in Lossing's *Home of Washington*, p. 397. There is a heliotype in *J.*, pl. xxi. (Cf. *Hist. Mag.*, viii. 49.)

⁴ While in his possession it was engraved by H. B. Hall, and can be found in Irving's *Washington*, Tuckerman, and Johnston (pl. viii).

⁵ Baker gives other engravings, including those in Winterbotham's *View of the U. S.* (N. Y., 1795); C. Smith's *Amer. War, 1775-1783* (N. Y., 1797); and the *Dublin University Magazine*.

⁶ It has not been engraved, but is given in heliotype in *J.*, pl. xvi. It is said to follow Stuart.

James Sharples, or Sharpless, an English painter, beside making some effective profiles, to be mentioned later, is also the author of other pictures (1796, etc.), and, unless there is a confusion in such descriptions as I follow, some are pretty certainly profiles: One for Col. James McHenry, owned by David Hoffman, of Maryland. A pastel made for Judge Peters. A full-face sold to Mr. Walker (?) of London. A picture in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. A cabinet painting owned by Mr. Nathan Appleton, of Boston. One painted for Col. Jeremiah Wadsworth, and now in the Wadsworth Gallery at Hartford. A crayon owned by John R. Smith, of Philadelphia. A picture belonging to the rector of Wymington, Bedfordshire. A picture in the National Portrait Gallery, Kensington, is said to be by Mrs. Sharpless (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xiv. 160).¹

William Birch, an English artist, is sometimes said to have been present (1796) while the President was occupied in his cabinet, but Hart says he used Stuart's first picture, when he made a crayon sketch, from which he painted several miniatures. One in enamel was bought by James McHenry, and descended to J. Howard McHenry, and this is given in heliotype in *J.*, pl. xvi. A fac-simile of this, enamelled on copper, 1797, was owned by Chas. G. Burney, of Richmond, and engraved by H. B. Hall, and appeared in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, vol. iii., Feb., 1879, after which the plate was destroyed. (Cf. *Ibid.*, Feb., 1880, p. 149.) W. Bone, in 1796, followed this Burney picture in an enamel mentioned in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xi. 292.

An engraving of another picture, by J. G. Walker, purports to represent an original by Birch, belonging to I. G. von Staphorst, of Amsterdam.

Still another picture is said to have been drawn clandestinely by Birch while Washington was entertained at dinner, and this is owned by Mrs. Susan Washington Edwards, of Maryland; and a fourth was exhibited at the Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia, in 1876, as the property of a Mr. Lyle, of Dublin.²

F. Kisselman painted in oil a cabinet bust portrait in 1798, which is said to have belonged to Robert Morris, and is now, or was recently, owned by B. G. Smith, of Germantown, Pa. It has not been engraved.

There are miniatures (after Stuart), painted by R. Field, the original being drawn on ivory in 1798, at Mount Vernon, for Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, and is now owned by her grandson, Lawrence Lewis Conrad, of Baltimore. A second was given by Mrs. Washington, who had worn it in a locket, to Col. Tobias Lear in 1801, and is now owned by Mrs. Wilson Eyre, of Newport. A third, painted on ivory for Thomas Meredith, is owned by C. C. Moreau, and is given in heliotype in *J.*, pl. xvi. A fourth was sent by Bushrod Washington in 1825 to Bolivar, and is said to have been engraved.

Johnston (p. 144) also mentions an india-ink miniature made in 1799 by Charles Fraser, beside others without date.

The likenesses so far mentioned are wholly or in part front views, except the side aspects of the Houdon head. There is a large group of profile likenesses now to be noted.

The earliest we have was drawn by Eugène Pierre Du Simitière, a Swiss, who settled in Philadelphia in 1766, and is supposed to have made his studies of Washington in the winter of 1778-79, though we have no other evidence that Washington sat to him than the inscriptions on the early engravings of his profiles. His first drawings for these engravings are not known; but the first plate was executed by Brandi at Madrid in 1781. It was reproduced in London in 1783, engraved by B. Reading as one of the *Thirteen portraits of American legislators, patriots, and soldiers*, published in a small thin quarto by Wm. Richardson, without date; and again at London, in the same year (1783), published by R. Wilkinson, in no. 1 of *Heads of Illustrious Americans and others*, where the plate is somewhat larger than in the Richardson publication.³

There was a picture exhibited at the Philadelphia Exhibition in 1876, and called a Wertmüller. Johnston,



WASHINGTON.

(Du Simitière's *Thirteen Portraits*.)

¹ Some fraudulent pictures ascribed to Sharpless, and portrayed in an audacious book by James Walter, *Memorials of Washington* (N. Y., 1886), are exposed in a report made to the Mass. Hist. Soc. (*Proc.*, Jan., 1887).

² Birch did not engrave any of his pictures, but David Edwin engraved one in the *Amer. Artillerist's Companion* (1809), and there is a print in the Paris ed. of Barlow's *Columbiad* (1813). Baker gives other prints.

³ It was also engraved in London in 1784; by A. W. Kuffner in 1793; by B. L. Prevost and by Bonneville in Paris; by Adam in Marbois's *Complot d'Arnold* (Paris, 1816). This was the first head used on American coins (1791), and it has been several times copied on medals (*Baker Med.*, 112, 122, 139).

who gives a heliotype of it (pl. iii), says it is a profile by Du Simitière, which once hung at Mount Vernon, and is now owned by J. P. McKean.¹ Chas. Henry Hart calls it a Wright picture.

While on a visit to Mount Vernon, in 1786, Miss De Hart, of Elizabethtown, N. J., cut a silhouette of Washington with scissors, from which (?) there is an engraving in Henry Wansey's *Journal of an Excursion to the United States in 1794* (Salisbury, 1796). It is also given in the large edition of Irving's *Washington*.



FROM WANSEY.

Madame de Bréhan, a sister of the Count de Moustier, the minister from France, drew a miniature from memory in 1787; and using this as a basis, she was favored by Washington with sittings at Mount Vernon in 1789, when she made a profile head, crowned with laurel, of which she made several copies. One fell to Mrs. Bingham in 1791. Another was sent to Paris, and was there engraved in 1790 by A. F. Séraent. She sent a number of prints from this engraving to Washington, who gave them to his friends.²

A miniature by Madame Bréhan is mentioned in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, vii. 300, as being in the family of Dr. Hosack. She also made heads of Washington and Lafayette in medallion on copper, of which there are engravings.³

Mention has already been made of the full-face portraits executed by Joseph Wright near the close of the war. In 1790, possibly for the purpose of sending an original sketch to his mother, who was then modelling in wax in London, Wright caught a profile likeness of Washington in church in New York, from a convenient pew which he occupied for two or three successive Sundays (G. C. Verplanck in *The Crayon*, August, 1857). He made an etching in military dress from this sketch, which he published on a card (1790), and it was afterwards reproduced in the *Mass. Mag.*, March, 1791. It attained a considerable popularity, and appeared,

more or less closely corresponding, in the *Literary Mag.* (1792), by Holloway; in the *Pocket Mag.*, October, 1795; in the *Amer. Universal Mag.*, February, 1797; in R. Bisset's *Hist. Biog. Lit. and Scientific Mag.*, London, July, 1799; with Benj. Trumbull's Eulogy (1800); and the names of Collyer, Chapman, Evans, Scoles, Murray, Roosing, as associated with it as engravers. Joseph Ames gave the drawing a civil dress, and in this shape it was republished in New York in 1863.

What is known as the "Goodhue portrait" (1790) is a drawing in profile which was owned by David Nichols, of Salem, and is considered as following the Wright etching.⁴ Another similar head is drawn in pen-and-ink on the back of a playing-card, and is marked J. Hiller, Jr., 1794. It is owned by the Mass. Hist. Society (*Proc.*, xiii. 243).

It is the opinion of Baker, though Johnston dissents, that a profile sketch purporting to be made by Nathaniel Fullerton was simply a drawing after Wright's etching, which it closely resembles. The Fullerton picture was engraved by G. G. Smith in 1851, which is given in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Register*, January, 1857, and published as a picture of Washington while reviewing the troops on Boston Common, which would place the sketch in 1776, or at the time of his visit in 1789.⁵

A silhouette, taken in 1792 by Michel Benvenit Poitiaux, is given in E. M. Stone's *French Allies*, p. 387. (Cf. Johnston, p. 145.) A small cabinet picture in oil, showing Washington on a white horse, in Continental uniform, sketched while he was reviewing some troops at Cumberland, Md. (1794), belongs to Thomas Donaldson of Idaho. It has never been engraved.

There belongs to the Penna. Hist. Society a silhouette likeness which was sketched on some public occasion in 1795, and it bears the following inscription: "Presented to James Henry Stevens, Esq., by his friend, Col. William Washington, Sept. 9, 1800. Said to be a correct likeness taken from life of his excellency Geo. Washington. . . . S[amuel] Folwell pixed, 1795."⁶

A hasty pen-and-ink profile sketch of his head, as Washington was looking at a distant vessel on the Potomac, was made by H. B. Latrobe in 1796, and is owned by B. S. Ewell.⁷

¹ He has published a full-size colored lithograph of it.

² One of them came finally into the hands of Gen. McClellan, and while he had it it was re-engraved by Charles Burt, and this new plate is reproduced in heliotype in *J.*, pl. ii. Cf., for the same, *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, xii. 550. A print in the first volume of Crèvecoeur's *Voyage dans la Haute Pennsylvanie* (Paris, 1801) is "gravé d'après le camée peint par Madam Bréhan à New York en 1789." This engraving is by Roger.

³ In Lossing's *Field-Book*, ii. 412, and in his *Home of*

Washington, p. 199. A medal showing the heads of Washington, Lafayette, and Rochambeau is said to have been designed by her.

⁴ It is heliotyped in *J.*, pl. ii. (*Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.*, xvi. 161, and *Proc.*, iii. 229). C. H. Hart has other opinions.

⁵ There is a heliotype in *J.*, pl. iii.

⁶ It is engraved on wood in J. F. Watson's *Annals of New York*, and is reproduced in *J.*, pl. xxi.

⁷ Given in *J.*, pl. xvi, and in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, August, 1881.

The work of Sharpless was exerted, as evidence goes, in profile. Of a few views of Washington's person mention has already been made. He executed a colored crayon profile of cabinet size in 1796, using the pantograph to assure an accurate outline, and this picture is now owned by Gen. G. W. C. Lee, and is given in heliotype in *J.*, pl. xix. He is said to have had several sittings, and G. W. P. Custis speaks of the results as giving "an excellent likeness with uncommon truthfulness of expression." He repeated several times in pastel this drawn profile. Among the works of Sharpless on this subject, it is not certain, from the way in which I



THE FOLWELL SILHOUETTE OF WASHINGTON.

find them enumerated, that I have not been mistaken in supposing the following to be certainly in profile: one presented by Washington to Col. Tallmadge, and engraved by H. B. Hall & Sons, in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, February, 1883; one for James Hillhouse, of New Haven; a cabinet picture for Mrs. Morton Sears, of Bridgewater, Pa., which was given by Washington to Miers Fisher, of Philadelphia; one belonging to Mrs. William Greenleaf Webster. This profile picture was also engraved in a memorial design published to commemorate Washington's death, in 1800, but has never been engraved adequately in steel till cut in a private plate by H. B. Hall, in 1868.

The wife of the artist, Mrs. Elizabeth Sharpless, has left us a profile picture, in civil dress, which was owned recently, if not now [1888], by Mrs. Eliza M. Evans, daughter of Gen. A. W. White, of New Jersey.¹

During the last years of Washington's presidency (1796-97), Samuel Powell, by the aid of an argand lamp, just then invented, made a silhouette of Washington, which is now in the possession of the Mass. Hist. Society.² When Washington took his last leave of Congress, in June, 1798, W. Louterburg, from a favorable

¹ It is engraved by P. Hall in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, June, 1884 (vol. xi. p. 513).

² It has been reproduced in J. J. Smith's *Amer. Hist. and Lit. Curiosities*, 2d series (N. Y., 1860), p. xiv, and

position in Christ Church, where the ceremonies were held, made the India-ink sketch, which was given by Washington to the wife of Major de la Roche, an aide of Lafayette.¹



WASHINGTON.
BY POWELL.

In 1798 Washington's adopted daughter, Eleanor Parke Custis, made a shadow picture, which is now preserved in the Everett schoolhouse in Boston.²

The last portrait made of Washington in his lifetime is the one known as the "Saint Memin picture," portrayed in 1798, for which he had a sitting, as would appear. Washington was at this time in Philadelphia, organizing the army, in view of threatened war with France. Jules Févret de St. Memin used a machine for securing easily the outline of a profile, and, finishing it, reduced it for his coppers. He seems to have treated the head of Washington with more care than was bestowed on the eight hundred and more delicately engraved heads which we have of the better known Americans of the time, and of which there is a set in the Corcoran Gallery in Washington. His drawings of them are in part preserved, including Washington, which is in crayon on a tinted paper, about half life-size, in military dress. This original, which is rather striking and life-like, was owned by the late James Carson Brevoort, of Brooklyn. St. Memin engraved this at the time, but of different size from the rest of the series (as is another of his, professing to follow the Houdon bust), and this engraving was closely copied for Washington's *Valedictory Address* (Philadelphia, 1810).³ St. Memin also made, for mourning-rings, six very small engravings at the time of Washington's death.

Beside the bust of Houdon, already mentioned, it has been claimed, but without positive proof, that three other busts were moulded from life. This is alleged of a bust in wax by Mrs. Patience Lovell Wright, mother of Joseph Wright, who was a well-known modeller in wax; and from such a one, belonging to the estate of Paul Beck,⁴ she also modelled a bas-relief likeness.⁵

A similar claim is made for the well-known bust by Giuseppe Ceracchi, of which that Italian artist produced three copies in 1792-93. He gave it the severe aspect of a Roman general, and Rembrandt Peale speaks of it as having good points "in the flexible parts," but more or less failing in the rigid parts. One of the three he made for Congress, and it was destroyed in the burning of the congressional library in 1851. The second copy was sent to Spain, but was brought back to this country by Richard Meade, the minister to that court, and finally passed into the hands (1857) of Gouverneur Kemble, of Coldspring, and is, or was, on deposit in the Corcoran gallery at Washington.⁶ A third colossal copy was kept by the artist, and finally passed into Canova's hands, and was used by him. It is now the property of Williams Middleton, of South Carolina.

The third additional bust, for which the claim of being modelled from sittings is made, is a miniature work (1796) by John Echstein, of the United States mint, now owned by J. C. McGuire, of Washington.⁷

The earliest monumental effigy commemorating of Washington, to be erected after his death, is supposed to be the bust in Christ Church, Boston. All that is known of it is, that it was placed in the church in 1800, by Shubael Bell, a vestryman; and Johnston conjectures that it may have followed a bust by Joseph Wright, that sculptor having died in Philadelphia in 1793.⁸ Wright is said to have taken a mould of Washington's head at Rocky Hill in 1783, which was broken at the time, but he is thought to have taken another at Mount Vernon in 1784, from which he moulded a bust, as the beginning of an intended equestrian statue for Congress; but as nothing is now known of it, it is supposed to have been destroyed in the burning of the Capitol in 1814. The testimony of Elkanah Watson is explicit, that Wright made a bust (*Hist. Mag.*, vii. 65). Rembrandt Peale says that a mould preserved among Wright's descendants was taken from Houdon, the two halves being clumsily put together. There are in existence two medallions of Washington's head, both of which are reproduced in heliotype in Johnston, pl. xxvi. One is of wax, belonging to Benjamin G. Smith, of Germantown; the other of plaster, and is owned by Gen. G. W. C. Lee. Another medallion in plaster, which belonged to the family of the late George Homer, is supposed to have been made by Wright (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xiii. 254). He is also supposed to have modelled the so-called "Manly medal," which was struck in 1791,—

in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, xiii. 126 (1873-75). Cf. the paper on "The Home and Haunts of Washington," by Mrs. Burton Harrison, in *The Century*, Nov., 1887, p. 12.

¹ Reproduced in *J.*, pl. xxi.

² Reproduced in Lossing's *Home of Washington*, p. 399, and in *J.*, pl. xxi. (Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, ix. 356.)

³ The Brevoort drawing was again engraved by Duden-sing, and published by Elias Dexter, in New York, in 1866. It was once more engraved by H. B. Hall's sons in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, Feb., 1880, and is given in heliotype fac-simile in *J.*, pl. xx. The St. Memin head is also reproduced on the title of the edition of the *Farewell Address*, published in Baltimore by the Washington Monument Association.

⁴ A photograph was published in 1865, and a heliotype is given in *J.*, pl. xxii.

⁵ *Hist. Mag.*, viii. 50; cf. Sparks's *Franklin*, viii. 343.


⁶ This copy was engraved by H. B. Hall for Irving's *Washington*, and for Tuckerman's *Portraits*. A heliotype of it as it stands in the Corcoran Gallery, is given in *J.*, pl. xxv. From a drawing of the bust by John G. Chapman, an engraving was made by G. F. E. Prud'homme, which appears in Paulling's *Washington*, in Harper's Family Library (1835).

⁷ There is a heliotype in *J.*, pl. xxiii.

⁸ It is given in heliotype in *Johnston*, pl. xxiii.

Manly being the publisher, — and was the earliest one issued in this country to bear Washington's head. The closest reproduction on a medal of the Wright type of head is one struck to commemorate the evacuation of New York (Baker, *Medals*, p. 180). Wright himself cut a die for a medal, which was broken after a few impressions had been taken. It was copied in the engraving in the broadside edition of the *Farewell Address*, in 1796. At the time of Washington's death, Wright's head seemed to be the favorite one for medals (Baker, *Medals*, 51, 78, 111, 151).

A somewhat effective standing figure in wood, leaning on a column, with a scroll in his hand, was placed before Independence Hall in 1814. It was cut by William Rush, and was originally intended for a ship's head, but was bought by the city of Philadelphia. It is given in heliotype in Johnston, pl. xxviii.



IN CHRIST CHURCH, BOSTON.

The figure of a sitting senator, holding a tablet of laws, was intended by Canova to pass for Washington, and was made for the State of North Carolina in 1814. It was destroyed with the State House in Raleigh, in 1831. There are engravings of it from different points of view by Aug. Bertini and Dom. Marchetti.¹

The English sculptor Chantrey followed Stuart's head in the figure, seven feet high, draped with a cloak, and holding a scroll, which in October, 1827, was placed in the State House in Boston.² André Causici was the maker of the statue upon the monument in Baltimore, which was erected in 1829.

¹ Both of which are reproduced in *Johnston*, pl. xxvii.

² It was drawn by H. Carbould for J. Thomson's engraving. *Johnston* (pl. xxviii) gives it in heliotype.

In 1832 Congress ordered a colossal statue, which was made by Horatio Greenough, at a cost of \$45,000. It was prescribed that it should have a head after Stuart, but other details were left to the artist. Alexander copied a Stuart head for the use of the sculptor, who also kept by him a cast of the Houdon head, at Fontainebleau. The statue was placed in the rotunda of the Capitol in 1841 (*House Docs.*, nos. 45, 53, 57, 219, 27th Cong., 1st session). Greenough petitioned in 1843 that it should be placed before the western front of the building, as the vertical rays in the rotunda destroyed the effect of the face.¹ The first equestrian statue, after a design by H. K. Brown, was erected in New York in 1856. The head follows Houdon.²



WASHINGTON. (*Nürnberg, 1777.*)

In 1857, a standing figure, draped in a cloak, was made for Noah Walker, of Baltimore, by Edward Sheffield Bartholomew. It is to be found in heliotype in *Johnston*, pl. xxviii, and a plaster model is at Hartford.

Crawford's equestrian statue was unveiled in Richmond in 1858, making the crowning effigy of a monument of which the figures of Jefferson, Marshall, Henry, George Mason, Thomas Nelson, and Andrew Lewis make part of the base.³

¹ It has been often figured, and is given in *Johnston*, pl. xxiii. Cf. A. H. Everett in *Democratic Rev.*, xiv. 618; and *Niles's Reg.*, xliii. 141.

² A view of it, engraved by G. R. Hall, appeared in the account of the statue published at the time for James Lee,

and the same engraving is in Tuckerman. *Johnston* (pl. xxviii) gives a heliotype.

³ It is shown in Irving's *Washington* and in Tuckerman; as well as in *Johnston*, pl. xxiv.

The Houdon head was also followed by Clark Mills in the equestrian statue erected in Washington in 1860.¹ A marble statue, by Joseph A. Bailey, was placed in front of Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, in 1869.² Thomas Ball's noble equestrian statue of the commander-in-chief was placed in the Public Garden in Boston in 1869.³ The latest effigies are the standing figure, in military dress, executed by J. Q. A. Ward, and placed at Newburyport in 1879,⁴ and a different figure by the same sculptor, erected in New York, on the spot where Washington first took the oath as President.⁵

In the first years of the Revolution, before correct likenesses of Washington became current, sundry engravings appeared in Europe, either with no pretence to accuracy of features, or at best indifferently made to conform to floating descriptions. The most common type of these heads is traceable to two prints issued in London in 1775, one a standing and the other a riding figure, which purported to have been drawn by Alexander Campbell, at Williamsburg, Va., but Washington disclaimed all knowledge of having sat to any



WASHINGTON. (Murray.)

such limner (*Sparks*, iii. 277). The standing picture shows a figure dressed in a cocked hat, with military garb, his left hand on his hip, while with his right he points behind to a battle going on in the distance.⁶ The legend says the print was published in London, September 9, 1775, by C. Shepherd; after which the plate seems to have passed to Germany, and in later impressions we read: "Ioh Martin Well excud. Aug. Vind."⁷

Campbell published on the same day an equestrian print, in mezzotint, which was reproduced, with some variation in the horse, in a line engraving in Germany (Baker, nos. 46, 47). The English print is reproduced in Smith's *Brit. Mezzotint Portraits*.⁸

Another mezzotint, with a French title (Baker's no. 50), purports to be "peint par Alexandre Campbell, à Williamsburg en Virginie. Le vend à Londres chez Thom. Hart." Still another French print of the Campbell type, bust only, published at Paris "chez Esnauts et Rapilly," and entitled, *George Washington, Egr. Général-en-chef de l'armée Anglo-Américaine, nommé Dictateur par le Congrès en Fevrier,*

¹ Figured in *Johnston*, pl. xxviii.

² *Johnston*, pl. xxviii.

³ *Johnston*, pl. xxviii.

⁴ *Johnston*, pl. xxviii.

⁵ A photograph is given in G. W. Curtis's *Address on the dedication of the statue* (N. Y., 1883).

⁶ *Johnston*, pl. iii.

⁷ Baker, *Eng.*, no. 49, and no. 52, a French print reversing the posture.

⁸ The same type of head was followed in a German print of a three-quarters figure, which is found in the *Geschichte der Kriege in und ausser Europa* (Nürnberg, 1777). This is Baker's no. 48, who gives other German prints (nos. 51, 53, 57, 61). One is in the *Nord Amerika historisch und geographisch beschrieben* (Hamburg, 1778).

1777, appeared in the *Correspondance du Lord G. Germain avec les généraux Clinton, Cornwallis et les Amiraux dans la station de l'Amérique, avec plusieurs lettres interceptées du Général Washington, du Marquis de la Fayette et de M. de Barras* (Berne, 1782). This is Baker's no. 58. Still another of the Campbell type is called: *George Washington, Esqr. General and Commander-in-Chief [sic] of the Continental army in America. Joh. Lorenz Rugendas sculpsit et excud. Aug. Vind.* It represents him above the thighs, standing by cannon, holding a sword pointed upward, with a ship in the background.

It is observable that even during the later half of the war these questionable likenesses remained current. The medal which was struck in Paris in 1778 by order of Voltaire gave a fictitious head of Washington. It has already been mentioned that so late as 1780 and 1781 a head scarcely to be associated with any credited likeness of Washington appeared in the London and Boston editions, respectively, of *The Impartial History of the War*, and one equally at variance with the usual standards is in the *Brit. Mag.*, vol. i. (1800).

Campbell's head, with some modifications, appears to have furnished the type for the head in William Russel's *Hist. of America* (London, 1779), and for Murray's *History of the War* (London, 1782).

Baker has separate sections on the engravings of these Campbell and other fictitious heads (pp. 33, 193), and in his *Medallic Portraits* he enumerates the coins and medals bearing the head of Washington.¹

¹ The early coins (1783, etc.) gave only ideal heads, the first true profile appearing in the cent of 1791. Baker's enumeration is in excess of all previous ones: W. S. Appleton, in the *Numismatic Journal*, 1873 and 1876, gave 344 numbers; James Ross Snowden, in his *Medals of Washington* (Philad., 1861), enumerated the 138 pieces in the United States mint; W. Elliot Woodward, in a privately printed list of those commemorating Washington's death, gave 48 numbers, and there are 49 in the list ap-

pendent to Tuckerman's *Portraits*. Cf. also Dickeson's *Amer. Numismatic Manual*; S. S. Crosby's *Early Coins of America*; *Catalogue* of the Amer. Numismatic and Archæological Society (N. Y., 1883), p. 30; *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, 1868, p. 196; *Hist. Mag.*, iv. 83, etc. See the *U. S. 19th Cong., 2d sess. House Rept.*, vi. (1827), for the medals of the Revolution belonging to Washington, which were purchased for the library of Congress.

POSTSCRIPT. — Some of the statements of Miss Johnston, which are followed in this paper, are controverted, on the ground of opinion or other information, by Mr. Charles Henry Hart in a review of her book in the *Amer. Architect*, June 10, 1882. Mr. Hart says that a profile, perhaps original by Vallée, belongs to himself. In the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, April, 1888, there are engravings of miniatures by Robertson, and of a bust-portrait by C. W. Peale.

INDEX.

[Reference is commonly made but once to a book, if repeatedly mentioned in the text; but other references are made if additional information about the book is conveyed.]

ABBOTT, B. V. & A., *Nat. Digest*, 261.
 Abbott, Gorham, *Mexico*, 524.
 Abbott, J. S. C., 339.
 Abert, Col. J. J., 557.
 Abolitionists, 237, 325. See *Slavery*.
 Adair, Capt. John, 456.
 Adair, *Amer. Indians*, 448.
 Adams, Brooks, *Emancipation of Mass.*, 318.
 Adams, C. F., 293; on the N. E. boundary, 182; on Jefferson, 307; *Life of John Adams*, 310; *Struggle for Neutrality*, 515.
 Adams, Henry, reviews Von Holst, 264; *New England Federalism*, 313; *Gallatin*, 316; *Randolph*, 317; on Andrew Jackson, 349.
 Adams, Henry C., *Taxation*, 328.
 Adams, Herbert B., on Washington's interest in the Potomac Co., 531; *Maryland's influence on land cessions*, 534.
 Adams, John, meets Lord Howe, 12, 13; sent to Europe, 47; autog., 47; his opinion of Franklin, 48; made commissioner to negotiate a peace, 57; in Paris, 57; relations with Franklin, 57; his letter-books, 58; letters to Calcoen, 68; *Correspondence of the late Adams*, 68, 168; instructions for his Holland mission, 68; obtains loans in Holland, 72; likeness, 90; commissioner for peace, 91; unsatisfactory to Vergennes, 92; his instructions about terms of peace, 92; in Holland, 100; his support of Jay's views as to the treaty, 115; joins in the negotiation of the treaty of 1782, 133; his treaty with Holland, 133; his views of the French policy, 134; his correspondence with Livingston, 134; relations with Franklin, 134; co-negotiators given to him, 134; agrees with Jay's views, 135; calls on Vergennes, 141; his diary on the negotiations, 166; his account of the negotiations, 168; his ways in diplomacy, 168; references on his character, 168; his share in pressing the fishery claims, 171; opposes the Cincinnati Society, 219; urges control of commerce upon Congress, 222; commissioner to make treaty of commerce (1784), 233; minister to England, 233; presented to George III, 233; difficulties of his position, 234; interview with the Tripolitan minister, 234; fears war with England and France, 235; recalled, 235; *Defence of the Constitutions*, 260; French

translation, 260; criticised, 260; inaugurated Vice-President, 267; his administration as President, 269, 297; on Washington, 302; his casting votes as Vice-President, 309; *Life and Writings*, 310; his papers, 310; lesser lives, 310; eulogies, 310; genealogy, 310; Gibbs's administration of, 312; on the Hartford Convention, 322; references on his adm., 334; relations with Jefferson, 334; Alien and Sedition Laws, 334; sends embassy to France, 335, 518; rupture with Hamilton and Pickering, 335; his cabinet, 335; *Correspondence with Wm. Cunningham*, 335; *Suppressed Hist. of the Adm. of Adams*, 335; founds the navy, 363, 415; appoints generals in 1798, 455; his diplomatic career, 462; defeats the non-intercourse bill, 466; sends missions to France, 472, 475, 518; writes in Fenno's *Gazette*, 515; *Discourses on Davila*, 516; strained relations with Jefferson, 516; on the Tories, 207.
 Adams, J. J., 442.
 Adams, J. Q., *Letters on Silesia*, 43; *Futility of the Constitution*, 264, 297; and the N. E. Federalists, 274, 313; and the Monroe Doctrine, 281; made President, 282, 297; in House of Rep., 283, 349; *Memoirs*, 299, 346; on Jefferson, 307; *American Principles*, 311, 523; *Reply to the Appeal*, 313; *Eclogy and Life of Madison*, 315; *Life of Monroe*, 315, 316; correspondence with Sam Adams (1790), 318; *Four Letters*, 318; on secession plans in New England, 320, 321; and the John Henry letters, 321; a champion of anti-slavery, 324; right of petition, 324; sustained the embargo, 340, 523; *Letter to H. G. Otis*, 340, 523; references on his administration, 346; minor lives, 346, 347; bibliog., 347; portraits, 350; death, 355; commissioner to treat with Great Britain, 483; minister to Great Britain, 488; Sec. of State, 489; negotiations with Onis, 498, 524, 550; concludes treaty of 1819, 499, 556; *Letters of Publicola*, 516; goes over to the administration, 523; *Review of Fisher Ames*, 523; *The Duplicate Letter*, 524; Treaty of Ghent, 524; diplomacy of his administration, 525; his foreign missions, 525; attacks the scheme of annexing Texas, 551; on the Oregon question, 559.

Adams, Samuel, 89, 186; and the fishery claims, 171; unrelenting towards Tories, 209; and the Articles of Confederation, 218; advocating state rights, 220; opposes the Constitution, 248; induced to support the Constitution, 258; correspondence (1790) with John Adams, 318; lives, 318; *Four Letters*, 318; attacked by Osgood, 318; his character, 318; his failures as a tax collector, 318.
 Adams, Wm., 484.
 Addington ministry, 480.
 Addison on Gallatin's speech, 517.
 Adet, French minister, 472; *Notes*, 515, 518; Cockade proclamation, 515; controversy with Pickering, 518.
 Adolphustown, 214.
 African coast, Amer. fleet on, 525.
 Agua Nueva, 409.
 Aiken, P. F., *Comparative View*, 266.
 Aitkin, James, 30.
 Akins, T. B., *Documents at Halifax*, 427.
 Alabama (State) admitted, 280; Indian war in, map, 448; territory, 546.
 Alagon, Duke of, 500.
 Alamo, 551.
 Alaska, bounds, 559; bought, 559.
 Albach, James R., *Annals*, 536.
 Albany Regency, 283, 344.
 Albedyhill, Baron d', *Mémoire*, 80, 82.
 Albemarle, *Rockingham and his Contemporaries*, 96.
 Aldam, John, *Map of N. Y.*, 447.
 Alden, Timothy, *Sundry Missions*, 447.
 Aldrich, M. Almy, *Marine Corps*, 416.
 Algiers, depredations on Amer. vessels, 359, 405; imprisoned Americans, 359; treaty with, 361; receives tribute, 368; Com. Decatur before, 405; sources, 417; war with, 438; hist. of, 418; treaties with, 418. See *Barbary Powers*.
 Alien and Sedition Laws, 252, 269; effect of, 319; references, 334.
 Alison, Sir Archibald, *Europe*, 425; *Castlereagh and Stewart*, 522.
 Alleghany Mountains, 529.
 Allen, Ethan, correspondence with Beverly Robinson, 188.
 Allen, Ira, 188.
 Allen, James, a Pennsylvania Tory, 190.
 Allen, Lieut. J., on the source of the Mississippi, 553.
 Allen, Joseph, *Science of Government*, 263.

- Allen, Joseph, *British Navy*, 423.
 Allen, Paul, prepares Lewis and Clarke's narrative, 558.
 Allen, S. M., *Repub. Parties*, 298.
 Allen, Wm. (Penna.), 190.
 Almonte, 505.
 Alvarado, 471.
 "Ambuscade," French frigate, 465.
 Amelia Island occupied, 438, 546.
 American Anti-Slavery Society, 287.
 American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 288.
American Military Pocket Atlas, 183.
 American Philosophical Society, 333.
American Register, 338.
 American Revolution, diplomacy, 73.
American Statesmen Series, 298.
American State Papers, 413.
 American System (high tariffs, etc.), 279. *See* Tariff.
American Traveller, 175.
American Whig Review, 296.
 Ames, Fisher, on Hamilton, 308; *Works*, 310; memoir, 310; letters, 311; speeches, 311; portrait, 311; as a speaker, 311; on Madison, 315; speech on public credit, 328; on assumption, 329; speech on Jay's treaty, 518; justifies British Orders in Council, 523; on the purchase of Louisiana, 547.
 Ames, Joseph, 576.
 Ames, Pelham W., 311.
 Ames, Seth, 311.
 Amiens, peace of, ended, 479.
 Amory, T. C., *James Sullivan*, 318, 341.
 Amos, *Fifty Years of the English Constitution*, 265.
 Ampère, J. J., 302.
 Ampudia, Gen., 409.
 Amsterdam, wishes a treaty with America, 64.
 Anderson, Archer, 574.
 Anderson, J. J., 557.
 Anderson, R. C., 503.
 Anderson, Capt. S., 555.
 Anderson, *Canada*, 460.
 Anderson, *Hist. of Commerce*, 80.
 Andreas, A. T., *Chicago*, 429.
 Andrews, Chas., *Prisoner's Memoirs*, 426.
 Andrews, Jos., engraver, 571.
 Andrews, Israel W., 530; *Washington Co., Ohio*, 536; on the Colonial System in Ohio, 536; on the ordinance of 1787, 538; on the admission of Ohio, 543.
 Andrews, *Hist. of the War*, 566; portrait of Washington, 565.
 Andrews, Thos., *Old Jersey Captive*, 88.
 Anduaga, 502.
 Angell, James B., "The Diplomacy of the United States, 1789-1850," 461.
 Anhalt-Zerbst, treaty selling troops, 23, 84.
 Annapolis, Md., convention at (1786), 226; references, 226; Naval Academy, 460.
 Annexation, right of, 547.
 Anspach-Bayreuth, Margrave of, his troops in America, 23; treaty selling troops, 84.
 Anti-Federalists, 246; lives and writings, 315; in New England, 318; their movements, 515. *See* Republicans, Democrats.
 Anti-Masonry, 284, 348.
 Anti-rent troubles, 353.
 Anti-slavery opposition to the annexation of Texas, 551. *See* Abolitionists, Slavery.
 Appalachian Mountains, 529.
 Appalachicola River, 531.
 Appleton, Emily W., 571.
 Appleton, John (Salem), 197.
 Appleton, Nathan, 575.
 Appleton, W. H., 571.
 Appleton, W. S., 167; on Washington coins, 582.
 Aranda, Count of, interviews with Franklin, 41; character, 41; correspondence, 41, 54; zeal for America, 54; relations with Vergennes, 108; in Paris, 108; opposed Jesuits, 108.
 Aranjuez, convention of (1779), 108, 120.
 Arbutnot and Ambrister, 438, 546.
Archæological and Hist. Quarterly, 536.
 Archenholz, J. W. von, *Neue Literatur*, 78.
 "Argus," action with the "Pelican," 387, 457.
 Arista, Gen., 408.
 Arizona, 553.
 Arkansas admitted, 287. *See* Arkansas.
 Arkansas territory, 550; State, 550.
 Armed neutrality, 62; position of England, 62; of France, 62; of Spain, 62; of Denmark, 63; of Sweden, 63; of the United States, 63; of the Netherlands, 63; of Austria, 63; of Prussia, 63; of Portugal, 63; of Turkey, 63; of the Two Sicilies, 63; works respecting, 74; references on, 80; treaties, 82.
 Armistead, Gen., 408.
 Armstrong, Gen. John, 316; at Sackett's Harbor, 390; Secretary of War, 387, 403, 434; *Life of Wayne*, 453; on St. Clair's defeat, 451; *Notices*, 422.
 Armstrong, K., 434.
 Army of the United States, increase of, 376, 377; peace establishment (1815), 406; in Mexican war, 409; report on reorganization, 415; engineer corps, 415, 425; Burnside Report, 415; *Official Docs.*, 415; artillery, 415; cavalry, 415; looks to the western lands for pay after the peace (1782), 528; lands devoted, 532.
 Arnold, I. N., on the Blackhawk war, 439.
 Aroostook war, 177; expenses of, 179.
 Arrowsmith, *Map of U. S.*, 460; *Map of N. Amer.*, 558.
 Artillery corps, 358. *See* Army.
 Ashburton, Lord, 493; to settle the boundary difficulties of the U. S. and Great Britain, 179.
 Astor, John Jacob, his fur-trading, 558; Pacific Fur Co., 558; accounts of his life, 559.
 Astoria founded, 558.
 Atcheson, Nath., *Amer. Encroachments*, 174, 176.
 Atherton, Wm., *Narrative*, 431.
 Atkinson, Gen. Henry, 406.
 Atkinson, *Newark, N. J.*, 316.
Atlas Américain, 183.
Atlas of the Battles of the Amer. Revolution, 183.
Atlas Methodique, 180.
 Atwater, Caleb, *Ohio*, 454.
 Auchinleck, Gilbert, *Hist. of the War*, 427.
 Auckland, Lord, 480; *Correspondence*, 52; papers, 51.
 Audubon, J. W., 569.
 Augusta, Georgia, treaty at, 446.
 Austin, Benj., writings, 318; *Const. Republicanism*, 318.
 Austin, J. T., *Gerry*, 318; *Letters to Otis*, 342.
 Austin, Nicholas, 191.
 Austria offers mediation (1781), 55, 92.
 Autosse, 436.
 Avery, John, 228.
 BABSON, *Gloucester, Mass.*, 426.
 Backus, E., 439.
 Bacon, John, 221.
 Bad Axe, fight at, 406.
 Badger, Barber, *Naval Temple*, 417; *Amer. naval battles*, 417.
 Bagby, G. W., 306.
 Bagehot, *English Constitution*, 265.
 Bagot, 489.
 Bailey, Francis, *Pocket Almanac*, 529.
 Bailey, Isaac, *Amer. Naval Biog.*, 417.
 Bailey, Jos. A., 581.
 Bainbridge, Wm., at sea, 363; captured, 364; sent to Algiers, 368; on the "Philadelphia," 371; portrait, 380; his medal, 380; in the "Constitution," 381; in the Mediterranean, 406; life by Harris, 417, 419; by Cooper, 419.
 Baine, Edw., *French Revolution*, 425.
 Baker, Gardner, 570, 574.
 Baker, G. E., edits *Seward's Works*, 355.
 Baker, Jas. H., *Sources of the Mississippi*, 553.
 Baker, John T., *Federal Constitution*, 256.
 Baker, W. S., *Character Portraits of Washington*, 302; *Engraved Portraits of Washington*, 563; *Medallic Portraits of Washington*, 563.
 Baker's Bottom, 456.
 Baker's fort, 456.
 Balch, Thomas, edits Galloway's *Examination*, 202.
 Baldwin, C. C., *Relics of the Mound Builders*, 431; edits Heckewelder's map, 534; *Early Maps of Ohio*, 547.
 Baldwin, Henry, *The Constitution*, 260.
 Baldwin, J. D., *Party Leaders*, 298.
 Ball, Col. J. V., 455.
 Ball, Thos., equestrian statue of Washington, 581.
 Baltimore, attacked, 435; made the capital city, 267; view of harbor, 402.
 Bancroft, Aaron, on Washington, 300.
 Bancroft, Geo., on the negotiation of George III for Russian troops, 17; his account of the French Alliance, translated by Circourt, 48; on the diplomacy of the Rev., 74; on exchange of prisoners, 87; on the treaty of 1782-83, 168; *Hist. of the Const.*, 257, 263; on Washington, 302; on battle of Lake Erie, 433; founds Naval Academy, 460; on Henry Clay, 343; on And. Jackson, 349; *Miscellanies*, 349; on the Ordinance of 1787, 538.
 Bancroft, H. H., *Mexico*, 356; on the Mexican war, 442, 443, 507; on the American conquest of California, 444; his *California*, 444; *North Mexican States*, 444; on the diplomacy of the Mexican war, 525; *Oregon*, 555; *Brit. Columbia*, 556; *No. W. Coast*, 556; on the Oregon question, 562.
 Bank of No. America, 235.
 Bank of the United States, 268, 276, 277, 283; Hamilton's arguments for a, 328; the adverse arguments, 329; Jackson's antipathy, 351; *War on the Bank*, 351; chartered by Penna., 285.
 Banks, pet, 289.
 Banning, Henry, 435.
 Barbarata, pirates of, 403, 437, 439.
 Barbaroux, C. O., *Voyage du Général Lafayette*, 344.
 Barbary Powers, prisoners to, 418; diplomacy with, 525. *See* Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli, Morocco.
 Barbé-Marbois, F. de, *Constitution des Etats Unis*, 26; *La Louisiane*, 547.
 Bárcenas, J. M. R., *La Invasión Norte-Americana*, 443.
 Barclay, Capt., on Lake Erie, 432; trial for his conduct, 433.
 Barclay, Com., 391.
 Barclay, Thomas, 173, 234.
 Baring, Alex., 483; *Inquiry*, 521.
 Barlow, Joel, 300, 525; in France, 514; portrait, 531; his map, 532; *Plan des Achats des Compagnies de l'Ohio et du Scioto*, 532; agent in Europe, 535.
 Barlow, S. L. M., 225.
 Barnard, D. D., 353.
 Barnard, John, *Retrospections of America*, 301.

- Barnard, *Rensselaerswyck*, 353.
 Barnburners (political party), 293.
 Barnes, J. S., *Submarine Warfare*, 425.
 Barnett, C. M., 263.
 Barney, John, *Fifty Years*, 435.
 Barney, Com. Joshua, portrait, 401; at Bladensburg, 401, 435; life, 417.
 Barnwell, J. G., *Reading Notes on the Const.*, 25t.
 Barr, James, *Indian War*, 440.
 Barr, John, 534.
 Barré, Col. Isaac, caricature, 98.
 Barre, L., 59.
 Barrière, *Bibl. des Mémoires*, 79.
 Barron, Com. James, supersedes Preble in the Mediterranean, 374; court-martial, 420, 522.
 Barrow, Sir John, *Memoir*, 424; *Life of Earl Howe*, 12.
 Barrows, Lieut. Wm., 458.
 Barrows, Wm., *United States of Yesterday*, 547; on the great American Desert, 559; *Oregon*, 562.
 Barry, John, made captain, 360; in the "United States," 363.
 Barry, Robert, 571.
 Bartholomew, E. S., 580.
 Bartlett, John Russell, on Gallatin, 316; *Lit. of the Civil War*, 323; *Bibliog. of R. Island*, 432; *Carver's Travels*, 555.
 Bartlett, W. S., *Frontier Missionary*, 214.
 Barton, Wm., *Paper Credit*, 236.
 Bateman, W. O., *Polit. and Const. Law*, 263.
 Bates, Joshua, umpire, 495.
 Bathurst, Lord, 484, 485.
 Baudry de Loriaès, *Voyage*, 550.
 Bavaria, treaty, 512.
 Bayard, James A., 314; and Jefferson, 337; sent to England, 483.
 Bayard, R. H., *Documents*, 337.
 Bayley, R. A., *Loans of the U. S.*, 235.
 Baylies, Francis, *Gen. Wool*, 442.
 Bayne, Col. Edw., 458.
 Beale, B. F., 574.
 Bear Flag Insurrection, 445.
 Beard, J. H., 441.
 Beaumarchais, his character, 27; brings news from London, 28; confers with John Wilkes, 28; corresponds with Vergennes, 28; receives money for America, 28, 31, 32; Roderique Hortalez et Compagnie, 29; likeness, 29; contracts with Congress, 30; buys arms of France for America, 31; his armed ships, 31; new contract, 32; promises of Congress, 32; his claim on Congress, 32; his receipt for a million, 32; demands settlement of accounts, 33; his heirs paid, 33; his agent Francy, 33; *Le Vau de toutes les Nations*, 33; *Observations on the Mémoire of Gibbon*, 54; moneys received by, 71, 72; account by Loménie, 79; by Bettelheim, 80; *Mémoires*, 79; *La Paix ou la Gloire*, 79; in Hale's *Franklin in France*, 80.
 Beaurain, Chev. de, *Carte de l'Amérique*, 184.
 Beck, Paul, 571.
 Beckwith, Col., 451.
 Belknap, Edw., 573.
 Belknap, Jeremy, on the dangers of the Confederation, 219; notes on the Mass. Fed. Convention, 258; his letters, 258; on an extinction of slavery in Mass., 326; map of Wayne's march, 454; owned portrait of Washington, 573; on the imbecile condition of Congress (1786), 224.
 Bell, C. H., on Lorenzo Sabine, 214.
 Bell, J. G., *Catalogue*, 23.
 Bell, Peter, *Map of Brit. Dominions*, 182.
 Bell, Shubael, 578.
 Bellair, 435.
 Bellamy, 519.
 Bellamy, M., 472.
 Bellemare, E. L. G. de F. de, 441.
 Beltrami, G. C., *Sources du Mississippi*, 553; *Pilgrimage*, 553.
 Beuham, Gen. H. W., *Mexico and Buena Vista*, 442.
 Bennett, Edmund H., 263.
 Bennett, James Gordon, *Memoirs*, 350.
 Benson, Egbert, 173; portraits, 173; his paper on the St. Croix, 174.
 Benton, Thomas H., *Abridgment of Debates*, 295; *Thirty Years' View*, 295; life by Roosevelt, 324; on the Sau Pasqual campaign, 444; and the conquest of California, 445; on dividing Western territory, 543; sketch of life, 558.
 Berard, Blanche, *West Point*, 460.
 "Berceau, Le," captured, 456.
 Bergholtz, Carl, *Die Bewaffnete Neutralität*, 80, 82.
 Berlin and Milan Decrees repealed, 522.
 Bermuda Islands, 57; sought by the U. S., 89.
 Berthier, Gen., 478.
 Berquin-Duvallon, *La Colonie espagnole*, 550; *Travels*, 550.
 Bettelheim, Anton, *Beaumarchais*, 80.
 Betts, B. R., 569.
 Bew, *Map of N. America*, 175.
 Bezenberger, Dr. H. E., 75.
 Biddle, Chas., *Autobiog.*, 338, 418.
 Biddle, Craig, 405.
 Biddle, Capt. James, portrait, 405.
 Biddle, Nicholas, helps on Lewis and Clark's narrative, 558.
 Biddle, Mrs. Wm., 573.
 Biedermann, Karl, *Deutschland*, 76.
 Bigelow, Jacob, *War of the Gulls*, 430.
 Bigelow, John, 306; *Beaumarchais, the merchant*, 33; on Jefferson's financial diary, 82; on the treaty of France and Spain (1779), 170; *Frémont*, 445.
 Billon, F. L., *St. Louis*, 550.
 Binney, Horace, on John Marshall, 313; *Washington's Farewell Address*, 333.
 Binns, John, *Recoll.*, 350.
 Birch, W., *Country seats*, 224, 345; pictures of Washington, 575.
 Bird, A. G., on loyalist troops, 196.
 Birkheimer, W. E., *Artillery*, 415.
 Birney, J. C., 288, 291.
 Bishop, W. W., 442.
 Bisset, R., *Hist. Mag.*, 576.
 Black Hawk, lives of, 406, 439.
 Black River, 558.
 Black Rock, 390, 391, 459.
 Blackshear, Gen. D., 436.
 Blackstone, Sir Wm., *Commentaries*, 9, 265.
 Bladensburg, Md., fight at, 401, 434; sailors at, 435; plans, 435.
 Blair, F. B., 295, 349; *Gen. Jackson and Buchanan*, 347.
 Blake, Francis, 340.
 Blake, J. E., 440.
 Blakeley, Capt. Johnston, 458.
 Blanca, Count Florida, portrait, 53; prime minister, 53; independent of Vergennes, 53; offers mediation to England, 54; proposes a descent on England, 54; correspondence, 54; would satisfy Russia, 61; minister of Spain, 61; intriguing with England, 92; cold towards the U. S., 107; distrusted by Franklin, 107; designs on Gibraltar, 107, 109.
 Blanchard, A., 568.
 Bland, Richard, 186.
 Bland, Theodor, 501; proposes a N. W. ordinance, 528.
 Blane, W. N., *Excursions*, 175, 382.
 Blatchford, John, 88.
 Bledsoe, A. J., 257.
 Blennerhassett, Herman, his connection with Burr, 338; life and papers, 338; his widow, 339.
 Blight, Geo., 571.
 Blight, James, 571.
 Bliss, Henry, Jr., on the *N. Eastern boundary*, 177.
 Blockade, validity of, 62.
 Bloodhounds used in Florida, 440.
 Bloody River, 553.
 Blount, Thomas, 522.
 Blunt, *Formation of the Confederacy*, 215.
 Blyth, B., 565.
 Blyth, S. C., *War with Tripoli*, 419.
 Board of Treasury, 69.
 Bocanegra, 505.
 Bogart, Dr. Cornelius, 574.
 Bolivar, Simon, 575.
 Bolland, W., *Anc. rights of the Amer. fishery*, 170.
 Bolles, Albert S., *Financial Hist. of the U. S.*, 13, 81, 328; on R. Morris, 82.
 Bollman, Erich, 338.
 Bonaparte receives Amer. commissioners, 475; and the sale of Louisiana, 478, 479.
 Bone, W., 575.
 Bonne, *Map of America*, 184.
 Bonner, John, 431, 442.
 Bonneville, B. L. E., travels, 558; his map, 558.
 Bonnieu, 566.
 Bonvouloir, 24.
 Boogher, W. F., 336.
 Boone, Col. Daniel, accounts of, 541; *The first White Man of the West*, 541; *Life and Adventures*, 541.
 Boston, centre of the abolition movement, 326; defences of (1812), 458; her merchants subscribe to put down Shays Rebellion, 229; no. of Tories leaving at the evacuation, 195; view (1799), 328; Lafayette in, 345; Jackson in, 350.
 "Boston," man-of-war, fights the "Berceau," 366.
Boston Repertory, 308.
 Botts, J. M., *Hist. Rebellion*, 355.
 Boucher, Rev. Jona., *Causes of the Amer. Rev.*, 190.
 Bouchette, Jos., *Map of Canada*, 175; *British Dominions*, 172, 177; runs the line from the St. Croix, 172; *Top. Desc. of Lower Canada*, 175; portrait, 176.
 Boucher, Lady, *Sir Edw. Cochrington*, 423.
 Bouldin, *Randolph*, 317.
 Boundaries of the U. S. proposed, 89, 90, 92; French view, 92; on the Mississippi, 107; as urged in negotiating the treaty of 1782, 132; Maine demanded by England, 137; northern line, 138; the French proposal, 148; expressed by Rayneval, 149; Luzerne's surprise at the bounds agreed upon, 158; future accessions of territory, 165; history of the northern boundary controversy, 171; on the south, 171; map of N. E. bounds, 173; literature on the subject, 173, etc. See Florida, Lake of the Woods, Louisiana, Maine, North Eastern Boundary, Oregon, San Juan, United States.
 Bourbons, family compact, 148.
 Boutmy, *Constitutions Etrangères*, 265.
 Bowdoin, James (senior), urgent for regulation of trade, 221; silhouette, 229; his proclamation pardoning the actors in Shays Rebellion, 228; portraits, 229.
 Bowdoin, James (younger), *Opinions*, 518.
 Bowen, Abel, *Naval Monument*, 421.
 Bowen, Clarence W., 574.
 Bowen, Emanuel, *Map of N. America*, 182.
 Bowen, Francis, on the diplom. of the *Rev.*, 74; edits De Tocqueville, 265; *Amer. Institutions*, 265; *Social Influence of Democracy*, 265; *Documents of the Constitutions*, 265.
 Bowen, H. L., *Tristram Burges*, 317.
 Bowers, W., *Naval Adventures*, 424.
 Bowles, Carrington, *Map of N. America*, 174.

- Boyd, Col. J. P., 375, 428; *Documents*, 458.
- Boyer, Lieut., journal, 453.
- Boyle, *Marylanders*, 317.
- Boynon, *West Point*, 460.
- Brackett, A. G., *Cavalry*, 415, 441.
- Bradburn, Geo., 326.
- Bradford, Alden, *Federal Government*, 209.
- Bradford, S. D., *Works*, 322.
- Brand, W. F., 566.
- Brannan, John, *Official Letters*, 420.
- Brazito, 410.
- Breck, Samuel, *Continental paper money*, 16, 81.
- Breckenridge, H. M., *Western Insurrection*, 330; *Voyage*, 418; *Late War*, 422; *Journal*, 550; *Views of La.*, 550.
- Breckenridge, H. H., *The Insurrection*, 330.
- Breckenridge, John, 272, 320.
- Breckenridge, W. C. P., *Cent. Address*, 541.
- Bréhan, Mad. de, 576.
- Brenton, E. P., *Naval History*, 12, 423.
- Brevoort, Henry, 573.
- Brevoort, Jas. Carson, 578; owned Pine's Washington, 573.
- Brewer, Gardner, 38.
- Brewer, W., *Alabama*, 546.
- Brice, W. A., *Fort Wayne*, 453.
- Brickell, John, 451.
- Bridge, Horatio, *African Cruiser*, 418.
- Bridgewater, battle of. See Lundy's Lane.
- Briggs, Geo. N., 350.
- Brightly, F. C., *Digest*, 261, 206.
- Brighton, J. G., *Sir F. B. V. Broke*, 423.
- Brisbane, Col., 440.
- Brisson de Warville, *Travels*, 535.
- British instigating the Indians, evidence of, 451. See Indians.
- Brock, Sir Isaac, gov. of Canada, 384; captures Detroit, 384; killed, 385; acc. of, 427; *Life*, 450; letters, 459.
- Brogie, Comte de, plan for his becoming a leader in America, 35.
- Brogie, Duc de, *Le Secret du Roi*, 35.
- Broke, Sir P. B. V., 387, 457; *Memoir*, 423.
- Bronson, Henry, on Conn. currency, 81.
- Brooks, Edw., 38.
- Brooks, N. C., *Mexican War*, 441.
- Brougham, Henry (Lord), *The Ashburton Treaty*, 181; against the Orders of Council, 520, 522; offers his mediation, 522; on Jefferson, 303; *Statesmen*, 304.
- Brown, Chas., 571.
- Brown, Chas. Brockden, edits *Amer. Reg.*, 338.
- Brown, Chas. R., *Old North West Territory*, 454.
- Brown, Gen. Jacob, saves Sackett's Harbor, 390; on the Niagara frontier, 393; medal, 459.
- Brown, J. M., 541.
- Brown, John Mason, *Add. at Frankfort, Ky.*, 541.
- Brown, Henry B., 261.
- Brown, H. K., 572; equest. statue of Washington, 580.
- Brown, Peter A., 571.
- Brown, S. G., *Rufus Choate*, 349, 354.
- Brown, S. R., *Second War for Independence*, 422; *Northwestern Army*, 428; *Views on Lake Erie*, 433; *Views of the Campaign*, 433.
- Brown, W. G., 441.
- Brownson, O. A., *Amer. Republic*, 260; *Works*, 260, 299.
- Brownstown, fight at, 429; fort at, 454.
- Brownsville, 429, 456.
- Bruckner, Jos., *Chief Polit. Parties*, 298.
- Brunner, Albert, 256.
- Brunswick, Charles, Duke of, 19; Charles William Ferdinand, Prince, 19; agrees to send troops to America, 19; income and debt, 19; his city, 19.
- Brunswickers sent to America, 19, 83.
- Brush, Capt. Henry, 429.
- Bryan, T. J., 571.
- Bryant, Edwin, *In California*, 446.
- Bryant, Wm. C., *The Embargo*, 341.
- Bryce, Geo., *Canadian People*, 213, 427.
- Buchan, Earl, 574.
- Buchanan, Dr. George, 325.
- Buchanan, James, 283, 511; on the N. E. boundary, 179; *Eve of the Rebellion*, 324; on the right of petition, 324; in Russia, 525; and the Oregon question, 560, 562.
- Buckingham, Duke of, *Court and Cabinets of George III*, 97, 106.
- Buckingham, Jos. T., *Reminiscences*, 258, 319; *Personal Memoirs*, 319.
- Buckler, W., 571.
- Bucktails (party name), 283.
- Budd, Lieut., 457.
- Buell, Joseph, 536.
- Buell, W., 543.
- Buena Vista, battle, 409, 442.
- Buffalo, N. Y., 390; views of, 459.
- Bulfinch, Thos., 306; *Oregon and El Dorado*, 558.
- Buller, C., on the N. E. boundary, 174, 182.
- Bullock, Alex., on the Const. of Mass., 538.
- Bump, O. F., *Const. Decisions*, 261.
- Bunn, Mat., *Life*, 451.
- Bunnell, D. C., *Travels*, 433.
- Bunson, Georg von, on Kapp, 78.
- Burbeck, Maj. H., 456.
- Burch, Samuel, 296.
- Burges, Tristram, 351; life, 317; *Battle of Lake Erie*, 432.
- Burgoyne, R. H., *Sutherland Highlanders*, 437.
- Burgoyne, Gen., view of his surrender in France, 43; found little help from loyalist troops, 196; his surrender disposed the Russian king to the Amer. cause, 81.
- Burke, Ædanus, on the Cincinnati, 219.
- Burke, Edmund, 11; *Letter to Sheriffs of Bristol*, 50; paymaster-general, 97; likenesses, 97; character, 106; his reform bill (1781), 106; authorities on, 111; *Works*, 111; against the treaty of 1782, 160; *French Revolution*, 516; plans a secession from Parliament, 52.
- Burke, *Affairs of R. I.*, 355.
- Burke, Thomas, of N. C., 89.
- Burnaby, Rev. Andrew, letter to Washington, 51.
- Burnet, Jacob, *Notes*, 536; acc. of, 537.
- Burney, Chas. G., 575.
- Burnt Corn Creek, 435.
- Burr, Aaron, political management, 269; portrait, 297; lives of, 316; *Private Journals*, 316; bibliog., 316; suppresses Wood's *Adm. of Adams*, 334; Vice-President, 337; references on his conspiracy, 338; his trial, 339.
- Burr, C. C., *Hist. of the Union*, 264.
- Burrows, Lieut., in the "Enterprise," 387.
- Burt, Chas., 569, 576.
- Burt, Nath., 332.
- Bury, Viscount, on the loyalists in Canada, 213.
- Bushnell, Chas. I., 198.
- Bustamente, MS. on the Mexican war, 442.
- Butler, Anthony, 505.
- Butler, Frances Anne, *Journal*, 350.
- Butler, Gen., in Mexican war, 409; supersedes Scott in Mexico, 412.
- Butler, James, *American bravery*, 421.
- Butler, Lawrence, 536.
- Butler, Mann, *Kentucky*, 541.
- Butler, N. M., 342.
- Butler, Rich., 447.
- Butler, Wm., British commissary, 189.
- Butler, W. O., 431.
- Butler, Groton, 231.
- Butterfield, C. W., *Washington Crawford letters*, 531; edits *Heart's Journal*, 450.
- Byles, Mather, 194.
- Byrdsall, F., *Locofoco party*, 351.
- CABLE, G. W., 437; *Creoles of Louisiana*, 338, 439, 550.
- Cabot, Geo., 311; owned portrait of Hamilton, 232; *Life* by H. C. Lodge, 313; papers destroyed, 322; president Hartford Convention, 322.
- Cabrillo, voyage of, 555.
- Caldwell, J. D., *Cinn. Pioneer*, 535.
- Calbee, 436.
- Calhoun, John C., and nullification, 253, 255, 270, 322, 323; his governmental views, 253; debate with Webster, 254; in Congress, 275; on New England opposition to the war of 1812, 277; Vice-President, 281; quarrels with Jackson, 284, 438; and state sovereignty, 286; in Tyler's cabinet, 291; portrait, 297; *Address to S. Carolina*, 322; opposes petitions against slavery, 324; no extended life, 324; minor accounts, 324; *Works*, 324; strict construction views, 324; account by Von Holst, 324; described by Milburn, 355; urges war (1812), 482; on the McLeod case, 494; on the Monroe Doctrine, 524; urges annexation of Texas, 551; on the Oregon question, 560, 562.
- California annexed, 553; Bear Flag insurrection, 445; conquered by the Americans, 410, 444; H. H. Bancroft the best authority, 444.
- Calcoen, 68.
- Call, Gov., 407.
- Callender, E. B., *Thaddeus Stevens*, 325.
- Callender, J. T., attacks Hamilton, 309; *Hist. U. S.*, 309; *Sketches of the Hist. America*, 309, 330; *American Remembrancer*, 334; *The Prospect before us*, 334; arrested, 334; *Sedgwick & Co.*, 334.
- Callet, A. F., 93.
- Callot, Gen. V., *Voyage*, 550.
- Calvert, Geo. H., *Battle of Lake Erie*, 433.
- Camden, Lord, 97; likeness, 97; on Chatham's last speech, 52.
- Camillus (Hamilton), *French influence*, 514, 517; *Political Reformer*, 260.
- Campan, Mme., *Memoires*, 4, 79.
- Campbell, A., 555.
- Campbell, Archibald, on the San Juan dispute, 562.
- Campbell, Archibald, alleged portraits of Washington, 581.
- Campbell, Geo. W., 434.
- Campbell, John, *Naval History*, 423.
- Campbell, J. V., 451.
- Campbell, Mrs. Maria, 429.
- Campobello Island, 177.
- Campus Martius (Marietta), 535; view, 538; plan, 539.
- Canada to be attacked (1778), 58; plan abandoned, 58; Franklin wished the cession of, at the peace, 153; invaded (1812), 382, 459; rebellion in (1837), 494.
- Canadian Inspector, 427.
- Canal de Haro, 560.
- Canniff's *Upper Canada*, 213.
- Canning, George, 423, 482; on American diplomacy, 461; on neutral rights, 521.
- Canning, Stratford, 492.
- Canova, his statue of Washington, 579.
- Cantillo, A. del, *Tratador*, 82.
- Capefigue on Louis XIV., 5.
- Capen, Nahum, *Democracy*, 310.

- Capital city of the U. S., 243; contest over site, 267; movements about, 330. See Washington city.
- Carey, Matthew, *American Remembrancer*, 517; *Olive Branch*, 298.
- Carleton, Sir Guy, his peace mission to N. Y., 103; papers, 196; the press of Tories on his hands delayed the evacuation of New York, 198, 206; would not surrender the slaves which would have flocked to New York, 206.
- Carleton, J. H., *Buena Vista*, 442.
- Carleton, Osgood, *Map of Maine*, 174; *Amer. Pilot*, 460.
- Carlisle, Earl of, his portrait, 49; his letters, 51.
- Carlyle, T., *Frederick the Great*, 43.
- Carmarthen, Lord, 234.
- Carmichael-Smyth, Sir James, *Précis of the Wars in Canada*, 427.
- Carmontelle, portrait of Franklin, 39.
- Carnahan, J., 330.
- "Caroline," case of the, 494.
- Caron, Pierre Auguste. See Beaumarchais.
- Carpenter, S. C., on French influence, 514.
- Carpenter, T., 339.
- Carpenter, W. H., *Tennessee*, 530.
- Carpenter's Hall (Philad.), 333.
- Carrington, H. B., *Battle maps of the Amer. Revolution*, 183; on Washington, 302.
- Carroll, Chas., 186.
- Carroll, Daniel, 92, 571.
- Carson, Kit, 444.
- Carver, Jonathan, his surveys embodied in maps, 184; biblig. of his travels, 555.
- Casa Mata, 412.
- Casey, Thos. L., on the corps of engineers, 415.
- Casket*, *The*, 453.
- Cass, Lewis, 283, 437; defeated in presidential election, 293; portrait, 297; and the war in Florida, 440; in France, 525.
- Casseday, Benj., *Louisville*, 541.
- Cassel, Germany, MSS. at, 75.
- Cassin, Capt., 400.
- Cassin, Stephen, 434.
- Castiglioni, *Travels*, 332.
- Castine, Me., forts, 458.
- Castlereagh, Lord, 483, 490, 522; *Correspondence*, 524.
- Castropolis, 535.
- Catawbas, position of, 448.
- Catherine II (Russia), her character, 6; makes peace with the Porte, 17; her troops sought by George III, 17; incensed with England, 61; issues "Declaration," 61; caucus system, 297.
- Cathcart, Amer. consul at Tripoli, 369.
- Causici, André, 579.
- Cavendish, Lord John, 97, 111; his censure of the treaty of 1782, 162.
- Cayugas, treaties, 447. See Six Nations, Iroquois.
- Ceracchi, bust of Jefferson, 304; made head of Madison, 341; bust of Washington, 578; his bust of Hamilton, 231.
- Cerro Gordo, battle, 411; plan of the field, 442.
- Cevallos, 497, 498.
- Chabaud-Arnault, Ch., *Guerre navale de 1812*, 424.
- Chads, Sir H. D., *Memoir*, 424.
- Chadwick, Dr. Jas. R., translates Schöppf's letters, 75.
- Chalmers, George, *Treaties*, 74, 82, 166; on the islands in Passamaquoddy Bay, 177; papers, 202, 203.
- Chamberlin, portrait of Franklin, 37.
- Chamier, Capt., edits James's *Naval History*, 422.
- Champlain's sojourn in Acadia, 1604-5; settles the identity of the St. Croix River in 1798, 174.
- Champlin, Stephen, at battle of Lake Erie, 433.
- Champney, L. W., 214.
- Chandler, Gen., on the Niagara frontier, 428.
- Chandler, Samuel, 186.
- Channing, Edw., "Territorial Acquisitions," etc., 527.
- Channing, W. E., 457; *Memoirs*, 322; an abolitionist, 320; *Letter to Henry Clay*, 551.
- Channing, Dr. W. F., 569.
- Channing, W. H., *W. E. Channing*, 322.
- Chantrey, his statue of Washington, 579.
- Chaplin, Jeremiah, *Chips from the White House*, 298; *Addresses of the Presidents*, 298.
- Chapman, Daniel, *Crisis*, 524.
- Chapman, J. G., 578.
- Chappel, Alonso, 574.
- Chappell, A. H., *Miscellanies of Georgia*, 446, 534.
- Chapultepec, 412.
- Charles III (Spain), his character, 5; distracted, 53.
- Charlestown, Mass., Navy Yard, 416.
- Charleston* (S. C.) *Mercury*, 322.
- Chase, Geo. B., 563.
- Chase, Judge, impeached, 338.
- Chase, S. P., 289.
- Chase, *Administration of Polk*, 355.
- Chasles, P., on Franklin, 168.
- Chateaugay, fight, 458.
- Chatham, Lord, on mercenary troops, 24, 74; *Select Speeches*, 24; in the Lords (1778), 51; dies, 52; Copley's picture, 53.
- Chatterton, Lady, 424.
- Chaucey, Chas., 186; in the "John Adams," 374; on Lake Ontario, 388; portrait, 388.
- Cheeseman, Thomas, 568.
- Cheetham, James, *Suppression by Burr*, etc., 335; *Antidote to Wood's Poison*, 335; *Reply to Aristides*, 340.
- Cherokees, controversy with Georgia, 322; expelled from Georgia, 286; treaties with, 447; cessions of land, 447; removal of, 447; map of lands, 448.
- "Chesapeake," 363; attacked by the "Leopard," 273, 482, 522; fight with the "Shannon," 336; sources, 420, 457.
- Chesapeake Bay, British in, 458.
- Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co., 531.
- Chesney, *Essays in Mil. Biog.*, 198.
- Chesnoy, Capitaine du, *Théâtre de la Guerre*, 184.
- Chester, Col. J. L., on Washington's ancestry, 302.
- Chestnut, Gen., 571.
- Chevalier, E., *La marine française*, 456.
- Chevalier, M., *Lettres*, 350.
- Chèves, Langdon, 275.
- Chévilloy, 666.
- Cheyney, E. P., *Anti-rent agitation*, 353.
- Chicago, 429.
- Chickasaws, treaty with, 447; territory of, 448.
- Chihuahua, attacked, 444; Gen. Wool at, 409.
- Child, Lydia Maria, 326.
- Chili, treaty, 504.
- Chillicothe founded, 547, 548.
- China, diplomatic relations, 509; treaties with, 525.
- Chippewa, battle of, 383, 394; sources, 459.
- Chippewa Country, 529, 542.
- Chippewa, proposed territory, 543.
- Chippewas, treaty, 450.
- Choate, Rufus, on Webster, 325; life by Brown, 354, 560; on the McLeod case, 525; on the Oregon question, 560.
- Choctaw Country, shown in maps, 448, 529.
- Choiteau, Léon, *Guerre de l'Indépendance*, 48; *Les français en Amérique*, 48.
- Christian, Thomas, *Campaign of 1813*, 431.
- Christie, Robert, *Colonial Govt. of Canada*, 427.
- Chrystie, John, journal, 459.
- Chrystler's Farm (or Field), affair at, 390, 458.
- Church, R. S. H., 307.
- Churubusco, 411.
- Cincinnati, Ohio, 548; view (1810), 535; accounts of, 535.
- Cincinnati, Society of, popular aversion to, 219.
- Cincinnati Pioneer*, 535.
- Circourt, Comte de, *Histoire de l'Alliance*, etc., 48; his *Conclusions Historiques*, 48; *L'Action Commune de la France*, etc., 81.
- Cist, C., 451.
- Claiborne, Gen. F. L., papers, 436.
- Claiborne, J. F. H., *Mississippi*, 436; *Gen. Quitman*, 442.
- Claiborne, N. H., *War in the South*, 436.
- Claiborne, *Gen. Sam. Dale*, 436.
- Clark, Daniel, at New Orleans, 338; *Corruption of Wilkinson*, 338.
- Clark, Gen. Elijah, 447; enlists with Genet, 447.
- Clark, Geo. Rogers, and Virginia claims, 527.
- Clark, J. S., 326.
- Clark, P. D., *Tecumseh*, 454.
- Clark, Thomas, *Naval History*, 416.
- Clarke, Jas. Freeman, on hist. of abolition, 326; *Anti-Slavery Days*, 326; on Gen. Wm. Hull, 429.
- Clarke, Samuel C., 429.
- Clarke, M. St. C., 294.
- Clason, A. W., on the Mass. Convention, 258; on the Va., N. Y., N. C., Conventions, 259.
- Clay, C. M., *Life*, 326.
- Clay, Gen. Green, 387, 431.
- Clay, Henry, in Congress, 275; leads the new republicans, 279; frames the Missouri Compromise, 280; candidate for the presidency, 281; Sec. of State, 282; nominated for President, 291; portraits, 297, 343; lives of, 324; *Private Correspondence*, 324; *Works*, 324; duel with Randolph, 324; counsel for Burr, 339; leader of war party (1812), 342; on internal improvements, 345; and the election of J. Q. Adams as President, 347; quarrels with Jackson, 438; Treaty of Ghent, 484; convention with England, 488; opposed treaty of 1819, 500; his compromise bill, 255.
- Clay, T. H., 349.
- Clayden, P. W., 298.
- Claypole's *American Daily Advertiser*, 334.
- Clypoole, D. C., 567.
- Clayton, W. W., *Davidson Co., Tenn.*, 530.
- Cleveland, Gen. Moses, 534.
- Cleveland (Ohio), 545, 549; accounts of, 534; Perry statue at, 433.
- Clifford, Nathan, 507.
- Clinch, Gen., 407.
- Clinton, De Witt, 275, 276; portrait, 297; *Vindication of Jefferson*, 337.
- Clinton, Geo., opposes the Constitution, 231, 250, 259; Vice-President, 273.
- Clinton, Sir Henry, his secret journal, 189.
- Cluskey, M. W., *Polit. Text-book*, 297.
- Cobb, Gen. David and Shays Rebellion, 231.
- Cobb, Joseph B., *Leisure Labors*, 345.
- Cobbett, Wm., 314; life of, 315; *Peter Porcupine's Works*, 314, 515; *Peter Porcupine's Gazette*, 314; suit with Dr. Rush, 314; *Rush Light*, 314; *Emigration of Dr. Priestley*, 314; *Selections from Cobbett*, 315; *Polit. Register*, 315; *And. Jackson*, 349; *Britannia Humbled*, 422; *Letters*

- on the late War, 422; his pamphlets, 515; *Diplomatic Blunderbus*, 515; *Observ. on Randolph's Vindication*, 517; *Little plain English*, 518.
- Cobscook River, 174, 184.
- Cochin, C. C., 39.
- Cochin China, 508.
- Cochrane, Sir Alex., Vice-Adm., 400; corresp. with Monroe, 426; in the Chesapeake, 385.
- Cocke, W. A., *Const. History U. S.*, 264.
- Codrington, Sir Edw., 423.
- Coffee, Gen., 436.
- Coffin, W. F., on the N. E. boundary, 182; *Quirks of Diplomacy*, 182; *The War*, 427.
- Coffinberry, Andrew, *Forest Rangers*, 453.
- Coggeshall, Geo., *Amer. Privateers*, 426.
- Cohen, M. M., *Notices of Florida*, 440.
- Coin Journal*, 81.
- Coinage, plan for, 236.
- Colburn's United Service*, 424.
- Colden, Cadwallader, letter-books, 190.
- Colden, C. D., *Fulton*, 425.
- Coleman, F. J., *Crittenden*, 353.
- Coleman, Wm., *Death of Hamilton*, 308; *Remarks on J. Q. Adams*, 341.
- Coles, Edward, 325, 341, 571; on the *Ord. of 1787*, 537, 538.
- Coles, John, 565.
- Colles, Christopher, *Roads*, 339.
- Collet, O. W., on the founding of St. Louis, 550.
- Colleville, Vicomte de, *Les Missions de Kalb*, 35.
- Collins, Luther, *Kentucky*, 541.
- Collins, R. H., 541.
- Collom, Richard S., 416.
- Colombia (S. America), treaty with, 504.
- Colonization Society, 287.
- Colorado, 553.
- Colraine, treaty at, 447.
- Colton, Walter, *California*, 444; *Deck and Port*, 417.
- "Columbia," Boston ship, 556.
- Columbia, District of, 330.
- Columbia River, named, 556, 561.
- Columbian Magazine*, 327.
- Columbus, Ohio, founded, 547.
- Columbus* (periodical), 434.
- Colvin, A. J., 353.
- Colvin, J. B., 296.
- Colvocoresses, Geo. M., *Govt. Explor. Exped.*, 418.
- Commerce of the U. S., 294; and the Constitution, 243.
- Compromise bill of Henry Clay, 255.
- Compromises in U. S. politics, 280.
- Conciliatory acts, 84.
- Condorcet, 260; *Quatre Lettres*, 515.
- Cone, Mary, *Life of Rufus Putnam*, 536.
- Federation of the United States, 215, 528; its articles, 84, 215; analysis of them, 215.
- Confiscation of Tory estates forbidden, 462.
- Congdon, Chas. T., *Reminiscences*, 319.
- "Congress," frigate built, 363.
- Congress, Continental, congratulates Louis XVI on the birth of a princess, 56; efficacy of, 185; its last meetings, 267; its proposed terms of peace (1779), 89, (1781), 92; instructs commissioners, 92, 93, 94; puzzled as to its relations with Beaumarchais, 32. See Continental.
- Congress of the U. S., history of, 294; *Annals*, 294; *Register of Debates*, 294; *Congressional Globe*, 295; Benton's *Debates*, 295; *Congressional Record*, 295; March's *Reminiscences*, 295; indexes of documents, 296; character of the first, 326; documents, 413; *General Personal Index*, 457; and western land cessions, 527; assumes power under the ord. of 1787, 538.
- Congress. See United States.
- Connally, Dr., 541.
- Connecticut, paper currency, 81, 235; tories in, 189; adopted the Constitution, 247; in the Federal Convention, 257, 258; western land claims, 527; disputes Virginia's claims, 527; her cession, 530, 533; Western Reserve, map of, 545, 547, 549; Firelands, 548.
- Connecticut Courant*, 320.
- Conner, Com. David, 411, 443.
- Connolly, John, *Narrative*, 198.
- Conover, G. S., *Birthplace of Red Jacket*, 447; *Geneva, N. Y.*, 533.
- Conrad, L. L., 575.
- Conrad, Robt. T., *Gen. Taylor*, 441.
- Considerations addressed to all persons of property*, 51.
- Considerations on a treaty of peace with America*, 51.
- Constable, Wm., 570.
- "Constellation," frigate built, 361; under Truxtun, 363; fights the "Insurgente," 364, 456; the "Vengeance," 365, 456.
- Constitution of the United States, history of, 237 (see Federal Convention); sent by the Fed. Convention to Congress, 246, 256; submitted to the States, 246; its fate in the several States, 246, 257; sources of information, 255; bibliography, 255; its text, 256, 296; the original document, 256; Elliott's *Debates*, 257; relations to religious liberty, 258; *The Federalist*, 259; treatises on, 260; decision upon, by the courts, 261; Story's *Commentaries*, 262; considered as making a unified government, 262; as a league, 262, 263; histories of, 263; *Commentaries*, 263; amendments, 266; inauguration of, 267; twelfth amendment, 270; compromises as regards slavery, 325; acc. in Rives's *Madison*, 263.
- "Constitution," frigate built, 361; under Nicholson, 363; cut of, 379; under Hull, 379; escapes, 379; called "Old Ironsides," 379; and "Guerriere," 380, 457; and "Java," 381, 457; captures "Cyane" and "Levant," 405, 458.
- Consuls, U. S., jurisdiction, 510.
- Continental army, gunpowder bought for, 13. See Army.
- Continental Congress seeks (1775) aid from Europe, 26; sends Silas Deane to Europe, 26; *Secret Journals*, 83. See Congress.
- Continental currency, 13, 81; depreciation of, 16, 69, 91; counterfeits, 69, 81; value (1779), 69; disappears from use, 69. See Finance.
- Contraband of war, 44; defined, 62, 85.
- Contreras, 411.
- Conventions for nominating presidents, 283; of 1787 (see Federal).
- Conway, Gen. H. S., likeness, 95; speech against the war (1782), 95; friend of America, 97.
- Conway, M. D., 257; on Edmund Randolph, 517.
- Cook, Capt. James, on the Oregon coast, 555.
- Cook, J. H., *Attack on N. Orleans*, 437.
- Cooke, E., *Address at Put-in-Bay*, 435.
- Cooke, G. W., *Hist. of Party*, 95.
- Cooke, J. E., on Jefferson, 397.
- Cooke, P. St. George, *Conquest of New Mexico*, 444.
- Cooley, T. M., *Acquisition of Louisiana*, 546; *Constitutional Limitations*, 263; *Const. Law*, 263; edits Story, 262.
- Coolidge, Joseph, 38.
- Coolidge, Susan (Miss Woolsey), *Philadelphia*, 332.
- Coolidge, T. Jefferson, 341, 571.
- Coombs, J., 340.
- Coombs, Gen. Leslie, lives of, 428; at Fort Meigs, 431.
- Cooper, James Fenimore, *Travelling Bachelor*, 170; *Littlepage Tales*, 353; *U. S. Navy*, 415; *Naval Officers*, 417; unfair to Perry, 432; sues Duer, 432; *Battle of Lake Erie*, 433.
- Cooper, Mrs. J. T., 571.
- Cooper, Samuel, 186.
- Cooper, Susan F., *Mount Vernon*, 563.
- Cooper, Thos., *Consolidation*, 323.
- Cooper, T. V., and Fenton, H. T., *American Politics*, 298.
- Cooper, Wm., *Guide in the Wilderness*, 533.
- Cope, W. H., *Rifle Brigade*, 436.
- Copley, J. S., his supposed likeness of Franklin, 37; supposed likeness of Washington, 563; his picture of Earl Howe, 12; portrait of Laurens, 66.
- Copley, Mary, 564.
- Copp, H. R., *Public Land Laws*, 533.
- Cornplanter, accounts, 447.
- Cornwallis and the Tories, 199.
- Corwin, Thos., opposes Mexican war, 355.
- Costa Rica, 504.
- Cotton in diplomacy, 468; and slavery, 280.
- Coues, Elliot, bibliog. of Lewis and Clarke, 557.
- Courtenay, T. P., *The American Treaty*, 521.
- Cox, Ross, *Adventures*, 559.
- Cox, Lieut., 457.
- Coxe, Tench, *Conduct of Great Britain*, 520.
- Coxe, R. S., *Digests*, 261.
- Coxe, *Spanish Bourbons*, 170; *House of Austria*, 170.
- Cradock, Jos., 536.
- Craft, M. M., 574.
- Craig, Sir Jas. H., 321, 427.
- Craigie, Andrew, 569.
- Crallé, R. K., *Calhoun*, 324.
- Cranch, W., *Reports*, 261.
- Crane, E., 231.
- Crane, W. C., *Remains of Houston*, 551.
- Crane and Moses, *Politics*, 266.
- Craney Island, 386; attacked, 458.
- Crawford, Wm. H., 275, 279, 281; portrait, 297, 348; Sec. of the Treasury, 341; accounts of, 345.
- Crawford, Thomas, equest. statue of Washington, 580.
- Creek Country, 448, 529.
- Creek Indians, aroused by Tecumseh, 392; treaties of, 446; alliance with Spain, 447; cede lands to the U. S., 447.
- Creek War, 436.
- "Creole," case of, 494.
- Crillon, Duc de, 130.
- Crockett, David, 436; *Autobiog.*, 299, 551.
- Croghan, Maj. Geo., at Fort Stephenson, 387, 432; portrait, 432; medal, 432.
- Croker, J. W., *Correspondence*, 424.
- Crosby, J. S., 571.
- Crosby, S. S., *Early Coins*, 582.
- Crosswell, Harry, 334.
- Cruden, John, loyalist agent, 203.
- Cruger, Henry, Jr., 201.
- Cullum, George W., *U. S. Military Acad.*, 418, *Campaigns of the War of 1812*, 425; on the capture of Washington, 435; books on West Point, 460.
- Cumberland River settlements, 530.
- Cumberland road, 275, 345.
- Cummings, Alex., 256.
- Cummins, E. H., 425.
- Cunningham, Wm., 335.
- Curio, The*, 328, 560.
- Curry, J. L. M., 546.
- Curtis, B. R., *Digests*, 261; *Decisions*, 261.

- Curtis, Geo. T., 326; on the exchange of prisoners, 87; on Vergennes and the treaty of 1782-83, 170; "The Constitution and its history," 237; proposed *Const. Hist. of the U. S.*, 255; *Hist. of the Const.*, 257, 263; on a strong government, 262; *Daniel Webster*, 325; *Last Years of Daniel Webster*, 325; *Buchanan*, 350.
- Curtis, Geo. Wm., *Address on unveiling statue of Washington*, 326, 581; on Wendell Phillips, 326; on the Ord. of 1787, 538.
- Curtius (Rufus King), 517.
- Curwen, Samuel, his *Journal and Letters*, 200; his career, 200; in England, 208.
- Cushing, Caleb, *Letters to Gov. Everett*, 182; sent to China, 509; on the Oregon question, 559.
- Cussy, Baron Ferd. de, 83.
- Custis, Eleanor Parke, 578.
- Custis, G. W. P., *Recoll. of Washington*, 301, 563.
- Cutler, Jervis, *Ohio*, 535.
- Cutler, Julia P., 536.
- Cutler, Manasseh, in the Ohio Co., 534, 537; makes contract, 534; journal and papers, 536; *Life, Journals, and Correspond.*, 536; other accounts, 536; *Map of the Federal Lands*, 536; predicts steamboats on the Ohio, 536; buys land, 537; portrait, 537; connection with the Ord. of 1787, 537.
- Cutler, W. P., 536; *Ord. of 1787*, 538.
- Cutter, C. A., edits *Sparks Catalogue*, 73.
- Cutts, J. M., *Party Questions*, 208; *Conquest of California*, 444.
- "Cyane," war-ship, 446.
- DARNEY, J. P., on the American loyalists, 214.
- Dade, Major, his party massacred, 407.
- Dahlgren, John A., *Memoir*, 418.
- Dahlgren, Mrs., 571.
- Dale, Richard, made captain, 360; goes to sea, 363; portrait, 360; sent to the Mediterranean, 369; in the Tripolitan war, 418; life of, 419.
- Dallas, A. J., *Reports*, 261; Sec. of Treasury, 277; life of, 317; *Causes of the War*, 342, 521; *Life and Writings*, 342, 468; on the capture of Washington, 434; on Jay's treaty, 468, 517.
- Dallas, Geo. M., 291; *A. J. Dallas*, 317.
- Dallas, Sir Geo., *Sir Peter Parker*, 435.
- Dalliba, James, *Brownstown*, 420.
- Dana, Francis, 472; in Russia, 63; commission, instructions, and letters, 63.
- Dana, R. H., Jr., on the "Creole" case, 495.
- Dance, his picture of Auckland, 52.
- D'Anville, *Carte du Canada*, 171; *Map of No. America*, 183; maps and the Red-line map, 181.
- D'Aranda and the American bounds, 118; on the treaty of 1782, 152. See Aranda, D'.
- Dane, Nathan, opposes a federal convention, 227; his activity in creating the Ordinance of 1787, 537; *Digest of Amer. Laws*, 537.
- David, bust of Lafayette, 59.
- Daniel, Judge, his *Dissenting Opinions*, 261.
- Daniel, P. V., Jr., 517.
- Danzig, 8.
- Danver, John T., *Republican Magistrate*, 340.
- Darby, Wm., *Louisiana*, 550.
- Darnall, Elias, *Journal*, 431.
- Dartmoor prison, 426.
- Daveiss, J. H., *Conspiracy of 1806*, 340.
- Davenport, John, at the Raisin River, 431.
- Davie, Gov., 474.
- Davies, C. S., on the N. E. boundary, 177, 182.
- Davies, John, 550.
- Davignon, likeness of Clay, 343.
- Davila, H. C., *Guerre Civile di Francia*, 516.
- Davis, C. A., 574.
- Davis, Horace, *Amer. Constitutions*, 264.
- Davis, Isaac P., 570.
- Davis, Jefferson, *Confederate Government*, 262.
- Davis, Judge John, opinion on war with France, 418.
- Davis, J. C. B., *Notes on Treaties*, 84, 471, 513.
- Davis, J. D., *Memphis*, 530.
- Davis, M. L., *Burr*, 316.
- Davis, P. M., *The Late War*, 422; *Battle of New Orleans*, 437.
- Davison, G. M., *War of 1812*, 422.
- Dawes, E. C., *Ohio Company*, 536.
- Dawson, H. B., edits *Dring's Jersey Prison Ship*, 88; *Westchester Co.*, 190; on the Confederation period, 221; on the first motion towards a Federal convention, 226; edits *The Federalist*, 259; on Lossing, 421.
- Dawson, Moses, *General Harrison*, 454.
- De Barres, J. F. W., *Seacoasts of Nova Scotia*, 183; *Gulf and River St. Lawrence*, 183; *Coast of New England*, 183; *Charts of No. America*, 183; *Atlantic Neptune*, 183.
- De Borre in America, 34; his MS. journal, 34.
- De Caindry, W. A., on the War Department, 415.
- De Franca, J. S., 571.
- De Gouyon employer, 34.
- De Grasse a prisoner in London, 123; his letters regarding the peace of 1782, 123; defeated by Rodney, 130.
- De Hart, Miss, 576.
- De Krafit, Midshipman, 419.
- De Lancey, E. F., edits *Judge Jones's N. Y. during the Rev.*, 208.
- De Lancey, James, 203.
- De Lancey, Oliver, and his loyalist troops, 196.
- De Lancey, Stephen, 81.
- De Laumoy employed, 34.
- De Lohme, *Const. of England*, 265.
- De Peyster, F. de, 566.
- De Peyster, J. W., *Mil. Career of Sir John Johnson*, 196; *Gen. Kearny*, 442. See Peyster.
- De Roos, F., *Travels*, 339.
- De Witt, Cornelis, *Washington*, 302; on Jefferson, 24, 307; *La Démocratie Amer*, 337.
- De Witt, Simeon, geographer U. S. army, 183.
- Deane, Chas., owns the Fanning Narrative; 198; owns S. Vaughan's journal at Mount Vernon, 224; on the Constitution of Mass., 538.
- Deane, John G., on the N. E. boundary, 177; biog. of, 177.
- Deane, Lewellyn, *Sketch of J. G. Deane*, 177.
- Deane, Silas, 33; sent to Europe, 26, 27; portrait, 26; his instructions, 27; in Paris, 29; agrees with Beaumarchais, 30, 79; charged with encouraging John the Painter, 30; quarrels with A. Lee, 31, 46; recalled, 32, 46; again in France, 32; autog., 33; his character, 33; his family, 33; bibliography, 33; correspondence, 33, 79; *Papers in Relation to his Case*, 33; letter to Hancock, 33; memorials to Congress, 33; his *Address to the Public*, 33; *Paris Papers*, 33; *Memorial of his heirs*, 33; engages engineers, 34; signs treaty with France, 45.
- Dearborn, Henry, Sec. of War, 359; in war of 1812, 377; on the N. V. frontier, 385; portrait, 385; autog., 385; his house 385; commands a department, 387; attacks York, 389; MS. life, 428.
- Dearborn, H. A. S., *Defence of Gen. Dearborn*, 429.
- Deas, Maj. Geo., 441.
- Deas, Mrs., *Correspondence of R. Izard*, 42.
- Decatur, James, 373.
- Decatur, Mrs., *Claims*, 420.
- Decatur, Stephen, life of, 417, 419; in the "Delaware," 363; burns the "Philadelphia," 372; portrait, 372; attacks Tripoli, 373; in the "United States," 380; at Algiers, 405; negotiations at Tunis, 438.
- Declaration of Independence in Europe, 411.
- Del Cantillo Tratados de Paz*, 55.
- Delany, Daniel, 186.
- Delaware adopts the Constitution, 247; opposed to Virginia's claims for Western land, 527.
- Delawares, treaty, 450; their villages, 456.
- Deming, E., 454.
- Democratic-Republican party, 282.
- Democratic party, origin, 299. See Democrats.
- Democratic Review*, 296.
- Democrats, a French faction, 268; their clubs, 268; succeed as a name to Republican, 278; become Jackson's party, 282; histories of, 310. See Republican.
- Denis, C., *Thiâtre de la Guerre*, 184.
- Denman, Mathias, 535.
- Denmark, accedes to convention (1780), 86; (1782), 87; convention with Russia, 85; neutrality of the Baltic, 85; decl. to belligerents, 85; queen of, 81; treaty, 504, 511.
- Dennie's *Porifolia*, 303.
- Dennis, J., *French Aggression*, 514.
- Denny, Maj. Eben., journal, 450.
- Denny, W. H., 450.
- Dent, J. C., on the N. E. boundary question, 182; *Last forty years of Canada*, 459, 562.
- Deposits, removal of, 285.
- Derby, S. C., 537.
- Derne (Africa), exped. to, 419; taken, 375.
- Desert, Great American, 559.
- Desnoyers, Abbé, his papers, 68.
- Desty, Robt., *Const. U. S.*, 256; *Fed. Citations*, 261.
- Detroit, 455; held by the British after the peace (1783), 462; plans of, 429; views, 429; surrendered by Hull, 384, 428; treaty at, 454.
- Detroit River, maps, 429.
- Deutsch-Amerikanische Monatshefte*, 75.
- Devlin, J. S., in Mexico, 442.
- Dexter, Elias, 573.
- Dexter, Samuel, 319; *Life*, 313; writes out Ames's speech on Jay's treaty, 518.
- Dickey, *Lectures*, 266.
- Dickens, Chas., on Curwen's journal, 200.
- Dickeson, *Amer. Numismatic Manual*, 582.
- Dickins, A., *Index to Larus*, 296.
- Dickinson, A., 564.
- Dickinson, John (Fabius), 257; *Polit. Writings*, 257.
- Diggs, Amer. merchant, 96.
- Dillie's Fort, 456.
- Diman, J. Lewis, 266.
- Dimitry, Chas., 437.
- Diplomacy of the Revolution, 1, 73; in Europe, under the Confederation, 233; of the United States (1789-1850), 461; aims of, 461, 512; sources of its history, 513; histories of, 513.
- District of Columbia. See Columbia.
- Disturnell, J., *Map of United Mex. States*, 553.
- Dix, Dr. John, 457.
- Dix, Gen. John A., 283; *Memoirs*, 355, 418; in Mexico, 442; *Speeches*, 355; on the Oregon question, 562.

- Dix, Morgan, 355; *Mem. of Gen. Dix*, 418.
- Dodge, *Red Men*, 454.
- Dohm, C. W. von, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, 82; *Materialien*, etc., 80, 82.
- Dolfin, Signor, on the treaty of 1782, 152.
- Dollar, the standard (1785), 70; Mexican, 71.
- Donaldson, Thomas, 576; *Public Domain*, 533, 534.
- Domol, Henri, *Participation de la France*, etc., 79.
- Doniphan, Col., in Chihuahua, 410; sent to join Gen. Wool, 444.
- Donne, Wm. B., edits *Corresp. of George III and North*, 74, 166.
- Doolittle, A., 572.
- Doran, Dr., proposes ed. of Wraxall, 95.
- Dorchester Heights, 328.
- Dorchester, Lord (Guy Carleton), sends emissary to the Kentuckians, 541.
- Dorr, Thomas W., life of, 355; *Trial*, 355.
- Dorr Rebellion, 355.
- Dorshimer, Wm., on Jefferson, 306.
- Douchet Island, 174.
- Doughty, Maj., 357, 449.
- Douglas, Gen. Sir Howard, *Naval Gunnery*, 424.
- Douglass, D. B., 459.
- Douglass, S. A., 355; on And. Jackson, 349.
- Downes, Com. John, 439.
- Downie, Com., 399.
- Drake, Benj., *Blackhawk*, 439; *Teutisch*, 454.
- Drake, Daniel, *Cincinnati*, 535; *Picture of Cincinnati*, 535; *Pioneer Life in Kentucky*, 541.
- Drake, Sir Francis, on the Oregon coast, 555.
- Drake, F. S., *Henry Knox*, 312.
- Drayton, John, *Letters*, 465.
- Dring, Thomas, *Jersey Prison Ship*, 88.
- Droit d'Aubaine, 461.
- Drown, Solomon, *Oration*, 536.
- Drummond, Gen., 394.
- Du Buisson, *Abrégé de la Rev. de l'Amérique*, 84.
- Du Courday comes to America, 34; drowned, 34.
- Du Pont, Adm., *Official Despatches*, 446; in the "Cyane," 446.
- Du Portail employed, 34.
- Duane, James, favors the Constitution, 250.
- Duane, Wm., 543; *Letter to Washington*, 334; *Debate on the Mississippi Question*, 547; *French Revolution*, 514.
- Duane, Wm. J., 517.
- Duane, *Coll. of select pamphlets*, 310.
- Duane, *Removal of the Deposits*, 351.
- Dubourg, 30.
- Dudley, Thomas P., 431.
- Dudley, Col. Wm., defeat, 431.
- Duer, Col. Wm., 535.
- Duer, Wm., his connection with *The Federalist*, 260.
- Duer, W. A., *Const. Jurisprudence*, 263; *New York as it was*, 331; suit with Cooper, 432.
- Dumas, C. W. F., his papers, 73; American agent in Holland, 68; his papers, 68.
- Dumouriez, Gen., 40; *La Vie de*, 40; *Mémoires*, 79.
- Dunbar, C. F., on the extinction of slavery in Mass., 326.
- Dunbar, H. C., 442.
- Dunbar, Wm., 558.
- DunDonald, Earl of, *Autobiog.*, 424.
- Dunkirk, English commissioner at, 26; fortified, 55.
- Dunlap, Wm., his portrait of Washington, 572.
- Dunlop, J., *Digest*, 206.
- Dunn, John, *Oregon*, 556.
- Dunn, Samuel, used Carter's surveys in his maps, 184.
- Dunning, E. O., 306.
- Duplessis, portrait of Franklin, 38.
- Duponcau, P. S., *Brief View*, 260.
- Dupont de Nemours, 260.
- Durand, A. B., 344, 350; engravings of Washington, 568, 571, 572; on the Gibbs picture of W., 569.
- Durand, James K., *Life*, 458.
- Durham, Admiral, 423.
- Durette, R. T., 320.
- Dutchman's Point, 462.
- Dwight, Jasper. See Duane, Wm.
- Dwight, Theodore, *Jefferson*, 305; *Hartford Convention*, 321.
- Dwight, Thomas, 328.
- Dwyer, C. P., *O. H. Perry*, 432.
- Dyer, T. H., *Modern Europe*, 80, 170.
- EARLE, BENSON, *Recollections*, 437.
- Earle, J. C., *English Premiers*, 95.
- Eastport, Me., occupied by the British, 458.
- Eaton, Dorman B., *Civil Service in Great Britain*, 107; *Secret Sessions*, 295; *Spoils System*, 351.
- Eaton, John, on the Ord. of 1787, 538.
- Eaton, J. H., *Andrew Jackson*, 348, 436.
- Eaton, Wm., *Candid Appeal*, 349; lives, 339; captures Derne, 375; in Tripoli, 418; life by Prentiss, 418; by C. C. Felton, 418; consul at Tunis, 419.
- Ebell, A. J., 426.
- Echstein, John, 578.
- Eckford, Henry, 388.
- Ecuador, 504.
- Eden, William, commissioner for peace, 50; became Lord Auckland, 51; his letters, 51; portrait, 52.
- Edmonds, C. R., *Washington*, 301.
- Edward, F. S., *Campaign with Doniphan*, 445.
- Edwards, Henry T., 79.
- Edwards, S. W., 575.
- Edwin, David, engraves portraits of Washington, 568, 575.
- Eel River village, 455.
- Eelking, Max von, *Die Deutschen Hülfsstruppen*, 75; his *F. A. von Riedesel*, 75.
- Eggers, C. U. D. von, *Peter Graf von Bernstorff*, 80.
- Eggleston, Edw., "Commerce of the Colonies," 81; *Roxy*, 353.
- Egleston, N. H., 189.
- Eliot, John (1809), 314.
- Elk Lake, 553.
- Ellet, Mrs., *Queens of Am. Society*, 315.
- Ellicott, And., surveys of the Ohio River, 539; runs bounds on Florida, 543; *Journal*, 543.
- Elliot, Andrew, 190.
- Elliot, Sir Geo., defends Gibraltar, 130.
- Elliot, Hugh, in Berlin, 42.
- Elliot, Jonathan, *The Amer. Diplom. Code*, 82; *Dist. of Columbia*, 330; *Debates*, 257.
- Elliott, I. H., *Illinois Soldiers*, 439.
- Elliott, Com. Jesse D., captures vessels under the guns of Fort Erie, 459; *Correspondence*, 459; life, 417; in battle of Lake Erie, 392, 432; quarrel with Perry, 432; *Review of a pamphlet*, 432; *Biog. Notice*, 432; attacked by Mackenzie, 432; *Speech at Hagerstown*, 433; opposing views, 433; medal, 433.
- Ellis, Geo. E., "The Loyalists and their Fortunes," 185; on C. W. Upham, 301; *Red Man and White Man*, 449.
- Ellmaker, Amos, 284.
- Ellsworth, Oliver, 248, 313; portrait, 261; life in Flanders' *Chief-Justices*, 261; sent to France, 474.
- Elmer, S., "Franklin the politician," 39.
- Elmes, Webster, *Comprehensive View*, 264.
- Elizabethtown, 458.
- Embargo act, 274, 482; references on the controversy, 340; its constitutionality, 340; sufferings under the, 520.
- Emmons, Geo. F., *U. S. Navy*, 416.
- Emory, W. H., *Map of Texas*, 553; his explorations, 553; *Note of a military reconnaissance*, 444.
- Emucktau Creek, 436.
- Encarnacion Prisoners*, 442.
- Engineer corps, 358.
- England, legal rights of the king, 9; small number of voters, 10; debt, 11; acts against America, 11; the ministerial side supported, 16; the merchants wish reconciliation, 16; public opinion in, 16; war with the Netherlands, 63; reaction in, against the war (1782), 95; debates over Yorktown, 95; enabling act, 95, 105; condition of parties, 95; vote on the war (1782), 96; opens negotiations with both Franklin and Vergennes, 101; proposes independence, 103; her civil service in America, 106; reform of civil service, 106; loyalists in, 109; her intrigues to disrupt the States (1784), 233; watching to renew the war, 233. See Great Britain.
- Enitachopco, 436.
- Ensom, engraver, 560.
- "Enterprise," schooner, 367; captures a Tripolitan vessel, 370; takes the "Boxer," 387, 458.
- Entick, John, *Letter War*, 182.
- Ephemeriden über Aufklärung, Literatur und Kunst*, 75.
- Era of Good Feeling, 279, 344.
- Erie, Lake, operations on (1813), 390.
- Erie triangle, sold to Penna., 528; history of, 528, 530, 535.
- Erskine, Robert, geographer, U. S. army, 183; his surveys, 183.
- Erskine, corresponds with Smith, Sec. of State, 520.
- Erving, Geo. W., 513; minister to Spain, 497.
- Esopus, fleet-prison, 88.
- Esquire as a title, 327.
- Essays Commercial and Political*, 51.
- "Essex," frigate, in the Pacific, 381, 395; captured, 395; her earlier history, 434.
- Essex Junto, 337.
- Etting, Solomon, 571.
- Europe, in the Eighteenth Century, 1; military service of the people, 16.
- Eustis, Abraham, 458.
- Eustis, Gen. Wm., 407; in Florida, 440; Sec. of War, 359, 382.
- Evans, C. H., *Exports*, etc., 221.
- Evans, Eliza M., 577.
- Evans, Sir De Lacy, *Capture of Washington*, 435.
- Evarts, Jeremiah, *Condition of the Indians*, 447.
- Everett, A. H., on Jefferson, 307; on the battle of New Orleans, 437; on Greenough's Washington, 580.
- Everett, Edw., *Address on Washington*, 301; *Mount Vernon Papers*, 301; *Life of Washington*, 301; on Jefferson, 307; on Elbridge Gerry, 318; executor of Webster, 324; writes a memoir of Webster, 324, 325; on the Webster statue, 181, 325; on early modes of travel, 339; speeches in Congress, 350; portrait, 495; minister to England, 495.
- Everett, Wm., on John Quincy Adams, 347.
- Everett, *Sandusky Co., Ohio*, 431.
- Ewald, J. von, *Belehrungen über den Krieg*, 75.
- Ewell, B. S., 576.
- Ewing, J. H., 571.
- Excellency as a title, 327.
- Excitement, The*, 108.
- Exports and imports of the Confederation period, 221.
- Extradition of criminals, 292, 468.
- Extrait des Gazettes Americaines*, 233.
- Eyre, Mrs. Wilson, 575

- FABIUS. See Dickinson, John.
- Fabre, Joseph, *Washington*, 302.
- Faden, Wm., 183; changes the line of the N. E. bounds of U. S., 176; map of *British Colonies*, 184; map in Carver's *Travels*, 184.
- Faed, John, 572.
- Fairhaven (Ohio), 532.
- Falconer, Thomas, controverts Greenhow, 562; *Discovery of the Mississippi*, 562; *Oregon Question*, 562; *Reply*, 562.
- Fallen Timbers, battle, 454, 455. See Maumee, battle of.
- Falls, Moor, 572.
- Family Compact of the Bourbons, 83, 145.
- Fanning, Col. David, Tory leader, 198; his *Narrative*, 198.
- Farmer, Silas, *Detroit and Michigan*, 530.
- Farnham, J. H., 537.
- Farragut, D. G., life of, 434.
- Farragut, Loyal, 434.
- Farrar, Timothy, *Manual of the Const.*, 263.
- Fauchet, his intercepted despatch, 517; his *Coup d'œil*, 517.
- Faucitt, Col. Wm., 17, 18.
- Favier papers, 73.
- Fay, H. A., *Collection*, 420.
- Fayal, the "Gen. Armstrong" at, 426.
- Federal Convention (1787), first motions towards, 226; movement of the States, 227; Congress accedes, 227; assemblies, 237; opposing parties, 238; the Virginia plan, 238; New Jersey or States Rights plan, 238; the Senate agreed upon, 239; mutual concessions, 239; proportional representation, 239; committee of detail, 241; powers of the President, 242; of the Vice-President, 244; the cabinet, 244; judiciary, 244; fugitive slaves, 245; the Constitution signed, 245; the discontents, 245; sat with closed doors, 246 (see Federalists and Anti-Federalists); minor papers, destroyed, 256; its journal, 256; printed, 256; *Genuine Information*, etc., 256; Yates's *Notes*, 256; sat in the State Ho. in Philad., 256; its records, 256; list of members, 257; histories of, 257; Hamilton's plan, 257; Pinckney's plan, 257; Randolph's plan, 257; personal aspects, 257; Madison's letters, 257.
- Federalist*, *The*, published, 247; bibliog. of, 259; the text, 259; authorship, 260.
- Federalists, sustaining the Constitution, 246; *The Federalist* published, 247 (see Federalist); as a party, 268, 309; their theories, 268; their end, 278, 309, 335; lives and writings of their leaders, 310; in New England, 313; their newspapers, 314; and the whiskey insurrection, 330; led by Quincy, 337; address on the war of 1812, 342; oppose French revolution, 465; against purchase of Louisiana, 547.
- Fell, R., *Life of Fox*, 106.
- Felton, C. C., *Life of Gen. Eaton*, 339, 418.
- Felsing, G. G., 571.
- Fenno, *Gazette*, 309, 334, 515.
- Fenton, H. T. See Cooper, T. V.
- Fentress, W. E. H., 416.
- Ferdinand VII of Spain, 500.
- Fernow, B., 188.
- Ferris, G. T., 298.
- Fessenden, Thos. G., *Democracy unveiled*, 303, 521; *Present Dispute*, 521.
- Field, Robert, 574.
- Field, Thomas W., *Indian Bibliog.*, 455.
- Fillmore, Millard, 284, 293.
- Finances of the Amer. Rev., 13, 81; of the Confederation, 235; a national bank, 235; loans (1783), 235; of the U. S., 294.
- Financial crisis of 1837, 289, 353.
- Findlay, Col. Jas., 455.
- Findley, Wm., *Insurrection in Pa.*, 330.
- Finlay, Isaac J., *Ross Co.*, 547.
- Finlay's map, 558.
- Finlands Pioneer*, 534.
- Fiscal Bank of the U. S., 290.
- Fish, Hamilton, 572.
- Fisher, E., 37.
- Fisher, Geo. P., *Outlines of Universal History*, 552.
- Fisher, Miers, 577.
- Fisher, R. J., 571.
- Fisher, S. G., *Trial of the Const.*, 260.
- Fisher, Wm., *Voyages of Lewis and Clarke*, 558; *New Travels*, 558.
- Fisher, Benj. Silliman, 335.
- Fisheries, clauses in treaties, 514; dispute (1779), 56; rights to, 89, 90; urged in New England, 90; in the Treaty of Ghent, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490; claims of the United States opposed by France, 119, 121, 133; nursery for seamen, 120, 425; negotiations for, 138, 143; results pleasing to New England, 159; documentary history, 170.
- Fiske, John, on the British civil service (1782), 107; on the treaty of 1782, 150; on Franklin, 170; on the Confederation period, 221; on Shays Rebellion, 231; on the finances of the Confederation, 235; on the Constitution, 263.
- Fitch, John, *Map of N. W. parts of the U. S.*, 529; projects a steamboat, 536; controversy with Rumsey, 536; lives of, 536.
- Fitzherbert, Alleyne (Lord St. Helens), in Paris, 112; joined in the negotiations with the United States, 142.
- Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond, *Life of Shelburne*, 167.
- Fitzroy, Alex., *Kentucky*, 541.
- Flagg, A. C., 283.
- Flanders, Henry, *The Constitution*, 260; *Lives of the Chief Justices*, 261.
- Flassan, *La Diplomatie française*, 74, 82.
- Fletcher, Abraham, 88.
- Flint, Timothy, *Indian Wars*, 428.
- Flint River, 543.
- Florida, attempt to buy, 497; part annexed to Louisiana, 498; to Mississippi territory, 498; occupied by U. S. troops, 498; annexed to U. S., 499, 531; feeling as to the policy of acquiring it, 500; bounds of, 543; West Florida, 543; early plan of annexation, 543; revolution, 546; independence declared, 546; seized by Gov. Claiborne, 546; annexed, 546; to be conquered by the U. S. (1779), 89; invaded by Jackson, 438; admitted, 291. See Seminole wars.
- Florida Blanca, Count de, fearful of France yielding, 114; avoids treating with U. S., 127. See Blanca.
- Flower, Geo., *Edwards Co.*, III., 325.
- Floyd, John (Va.), 284.
- Floyd in the Creek War, 436.
- Flucker, royal sec. of Mass., 201.
- Foggo, A. H., 573.
- Folsom, Benj., *Amer. Navy*, 417.
- Folwell, Richard, 296.
- Folwell, Samuel, 576; his silhouette of Washington, 576.
- Foot, resolution on public lands, 286.
- Foote, A. H., *Africa and the Amer. Flag*, 439.
- Foote, H. S., *Texas*, 551.
- Forbes, J. M., 501.
- Forbes, Lt.-Col., 429.
- Force Bill, the, 286, 323.
- Force, Peter, *State Papers*, 294; *Amer. Archives*, 82; and the Ordinance of 1787, 537.
- Ford, Capt. David, 330.
- Ford, H. A., *Cincinnati*, 535.
- Ford, Leicester B., 256.
- Ford, P. L., *Bibl. Hamiltoniana*, 307.
- Ford, Worthington C., on the tariff, 330; on the public lands, 533.
- Foreign relations of the U. S., 294. See Diplomacy.
- Forsyth, John, 505, 513; at Madrid, 500.
- Fort Adams, 456, 545; on the St. Mary's River, 452.
- Fort Ancient, 456.
- Fort Ball (Sandusky River), 455.
- Fort Bowyer attacked, 403.
- Fort Brooke, 407.
- Fort Brown, 408.
- Fort Chamblée, 179; view of, 398.
- Fort Claiborne, 558.
- Fort Dearborn, 429, 455.
- Fort Defiance, 455, 545, 548; plan, 452.
- Fort Drane, 407.
- Fort Du Quesne, 456.
- Fort Erie surrenders (1814), 394, 462; attacked by the British, 395, 459; destroyed, 395.
- Fort Findlay, 455.
- Fort George (Niagara River), 384; attacked, 389.
- Fort Gower, 456.
- Fort Gratiot, 455.
- Fort Greenville, 456; plan, 451.
- Fort Hamilton, 456; plan, 450.
- Fort Harmor, 456, 535; view of, 449; treaty, 450.
- Fort Harrison, 456; defended, 430.
- Fort Industry, treaty, 454.
- Fort Jackson, treaty, 436.
- Fort Jefferson (Ohio), 456, 548.
- Fort Junandot, 455.
- Fort King, 407.
- Fort Laramie, 456, 548.
- Fort Laurens, 456.
- Fort Leavenworth, 553.
- Fort Lebeuf, 456.
- Fort McArthur, 456.
- Fort McHenry, view, 402; attacked, 403.
- Fort McIntosh, 456; view, 449; treaty, 450.
- Fort Madison on the Mississippi, 430.
- Fort Meigs, 454, 455; invested, 387; defended by Harrison, 431.
- Fort Miami, 454, 455.
- Fort Mims attacked, 392, 435.
- Fort Niagara, view of, 384.
- Fort Oswego, 396.
- Fort Phoenix, 458.
- Fort Piqua, 456.
- Fort Recovery, 451, 456, 545, 548.
- Fort Schlosher, 383.
- Fort Schuyler, treaty at, 447.
- Fort Seneca, 455.
- Fort St. Clair, 456.
- Fort St. Joseph, 455.
- Fort St. Mary's, 456.
- Fort Stanwix, treaties at, 447.
- Fort Stephenson, 455; monument at, 432; plan, 431; delended, 387, 431.
- Fort Steuben, 456.
- Fort Washington (Potomac) abandoned, 403.
- Fort Washington (Cinn.), 456, 535; Harmor's trial at, 450.
- Fort Wayne, siege of, 430, 455, 545, 548; treaty, 454.
- Fort Winchester, 455.
- Forth sent to Paris, 96.
- Foster, James, *Capitulation*, 430.
- Foster, John, *Tour of Lafayette*, 344.
- Foster, W. E., 355; *References*, 296.
- Foster, British minister in Washington, 522.
- Fowler, Maj. Jacob, 450.
- Fowler, Samuel, on Jefferson, 307.
- Fowler, W. C., *Sectional Controversy*, 298.
- Fox, Charles James, foreign sec. under Rockingham, 96; likeness, 97; caricature, 98; tries to make armistice with the Dutch, 100; sends Grenville to Paris, 101; his policy shaped in

- Franklin's letter, 102; would dismiss Oswald, 104; breaks with Shelburne, 105; favors Amer. independence, 105; disciple of Burke, 106; lives of, by Fell and Trotter, 106; by Lord John Russell, 106; correspondence with Thomas Grenville, 106; his resignation, 106, 111; league with North, 159; denounces the treaty, 160; becomes Sec. of State, 162.
- Foxado, 439.
- France, her position in Europe, 2; her great expenses, 3; under Louis XVI, 3; condition of her people, 5; her government, 5; her minister in England intimates her aid to America, 12; early (1775) offers aid, 24; lends money to America, 26; provisions of the treaty, 44; where printed, 45; influenced by Burgoyne's surrender to make treaty with U. S., 44; known in England, 48; references on the alliance, 48; effect in America, 48; ratified, 50; correspondence with Spain, 54; treaty with Spain (Apr. 12, 1779), 54; conditions of, 55; loans to America, 71; papers in the archives, 73; alliances with, its causes, 74; docs. relating to, 79; treaties with Great Britain, 83; with Spain (family compact), 83; with United States (1778), 44, 48, 84; secret articles, 84; announces American treaty to Great Britain, 84; proclamation on neutral vessels, 84; alliance with Spain against England, 85; answers Russian declaration of neutrality, 85; action on neutral vessels, 85; answers to Denmark, 85; to Sweden, 85; to Russia, 86; preliminary treaty with England (1783), 87; at Versailles, 87; to dictate terms of peace between England and the U. S., 92; joins with Spain to abridge the power of U. S., 94; to continue the war till Spain is satisfied, 114; opposes the fishery claims of the U. S., 120, 140; would confine the bounds, 120, 140 (see Vergennes and Boundaries); treaty with Spain (1779), 170; complains of restrictions on her trade, 222; Directory of, 269; her depredations on Amer. commerce, 362; quasi war with, 363, 454; convention of 1800, 366, 475, 519; naval war with U. S., 418; embarrassing relations with, 462; treaty of 1778, 462; abrogated, 473; her Amer. possessions guaranteed, 462, 476; consular convention with (1788), 463; sympathy for, 465; complains of American action, 471; decrees, 482; assists in suppressing the slave-trade, 493; complaints against U. S., 496; treaty (1822), 496; refused to carry out the treaty of 1831, 496; *Actes et Mémoires*, 519; sells Louisiana, 547.
- France, 33.
- Frank, S. D., 571.
- Frankfort, Ky., 456.
- Frankland, State of. See Franklin.
- Franklin, Benjamin, his consultations with Lord Howe, 12; at Staten Island, 12, 13; favors loans rather than paper money, 13; signs Deane's instructions, 27; portraits, 37-39; medals, 39; in Paris, 40; Turgot's inscription, 40; his familiarity with French, 40; his offers to Spain, 41; made sole minister to France, 47; autog., 47; quarrels of the commissioners, 48; receives anonymous plans of pacification, 51; relations with John Adams, 57; *Comparison of Gr. Britain and the U. S.*, 81; provoked at Spain's delays, 92; on the peace commission, 92; receives Oswald, 100; proposes acquisition of Canada (1782), 100, 110; interviews with Grenville, 102; considered the treaty with France ended by the independence of the U. S., 102; Jay's opinion of him, 108; proposed basis of treaty, 109; suspicious of France's purpose to continue the war, 114; and his other views, 114; impeded by his instructions, 115, 122, 135; distrusts Marbois's letter, 119; relations with John Adams, 134; finally accords with Jay and Adams, 135; testimony of his colleagues, 136; apologizes to Vergennes for signing the treaty, 153; his earlier communication with Shelburne, 153; his diary of the negotiations, 166; correspondence with David Hartley, 166; his instructions, 166; his letters, 168; acc. of, by P. Chasles, 168; opinion of him in England, 168; his relations to the fishery claims, 171; refuses compensation to loyalists, 143, 204; would eject them, 210; feared the renewal of the war, 210, 220; *Sending Felons to America*, 218; *Retort Courteous*, 218; opposes the Cincinnati Society, 219; his cheerful comments on the Confederation period, 221; *Consolation for America*, 221; commissioner (1784) to make treaty of commerce, 233; makes treaty with Prussia, 233; arrives in Philad., 233; in the Federal Convention, 233; his staff, 302; ridicules slavery, 325; on the Tories, 194.
- Franklin, Gov. Wm., and the associated loyalists, 198; pensioned after the war, 212.
- Franklin, Win. Temple, 136.
- Franklin, State of, 530.
- Fraser, Chas., 275; *Charleston*, 568.
- Frederick the Great, portrait, 7; on George III's application to Russia, 17; stops German mercenaries traversing his dominions, 43; delayed recognizing the U. S., 43; refused to see A. Lee, 42; his policy, 42; his correspondence, 42; sends messenger to Paris, 61; his views of the hiring of Hessians, 77; *Cœuvres*, 8, 77; *Friedrich II und die neuere Geschichts-Schreibung*, 78; corresp. with Von Goetz, 81.
- Free Soil party, 288, 293.
- Free trade, 329, 330. See Tariff.
- Freeman, A. C., *Digest*, 261.
- Freeman, Edw. A., *Hist. of Federal Government*, 265; *Hist. Essays*, 266.
- Freemasons, war against, 284.
- Freemasonry, books on, 348.
- Frelinghuysen, Theo., 291.
- Frémont, Jessie B., 558.
- Frémont, John C., in California, 410, 445; *Memoirs*, 445, 558; life of, 445; his California claims, 445; his trial, 446; explorations, 558; map, 558; discovers the La Platte pass, 559.
- French Margarets, 456.
- French officers to be sent to America, 25.
- French Revolution, influence in U. S., 514, 515.
- French spoliation claims, 367, 418, 473, 476, 480, 519; summary, 480; pressed against France, 495; settled, 496; bibliog., 519.
- Frenchmen engaged in the Rev. War, 34; some of them spies, 35.
- Frenchtown, 455; massacre, 387, 431.
- Freneau, Philip, republican editor, 316; his *National Gazette*, 316, 515.
- Frieze, *Suffrage in R. I.*, 355.
- Frobisher, Benj., 554.
- Frontier posts still held by the British, 218.
- Frost, John, 455; books on the navy, 417.
- Frothingham, O. B., *Theo. Parker*, 326.
- Fry, J. R., *Gen. Z. Taylor*, 441.
- Fugitive Slave Laws, 323.
- Fullerton, Nath., 576.
- Fulton, Robt., on torpedoes, 413, 425; lives of, 425; portrait of Joel Barlow, 531.
- "J ulton the First," war vessel, 460.
- Funding system, 329.
- Fur trade, history of, 559.
- Furber, Geo. C., *Twelve Months' Volunteer*, 441; completed Young's *Mexico*, 441.
- GADSDEN, COL., 406.
- Gadsden Purchase, 508, 552, 553.
- Gage, Gen., on the Tories in Mass., 193.
- Gaines, Gen. E. P., 394, 407; at Fort Erie, 459.
- Gainsborough, his portraits of Earl Howe, 12; of Franklin, 37.
- Gales, Jos., 294, 342.
- Gallatin, Albert, *Rights of the U. S.*, 177; his *Memoir on the N. E. Boundary*, 175, 177; Sec. of Treasury, 272, 328; *Report on Roads and Canals*, 275; seeks to make a treaty with Great Britain, 276, 483; *Writings*, 316; lives, 316; favors the whiskey insurrection, 330; *Considerations on the Currency*, 352; commissioner at the Treaty of Ghent, 484, 524; convention with England, 488; treaty of 1818, 490; on the foreign intercourse bill, 517; *Conduct of the Executive*, 517; on the British Orders in Council, 520; diplom. papers, 525; in the N. W. country, 530; *Land Laws of the U. S.*, 534; advises purchase of West Florida, 543; on the Oregon question, 559; *Letters on the Oregon question*, 559.
- Gallipolis, 532, 535, 549.
- Gallison, *Cases before Story*, 261.
- Gallois, 260.
- Galloway, Jos., 193; in London, 202; his *Examination*, 202; *Letters to a Nobleman*, 202; *Cool Thoughts*, 202; *Letters from Cicero*, 202; *Fabrics*, 202; *Political Reflections*, 202; *Claim of the Amer. Loyalists*, 203.
- Galphinton, treaty at, 446.
- Galveston, Texas, Hist. Soc., 551.
- Galvez, Bernardo de, takes Pensacola, 55.
- Gambier, Admiral, 424.
- Gambier, Lord, 484.
- Gananouki, 458.
- Gannett, *Boundaries of the U. S.*, 530.
- Garden, *Hist. Gén. des Traités de Paix*, 472.
- Gardener, Barent, 421.
- Gardiner, Sylvester, 212.
- Gardner, C. K., *Dictionary of the Army*, 418.
- Garibaldi, Diego, in Philad., 222.
- Garfield & Co., in Spain, 42.
- Garfield, James A., *N. W. Territories*, 534.
- Garland, H. A., *John Randolph*, 317.
- Garrett, W. R., on bounds of Tenn., 530; *South Carolina Cession*, 534.
- Garrison, Wm. Lloyd, 287; lives of, 325.
- Gass, Patrick, *Journal*, 558.
- Gassett, H., *Books on the Masonic Institution*, 348.
- Gay, S. H., *Madison*, 315.
- Gayarré, Chas., 349.
- Gazette de Leyde*, 68.
- Gazetteers, earliest, 542.
- Gebhardt, 519.
- Geffcken, F. H., 83.
- "Gen. Armstrong," case of the, 501.
- Genesee Country, 533; maps, 533.
- Genet, and Gen. Elijah Clark, 447; lands, 464; fits out privateers, 464, 515; intrigues to recover Louisiana, 464, 515; recall asked for, 471; mission, 268, 515; correspondence, 515; his instructions, 515; approved by Jefferson, 515; banquet, 515; his later years, 515.
- Geneva, N. Y., 533.
- Genoa, edict on commerce, 85.
- George II, portrait of, at Princeton, 505.
- George III, his character, 9, 74, 166; visited by Dr. Johnson, 9; his personal dependants, 9; the "king's

- friends," 10; Elector of Hanover, 17; his German soldiers, 17; seeks Russian troops, 17; Dutch troops, 18; German troops, 18; *Correspondence with North*, 74, 166; letter to Catharine II, 85; opposition to Amer. independence, 105; concedes the independence of the United States, 159; reluctantly accepts Fox as a minister, 162; his constitutional attitude, 166; his proclamation of 1763, defining bounds of his American possessions, 182; maps showing such bounds, 182.
- Georgia, paper currency, 81; Tories in, 190; treaties with Indians, 223; adopted the Constitution, 247; in the Federal Convention, 258; expels the Cherokees, 286; controversy with the Cherokees, 322; expenses in the Indian wars, 447; relations with the Indians, 446; Indians in, 448; cession of lands, 531, 534; in the Creek War, 436.
- Gérard, signs the treaty with the U. S., 45; likeness, 46; goes to America, 46; his address to Congress, 47; his instructions, 47; his influencing Congress, 55, 89; opposed to territorial enlargement of the U. S., 55; his threats, 56; his papers, 73.
- Germain, Lord Geo., his correspondence with the commissioners to America (1776), 13.
- German MSS. relating to the Amer. Rev., 73.
- German mercenaries, number sent to America, 24; desertions, 24; offered for America, 35.
- Germany, her many States, 8.
- Gerry, Elbridge, and the fisheries, 90; and the Articles of Confederation, 218; his views as to a Constitution, 231; in the Fed. Convention, 257; letter, 258; Vice-President, 276, 341; portrait, 297; New England leader, 318; life, by Austen, 318; sent to France by John Adams, 472, 518, 519; portrait, 474.
- Gerrymander, 318.
- Gesner, *New Brunswick*, 491.
- Ghent, Treaty of, 176, 277, 404; commissioners under, 176; negotiations, 484, 523; signatures, 524; commissioners on bounds, 554. *See* War of 1812.
- Gibboud, Edw., 84; on the ministerial side, 16; *Misc. Works*, 17; *Mémoire justificatif de la Cour de Londres*, 54; replied to in *Observations*, 54; adherent of Lord North, 95.
- Gibbs, Gen., 404.
- Gibbs, Geo., 571; *Washington and Adams*, 312; his picture of Washington, 509.
- Gibraltar, desired by Spain, 6, 89; Spain seeks restoration of, 55; relief of (1782), political effects, 130; in the treaties of 1782-3, 152. *See* Spain; Blanca, Florida.
- Gibson, Jas., 571.
- Gibson, J. W., *Buena Vista*, 442.
- Giddings, J. R., *Rebellion*, 325; *Exiles of Florida*, 439.
- Giddings, Luther, *Campaign in No. Mexico*, 442.
- Gifford, W. L. R., 355.
- Gila River, 552.
- Gilbert, W. K., 566.
- Gilder, R. W., 458.
- Gill, W. F., 566.
- Gillet, R. H., *Democracy*, 310.
- Gilliam, E. W., 297.
- Gilliband, J. C., *Late War*, 422.
- Gilman, Dr. C. R., 451.
- Gilman, D. C., *Monroe*, 316, 344.
- Gilman, Jos., 449.
- Gilmer, F. W., *Public Characters*, 313.
- Gilmore, Robt., 571.
- Gilmore, J. R., *John Sevier*, 530.
- Gilpin, H. D., 315.
- Gilpin, *Exiles in Va.*, 190.
- Gladstone, W. E., "Kin beyond Sea," 266; *Gleanings*, 266.
- Glazier, Capt. Willard, claim to have discovered the source of the Mississippi, 553.
- Gleig, G. R., *Campaigns of the British Army*, 435; *Subaltern in America*, 435.
- Gloucester (R. I.), bank in, 276.
- Gobright, L. A., *Recollections*, 350.
- Goddard, D. A., 310.
- Goddard, H. P., *Luther Martin*, 258.
- Goderich, Lord, 488.
- Godley, John C., 165.
- Goertz, Graf von, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, 80; corresp. with Frederick the Great, 81.
- Gold, Joyce, *Naval Chronicle*, 421.
- Goldsborough, C. W., *Naval Chronicle*, 416.
- Goldsmit, Lewis, *Conduct of France*, 519.
- Goodell, A. C., *Federal Convention*, 258; on Sam. Adams, 318.
- Goodell, Wm., *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, 323.
- Goodrich, C. B., *Science of Government*, 260.
- Goodrich, F. E., *Gen. W. S. Hancock*, 443.
- Goodrich, S. G., on Jefferson, 307; *Recollections*, 322.
- Goodwin, Daniel, Jr., *The Dearborns*, 429.
- Goodwin, T. S., *Nat. Hist. of Secession*, 323.
- Goold, *Portland*, 419.
- Gordon, Chas., 420.
- Gordon, Wm. A., *Registers U. S. Army*, 415.
- Gore, Christopher, 313, 319.
- Gorham, Nath., 204.
- Gorostiza, 505.
- Gosport, Va., navy-yard, 416.
- Gouge, W. M., *Paper Money*, 81, 352; *Fiscal Hist. Texas*, 553.
- Goulburn, Henry, 484, 486.
- Gould, David, *Robert Morris*, 82.
- Gould, Jay, *Delaware County*, 353.
- Gouverneur, S. L., 263.
- Grafton, Duke of, 97; in power, 10; caricature, 98; resigns from Shelburne's ministry, 159.
- Graham, John, 501.
- Graham, J. D., *Boundary between the U. S. and Mexico*, 553; *Map of Northern boundaries*, 178; *Map of N. E. boundary*, 173.
- Grand, the banker, 71, 72.
- Grand Menan, 177.
- Granger, Francis, 288.
- Granger, Gideon, 337; *Vindication of Jefferson*, 337; *Address*, 337.
- Grant, James, *Recent British Battles*, 425.
- Grant, U. S., *Personal Memoirs*, 443.
- Grantham, Lord, foreign secretary, 111; correspondence from Spain, 54.
- Grantland, Seaton, 339.
- Gray, Horace, 326, 571.
- Gray, Capt. Robt., 556.
- Gray, Wm. (Boston), 340, 476; favors the embargo, 520.
- Gray, W. H., *Oregon*, 562.
- Great American Desert, 559.
- Great Britain, *Statutes at Large*, 83; preliminary treaty with France (1783), 87; and Spain, 87; with Netherlands (1783), 87; with France (Versailles), 87; with Spain, 87; treaty of Paris with U. S., 87; treaties with Netherlands, 83; with France, 83; with Russia, 83; with German powers for troops, 83, 84; instructions to ships-of-war (1776), 84; conciliatory acts (1778), 84; instructions to privateers, 84; appeal to the Netherlands for aid, 85; declaration to same, 85; instructs privateers against the Dutch, 85, 86; answers Russian declar. of neutrality, 85; answer to Denmark, 85; to Sweden, 86; memo-
- rial to Netherlands on the Laurens papers, 86; another memorial, 86; manifesto against the Netherlands, 86; order for privateers against the Dutch, 86; answer to Sweden, 86; enabling acts for peace, 87; provisional treaty of peace, 87; armistice, 87; constitution of, 205; authorities on, 265; her Orders in Council, 276; war with (1812), 378; her navy, 379; treaty (1803) rejected, 480; (1806) not acted on, 481. *See* England.
- Great Miami River, treaty at, 450.
- Greece, Amer. interest in her revolution, 503, 525; treaty with, 503.
- Greeley, Horace, *Amer. Conflict*, 323; *Struggle for Slavery*, 323; *Busy Life*, 324.
- Green, Duff, 349.
- Green, Jos., 186.
- Green, S. A., on Shays Rebellion, 231.
- Green, Valentine, 66, 568.
- Greene, Albert G., 88.
- Greene, Geo. W., on the diplomacy of the Rev., 74; on the German mercenaries, 75; his *German Element*, 75, 78.
- Greene, Nath., on the Tories, 207.
- Greene, S. G., *Short History of Rhode Island*, 355.
- Greenhow, Robt., on the extent of Louisiana, 557; *Memoir of the N. W. Coast*, 562; *History of Oregon*, 562; *Triboli*, 419; controversy with Falconer, 562.
- Greenleaf, James, 571.
- Greenough, Horatio, statue of Washington, 580.
- Greenough, R. S., on Washington's expression, 563.
- Greenough, W. W., 38.
- Greenville, treaty at, 453.
- Greenwood, Isaac J., on portraits of Washington, 563.
- Greg, Percy, 264.
- Gregg, Josiah, *Commerce of the Prairies*, 553.
- Grenville, Geo., *Present State of the Nation*, 6.
- Grenville, Thomas, sent to Paris by Fox, 101; to propitiate Franklin and the Dutch minister, 103; distrusted by Franklin, 104; his commissions, 104, 109; complains of Oswald's mission, 105; correspondence, 106; wishes to resign, 112.
- Greuze, portrait of Franklin, 38.
- Griffis, W. E., *M. C. Perry*, 417, 443.
- Griffith, T. W., 572.
- Grimaldi, Spanish minister, 26; meets A. Lee, 42; correspondence, 54.
- Grimshaw, Wm., 425.
- Griswold, R. W., *Repub. Court*, 331, 563.
- Gross, Charles, 75.
- Grundy, Felix, 275.
- Guadalupe Hidalgo, treaty, 412, 507, 525.
- Guatemala, 504.
- Guines, Comte de, in London, 48.
- Guizot, *Vie de Washington*, 301.
- Gülagher, Christian, 573.
- Gunboats (Jefferson's), 379, 457.
- HAARLEMSCHE COURANT, 68.
- Habberton, John, *Washington*, 301.
- Hague, Wm., *Life Notes*, 316.
- Haight, Cunniff, *Country Life in Canada*, 213.
- Haldimand, Gen., his correspondence concerning the disaffected in Vermont, 188; papers and the loyalist troops, 196.
- Hale, Charles, 258.
- Hale, E. E., *Franklin in France*, 40; on Beaumarchais, 80; on Lorenzo Sabine, 214; *Washington*, 301.
- Hale, Geo. S., 177.
- Hale, Capt. John, 420.
- Hale, Nathan (of Boston), 430; on the N. E. boundary, 174, 183.
- Hale, Selma, and the N. E. boundary, 177; his papers, 177.

- Halifax to be reduced (1780), 60.
- Hall, A. C., 339.
- Hall, Basil, *Forty Etchings*, 175, 339; *Travels*, 175.
- Hall, Benj., 339.
- Hall, B. F., *Repub. Party*, 310.
- Hall, Francis, *Travels in Canada*, 382, 432.
- Hall, H., 81.
- Hall, H. B., engraves portraits of Washington, 566, 567, 568, 569, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 577, 578.
- Hall, Jas., *Gen. Harrison*, 454.
- Hall, W. E., *International Law*, 466.
- Hall, *Hist. San José*, 446.
- Hall's Stream, 173.
- Halleck, H. W., *International Law*, 80.
- Hamburg, Regulations of Commerce, 84.
- Hammersly, T. H. S., *Registers*, 415, 417.
- Hamet Pasha, 418.
- Hamilton, Alex., 186; on Beaumarchais's claim, 321; as a financier, 72; attacks the subservency to France (1782), 94; on the Tories, 207; seeks to mitigate the severities against the Tories, 209; on the defects of the Confederation, 215; urgent for a federal convention, 231; bust, 232; portraits, 232; house, 232; on a national debt, 235; his plan in the Fed. Conv., 257; speech on the Constitution, 259; his share in *The Federalist*, 260; leads the Federalists, 268; references, 307; lives, 307; bibliography, 307; Van Buren's estimate, 307; lesser lives, 308; duel with Burr, 308; *Works*, 308; as Pacificus, 308, 515; *Official Papers*, 308; *Reynold's pamphlet*, 308, 309; *Continentalist*, 308; letters in the Sparks MSS., 308; attacked by Callender, 309; *Observations on Certain Docs.*, 309; as Sec. of the Treasury, 328; his policy, 328; *Report on Manufactures*, 329; *Excise Law in Penn.*, 330; and Washington's Farewell Address, 333; *Character of John Adams*, 335; letters in the *Boston Patriot*, 335; *Correspondence* (1809), 335; his intrigue in Connecticut, 335; defended against John Adams, 335; his interference with military matters, 358; chosen to go to England (1794), 466; defends Jay's treaty, 469, 517; opposes Adams's second mission to France, 518; would wrest Louisiana from Spain, 546; painted by R. Peale, 568; his picture of Washington, 570.
- Hamilton, James A., on the N. E. boundary controversy, 177; *Reminiscences*, 298, 307; in Jackson's time, 349; collates the texts of the Constitution, 256; edits *The Federalist*, 260, 263; *Alex. Hamilton*, 307; *Republic of the U. S.*, 307; edits A. Hamilton's *Works*, 308.
- Hamilton, Wm., 302.
- Hamilton, *Engraved Works of Reynolds*, 97.
- Hamilton Club (publishing), 308.
- Hammond, Charles, 324.
- Hammond, Geo., minister from England, 462; his correspondence, 514.
- Hammond, J. D., *Polit. Parties*, 298; *Silas Wright*, 298.
- Hampton, Gen. Wade, 458; on N. Y. frontiers, 390.
- Hampton, Va., 386.
- Hancock, John, portrait, 14; in the Massachusetts Federal Convention, 248; induced to support the Constitution, 258; receives Washington in Boston, 328; owns portrait of Washington, 564.
- Hancock, Gen. W. S., life of, 443.
- Hand, Gen. E., 569.
- Hanford, Levi, 88.
- Hanoverians recruited for America, 18.
- Hanau regiment in America, 23.
- Hanseatic republics, 504.
- Hanson, A. C., *Reflections*, 520.
- Hardin, Benj., life of, 299, 455.
- Hardinsburgh, Ky., 541.
- Harmar, Gen. Josiah, commands the army, 357; defeated, 450; sources, 450; trial, 450; site of his defeat, 455.
- Harney, Col., 411.
- Harper, R. G., *Works*, 175; *Select Works*, 314, 518; *Observations*, 516; *Short Account*, 517; *Address to Constituents*, 518.
- Harris, Alex., *Political Conflict in America*, 323.
- Harris, C. Fiske, 323.
- Harris, Geo. W., 295.
- Harris, Sir James, at St. Petersburg, 61; *Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury*, 61, 80.
- Harris, Thaddeus M., *Journal of a Tour*, 540, 544.
- Harris, Thomas, *Wm. Bainbridge*, 417, 419.
- Harrison, Benj., signs Deane's instructions, 27.
- Harrison, Mrs. Burton, 578.
- Harrison, Jos., 569.
- Harrison, J. O., 324.
- Harrison, W. H., President, 289, 297; portrait, 352; North Bend, 353; references on his administration, 353; lives, 353, 454; bibliog., 353; cabinet, 353; his campaign (1811) against the Indians, 375; commands Kentucky troops, 385; at Fort Meigs, 387, 431; commands a department, 387; invades Canada, 392; battle of the Thames, 431; Tippecanoe, 454.
- Harrowby, Lord, 480.
- Harrower, H. D., *Glazier and his lake*, 554.
- Hart, Prof. A. B., 236, 265.
- Hart, C. H., *Robert Morris*, 82; on the portraits of Washington, 582.
- Hartford Convention, 252, 277, 321; its *Proceedings*, 321; signatures of members, 321; *Short Account*, 321; history of, by Dwight, 321; its journal, 321; satirized, 322.
- Hartley, C. B., *Daniel Boone*, 541.
- Hartley, David, his pamphlet, 52; his portrait, 145; commissioner for the definitive treaty of 1783, 162; his papers, 166.
- Harvard College, students address Prest. Adams, 337.
- Harvey, Henry, *Shawnee Indians*, 450.
- Harvey, Peter, *Webster*, 325.
- Hastings, Hugh, 347.
- Hatch, Wm. Stanley, *War of 1812*, 430.
- Hathaway, *Hist. of New Brunswick*, 212.
- Hautval, M., 472, 519.
- Havre de Grace destroyed, 386, 426.
- Hawks, Francis L., 308.
- Hawkesbury, Lord, 480; and the Lake of the Woods boundary, 180.
- Hawkins, Gen. Benj., on the Indians, 447.
- Hawkins, Christopher, 88.
- Hawthorne, Nath., 418.
- Hayden, Sidney, *Washington and his Masonic Conspicors*, 574.
- Hayne, Col., 323; debate with Webster, 286.
- Haywood, John, *Tennessee*, 530.
- Hazeline, *Paper money*, 81.
- Hazen, Gen. W. B., on the great middle region of the U. S., 559.
- Hazewell, C. C., 297; on George III, 74, 166.
- Headley, J. T., *Washington and his Generals*, 302; *Second War*, 422.
- Healy, G. P. A., 350.
- Heart, Jona., *Journal*, 449.
- Heath, engraves Stuart's Washington, 570.
- Heckewelder, John, *Map of N. W. Ohio*, 534, 547.
- Helvidius (Madison), 515.
- Henderson, George, *Washington and Adams*, 333.
- Henley, Robert, 434.
- Hennings, A., *Sammlung von Staatschriften*, 80, 83.
- Henry, John, his mission to New England, 321.
- Henry, Patrick, would mitigate the severities against Tories, 209; on the carrying off of slaves by the British, 218; portrait by Sully, 226; refused to join in movement for a federal convention, 227; his opposition to the Constitution, 249, 258; favored Alien and Sedition laws, 334; statue, 580.
- Henry, W. S., *Sketches of the War*, 441.
- Henry, W. W., on Patrick Henry's objection to the Constitution, 258.
- Heron, Wm., traitorous, 189.
- Hesperian, 536.
- Hesse-Cassel, archives of, 75; troops hired, 76; treaty selling troops, 83, 84; troops in America, 21.
- Hesse-Hanau, treaty selling troops, 83, 84.
- Hesse, treaty, 511.
- Hessian fly, 75.
- Hessians, map of the Revolutionary battles, 184; troops, debates in Parliament on use of, 23; in America, 21; in the Rev., references on, 75; M.S. journals, 75; hired, 76; spurious letter, 76.
- Hickey, W., *Const. U. S.*, 256.
- Hicks, T., 572.
- Hidou, Jules, *Noël le Mire*, 59.
- Higginson, Stephen, *Writings of Laco*, 328; *Ten Chapters*, 328.
- Higginson, T. W., 323; *Larger Hist. U. S.*, 179; on Salem sea-captains, 426.
- Hildreth, Richard, *United States*, 414.
- Hildreth, Dr. S. P., antiquary, 536; *Pioneer History*, 536; *Pioneer Settlers*, 536; *Original contributions*, 536.
- Hill, Alfred J., 554.
- Hill, G. M., *Church in Burlington*, 186.
- Hill, Isaac, of New Hampshire, 349.
- Hill and Shaw, *Views*, 224.
- Hilliard, G. S., *Jeremiah Mason*, 313.
- Hiller, J., 576.
- Hillhouse, James, 577.
- Hills, John, 333.
- Hilyer, Capt., 434.
- Hincks, Sir Francis, on the red-line map, 180; *The boundaries formerly in dispute*, 182.
- Hinde, Thomas S., diary, 451.
- Hinsdale, B. A., 538; "Bounding the orig. U. S.," 552; *Old North West*, 562.
- Hittell, John S., *San Francisco*, 444.
- Hoady, C. J., on Silas Deane, 33.
- Hoar, G. F., 349.
- Hocking River, 456, 544.
- Hodgson, Jos., *Cradle of the Confederacy*, 322.
- Hodgson, W. P., 447.
- Hoffman, David, 575.
- Hoffman, Francis S., 308.
- Holland, J. G., *Western Mass.*, 231.
- Holland, Lord, 480; *Mem. of Whig Party*, 521.
- Holland, Sam., *Map of Lower Canada*, 174; his maps, 184; *Northern Brit. Colonies*, 184; *Middle Brit. Colonies*, 184.
- Holland, J. Q. Adams in, 525; as a province of the Netherlands, 8; Joans made in, 72; declaration (1780) of neutrality, 85; makes treaty (1782) with the United States, 133; authorities on, 134.
- Holland Land Co., 533.
- Hollis, Thomas, 66.
- Holloway, L. C., *Ladies of the White House*, 315.
- Hollowell, T., 566, 569.
- Holmes, Arthur, *Parties*, 298.

- Holmes, O. W., Jr., 263.
 Holst, Hermann von, *Verfassung der Ver. Staaten*, 264; *Const. History*, 264; *Const. Law*, 264; portrait, 265.
 Holston, treaty at, 447.
 Holy Alliance, 502.
 Holy Roman Empire accedes to armed neutrality, 86; order on navigation, 86.
 Homans, *Banker's Mag.*, 70.
 Homer, Geo., 578.
 Honduras, 504.
 Honorable as a title, 327.
 Hood, Washington, *Map of Oregon*, 557.
 Hook, Wm., 420.
 Hooper, W. R., 480.
 Hopewell, treaty at, 447.
 Hopkinson, Francis, 573; on the Philadelphia celebration, 258; portrait, 258.
 Hopp, E. O., *Bundesstaat in Nord-Amerika*, 56.
 "Hornet," action with "Peacock," 381, 457; with "Penguin," 458.
 Horseshoe Bend, battle of, 393, 436.
 Hortalez, Rodrigue, et Co., 29, 31.
 Hosmer, J. K., *Sam. Adams*, 318.
 Hotchkiss, J. H., *Western N. Y.*, 533.
 Hottinguer, 510.
 Houdon, busts of Franklin, 38; of Hamilton, 231; his statue of Washington, 572; his profile of Washington, 563; history of the statue, 572; casts, 572; bust, 572; medallion, 572; medals, 572; engravings, 572.
 Hough, F. B., *Northern Invasion*, 188; *Washingtoniana*, 302, 568; *Lawrence Co., N. Y.*, 428; *Jefferson Co.*, 428; *edits Proc. Com. Ind. Affs.*, 447, 533.
 Houghton, Walter R., *Amer. Politics*, 295.
 House of Representatives of the U. S., *Journals*, 295; *Congressional Register*, 295; its stenographer, 337; in Monroe's time, 345; plan of, 346; chooses J. Q. Adams President, 347; relations to treaties, 470, 518.
 Houston, John S., 450.
 Houston, Sam., 436, 551; in Texas, 551; his career, 551; accounts, 551.
 Howard, B. C., 569; *Reports*, 261.
 Howard, Col. J. E., 569.
 Howard, J. Q., 543.
 Howe, Richard, Lord (Admiral), his proclamation, 12; letter to Jos. Reed, 12; addresses "George Washington, Esquire," 12; portraits, 12; his fleet relieves Gibraltar, 130; life by Barrows, 12.
 Howe, Sir Wm., his proclamations of pardon, 12, 13; sends Sullivan to Congress, 12.
 Howell, David, 173.
 Howell, Geo. R., 334.
 Howick, Lord, 520.
 Hubbard, J. N., *Red Jacket*, 447.
 Hubbard, W. J., 343, 572; on a standard likeness of Washington, 563.
 Hudson Bay Co. in Oregon, 556.
 Hughes, John J., *Doniphan's Exped.*, 445.
 Hughes, R., 313.
 Hughes, Thomas, on Franklin, 168.
 Hull, Com. Isaac, acc. by Gen. J. G. Wilson, 425; portrait, 378; his medal, 378; in the "Constitution," escapes, 379, 457 (see "Constitution").
 Hull, Gen. Wm., his campaign of 1812, 382; surrender of Detroit, 428, 429; tried and condemned, 429; *Memoirs of the Campaign*, 429; reflects on Dearborn, 429; accounts of his trial, 429; his *Defence*, 429; *Revolutionary Services*, 429; conflicting views, 429, 430.
 Humphreys, Joshua, ship-builder, 360.
 Hunt, C. H., *Edward Livingston*, 317.
 Hunt, L. L., *Life of Mrs. Livingston*, 550.
 Hunt, Gen. W. P., 572.
 Hunter, Dr., in Lewis and Clarke's exped., 558.
 Huntington, Daniel, portrait of R. C. Winthrop, 354.
 Huntington, Samuel, Prest. of Congress, portrait, 63.
 Huntington, W. H., 563.
 Hurd, D. H., *Essex County, Mass.*, 426.
 Hurd, J. C., *Theory of our Nat. Existence*, 262.
 Huriburt, W. H., *Chicago Antiquities*, 429.
 Huron, proposed territory of, 543.
 Huron River trading-post, 455.
 Huskisson, William, 492.
 Hutchins, Thomas, 530, 532; map of the N. W. followed in Putnam's map, 544.
 Hutchinson, Gov. Thomas, his longings to return to New England, 298; *Diary*, 200; his *Mass. Bay, vol. iii.*, 213.
 IDAHO, map, 561.
 Ide, W. B., *Biog. Sketch*, 445; his career, 445.
 Ildefonso, treaty, 478.
 Illinois (State), admitted, 280, 543; slavery struggle in, 325; territory, 543; bounds on Lake Michigan, 543.
Impartial Hist. of the War in America, 565.
 Impression of seamen, 343, 420, 495, 521, 523.
 Independence, Declaration of, text, 296.
 "Independence," line-of-battle ship, 406.
 Indian affairs, 294; boundary line (1795), 544.
 Indiana, admitted, 280, 543; territory, 543; bounds on Lake Michigan, 543.
 Indianapolis, 456.
 Indians, dealings of the U. S. with, 473; treaties and wars with, 446, 447; their titles to lands, 446 (see names of tribes); laws relating to, 446; relations with War Department, 446; collections of treaties, 446; cessions of land, 446, 447, 450; those of the Northwest, 447, 448; series of medals for, 447; map of the territories of the Southern, 448; instigated by the British, 451; later treaties, 453; number in the N. W. (1811), 454.
 Ingalls, Walter, 569.
 Ingersoll, C. J., *Second War*, etc., 421; *Rights and Wrongs*, 521; *Report*, 525; *Texas Question*, 551.
 Ingersoll, Jared, 276.
 Ingersoll, L. D., *War Department*, 415.
 Ingham, C. C., 59.
 Inglis, Thomas, 564.
 Ingraham, E. D., *Capture of Washington*, 434.
 Inman, H., 351.
Inquiry whether Great Britain or America is most at fault, 200.
 Inquisition in Spain, 6.
 "Insurgent, L." fight with the "Constellation," 364, 456.
 Internal improvements, 275, 278, 284; in Monroe's time, 345.
 International Monetary Congress, report, 329.
 "Intrepid," under Decatur, 372; exploded, 374.
 Iowa, admitted, 291; territory, 543.
 Ireddell, Judge James, *Address*, 509; life by McRea, 261, 313.
 Irving, Washington, *Washington*, 301; at Burr's trial, 340; on O. H. Perry, 432; *Spanish Papers*, 432; in James Lawrence, 457; *Rocky Mountains*, 558; *Astoria*, 558.
 Irwin, Gov., 436.
 Isham, Chas., on Silas Deane, 79; *Fishery Question*, 170.
 Isle Philippeaux, non-existent, 171.
 Itasca Lake, 553.
 Izard, Col. George, 393, 395.
 Izard, Gen., *Official Correspondence*, 428, 459; portrait, 428; his career, 428.
 Izard, Ralph, minister to Tuscany, 42; in Paris, 42; *Correspondence*, 42.
 JACK'S CREEK, 447.
 Jackson, Andrew, and nullification, 254; his Force Bill, 254; as political leader, 279; presidential candidate, 281; chosen, 283, 297; war on the bank, 284, 351; removes deposits, 285, 351; his financial policy, 289; nullification proclamation, 322; and Burr's conspiracy, 338; his antagonism to J. Q. Adams's administration, 348; references on his administration, 348; *Messages*, 348; bibliog., 348; lives, 348, 349, 436; papers, 295, 349; correspondence with Wm. B. Lewis, 349; kitchen cabinet, 349; disruption of cabinet, 349, 351; Mrs. Eaton scandal, 350; his tours, 350; spoils system, 351; loco-focos, 351; removals from office, 351; censure by the Senate, 352; expunged from the record, 285, 352; invades the Creek territory, 393, 436; at the Horseshoe, 393; at New Orleans, 403; in the first Seminole war, 406, 438; portraits, 437; quarrel with Calhoun, 438; quarrel with Clay, 438; seizes Pensacola, 498, 546; governor of Florida, 501; diplomacy of his administration, 525; hangs Arbuthnot and Ambrister, 546; on Texas, 551.
 Jackson, Gen. T. J., life of, 443.
 Jackson, Rev. Wm., *Constitutions*, 230.
 Jackson, Brit. minister, dismissed, 523.
 Jacobin clubs, 268, 515.
 James, E., 559.
 James, Wm., *Mil. Occurrences*, 422, 425; *Naval Hist. of Gt. Britain*, 422, 423; his letters, 422; *Naval Actions*, 422; *Principal Naval Actions*, 422; *Chief Naval Occurrences*, 422; *Warden refuted*, 423; letter to Canning, 423.
 Jameson, John A., *Constitutional Conventions*, 263.
 Jameson, J. F., *Const. and Polit. History*, 297; bibliog. of Monroe, 316.
 Jarvis, J. W., 348.
 Jarvis, Russell, *Com. Elliott*, 417, 432.
 Jaudenes, 476.
 Jay, John, signs Deane's instructions, 27; minister to Spain, 58; obtains a loan from Spain, 71; sent to Spain, 91; likeness, 91; autograph, 91; on the peace commission, 92; in Spain (1782), 107; in Paris, 108; opinion of, by Oswald, 113; views on Oswald's commission, 113; dictates form of Oswald's commission, 115; sends Vaughan to England, 122; and a treaty with Spain, 127; his views agreed to by Adams, 135; his letters, 166; his *Life* by Wm. Jay, 168; by William Whitelock, 170; his map of the N. E. bounds, 171; on the Tories, 190; negotiating with Spain about the Mississippi, 222; his plan of surrendering its navigation, 223; favors the Constitution, 250; *Address on the Constitution*, 259; and *The Federalist*, 260; his treaty of 1794, 173, 269, 361, 466-469, 517; lives of, 312; portrait as chief justice, 312; attempted negotiations with Spain, 476; life in Flanders' *Chief Justices*, 261.
 Jay, John (b. 1817), on Vergennes, 4; on the peace of 1782-83, 89; his *Peace Negotiations*, 169; his *Fisher's Dispute*, 170.
 Jay, P. A., 91.
 Jay, Wm., *John Jay*, 168, 312; corresp. with J. Q. Adams, 169; *Writings*, 326; *Review of Mexican War*, 355, 356.
 Jebb, Dr., 334.

- Jefferson, Thomas, financial diary, 82; put on the peace commission (1782), 92; opposed to paying tribute to the Barbary powers, 234; his correspondence in France, 235; free-trade principles, 235; *Notes on Virginia*, 235; leader of Republicans, 268; his theory of government, 268; made President, 269, 297; his views of nullification, 290; removes office-holders, 271; *Anas*, 302, 303, 306; his view of Hamilton, 303; *Memoir*, etc., 303; alleged infidelity, 303; *Notes on Va.*, 303, 206; its bibliog., 303; relations with Marshall, 303; his religious belief, 303; suspicious of Washington, 303; hostility to Federalists, 303; life by Rayner, 303; partisan lives, 303; Federalist views and charges, 303, 304, 305; contemporary tracts on, 303; life by Geo. Tucker, 303; portraits, 304, 305; by Stuart, 305; alleged enmity to Washington, 305; *Writings*, 306; *Life* by Randall, 306; domestic life, 306; his private character, 306; at Monticello, 306, 341; his daughter, Mrs. Randolph, 306, 341; lives by Parton and Morse, 307; eulogies, 307; *Report on Commercial Relations*, 310; opposes Hamilton's financial policy, 329; relations with John Adams, 334; reconciled later, 334; references on his administration, 336; substitutes a message for a speech, 337; judged by Mrs. Washington, 337; inaugurated, 337; *Messages*, 337; executive patronage, 337; against the Federal Judiciary, 338; Burr's conspiracy, 338; social aspects of his administration, 338; intimacy with Thomas Paine, 338; on Andrew Jackson, 349; reduces the army, 358; his military policy, 376; *Report on Mediterranean trade*, 418; diplomatic position as Sec. of State, 462; correspondence with Hammond, 462, 514; resigns, 462; disapproves treaty of 1806, 481; withdraws Livingston from France, 406; his mission to France, 233, 514; approval of Genet, 515; on Paine's *Rights of Man*, 516; disputes with John Adams, 516; on British aggression, 520; urges Western cessions of land, 528; held by some to have drawn the Ord. of 1787, 537; eager to buy Louisiana, 547; attacked for his efforts, 547; *Account of Louisiana*, 547; his defenders, 547; on Meriwether Lewis, 556; message on the Lewis and Clarke exped., 357; statue, 580.
- Jefferys, Thomas, death, 183; *Gen. Topog. of No. America*, 183; *Amer. Atlas*, 183; *Western Neptune*, 183.
- Jenkins, John S., *And. Jackson*, 349, 436; *J. K. Polk*, 355; *Mexican War*, 441.
- Jenkinson, Chas., *Treaties*, 74, 82.
- Jennesadaga, 447.
- Jennings, Edmund, 90.
- Jennings, L. J., *Eighty years*, 266, 298; *Crocker*, 180, 424.
- Jennings, Paul, *Madison*, 315.
- Jennison trial (extinction of slavery in Mass.), 326.
- Jersey prison-ship, 88.
- Jerse, *Schuyler and his Contemp.*, 51.
- Jesuits driven from Spain, 6.
- Jesup, Gen. Thos. S., in Florida, 407.
- Jesup, Maj., 394.
- John the Painter, 30; his *Short account*, 30.
- Johnson, Col. Guy, his letters, 196.
- Johnson, John, runs the line from the St. Croix, 172.
- Johnson, Sir John, and his loyalist band, 196; his *Orderly book*, 196; his letters, 196.
- Johnson, Oliver, 288; *Garrison*, 325.
- Johnson, R. M., 288, 392, 434; *Biog. Sketch*, 432.
- Johnson, Rossiter, *War of 1812*, 422.
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, visits George III, 94; supports the ministry, 16.
- Johnson, Sam'l P., 447.
- Johnson, *Erle County*, 458.
- Johnson, *Free Government*, 266.
- Johnston, Albert S., 439.
- Johnston, Alex., "First Century of the Const.," 264; "Political parties in the United States," 267; *Hist. Amer. Politics*, 296; in *Lalor's Cyclopaedia*, 297; on the Whig party, 299; *Hist. U. S.*, 552.
- Johnston, Eliz. P., *Orig. Portraits of Washington*, 563.
- Johnston, E. W., 315.
- Johnston, Francis, 302.
- Johnston, H. F., *Observations on Jones' Hist. of N. Y.*, 208.
- Johnston, H. P., on De Kalb, 78.
- Johnston, John Taylor, 574.
- Johnston, J. W., 546.
- Johnston, W. P., *Alb. Syd. Johnston*, 439, 443.
- Johnston (Chateaugua River), 458.
- Johnstone, Geo., commissioner for peace, 50; would bribe Jos. Reed, 51; his speech, 51.
- Johannot, Jackson, *Adventures*, 451.
- Jolez, *La France sur Louis XVI*, 79.
- Jones, C. C., *Com. Tattnell*, 417.
- Jones, David, journal, 453.
- Jones, Geo., *Naval life*, 417.
- Jones, Jacob, in the "Wasp," 380.
- Jones, Judge, *N. Y. during the Rev.*, 208; his character, 208.
- Jones, J. B., *Wild Western Scenes*, 541.
- Jones, Noble W., 92.
- Jones, Paul, at the Texel, 64; in Dutch ports, 68.
- Josselyn, L., *Appeal*, 322.
- Joy, Prof. C. A., 75.
- Julian, G. W., *Polit. Recoll.*, 325, 354.
- Jurien de la Gravière, *Guerres maritimes*, 424.
- KALB, BARON DE, an emissary of Broglie, 35; his reasons for joining the army, 35; his agreement, 35; his mission (1768), 35; his autog., 35; his oath, 36; life by Kapp, 78; by J. S. Smith, 78; by H. P. Johnston, 78.
- Kapp, F., *Life of John Kalb*, 35; *Der Soldatenhandel*, 75, 76, 77, 83; *Leben des Generals F. W. von Steuben*, 78; his death and character, 78; *Friedrich der Grosse und die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika*, 78; *Leben des Generals Kalb*, 78; *Aus und über Amerika*, 524.
- Kaunitz, the Austrian minister, 109.
- Keane, Gen., 403; at New Orleans, 437.
- Keary, Col. S. W., in New Mexico and California, 409, 410, 444; his instructions, 444.
- Keary, E., 300.
- Keary, J. W., *Amer. Finances*, 329.
- Keary, Gen. Philip, life of, 442, 443.
- Keewain, 555.
- Kelley, Hall J., *Oregon*, 559.
- Kelton, D. H., *Fort Mackinac*, 429.
- Kemble, Gouverneur, 578.
- Kenawha, battle, 456.
- Kendall, Amos, 383; life of, 349; *And. Jackson*, 349.
- Kendall, Geo. W., *War with Mexico*, 441; *Texas Santa Fé exped.*, 553.
- Kenly, J. R., *Maryland Volunteer*, 442.
- Kennedy, J. H., 534.
- Kennedy, J. P., on William Pinkney, 317; on Wm. Wirt, 318.
- Kennedy, P., *Answer to Paine*, 515.
- Kennedy, W., *Texas*, 551.
- Kennedy, W. S., *Western Reserve*, 534.
- Kennon, Mrs. Beverly, 574.
- Kent, James, *Commentaries*, 263; on Jay's treaty, 517; *Address*, 349.
- Kentucky, admitted, 268, 280; Resolutions of 1798, 270; her cavalry, in Mexico, 442; never a part of the public domain, 530, 539; immigrants, 539; seeks independence of Va., 539; made a State, 541; histories, 541; maps, 542; Resolutions (1799), 257; authorship of, 319, 320; text of, 320; troops of, 431; in 1812, 385; in 1813, 387; troops at New Orleans, 437.
- Keppel, Lord, 97; caricature, 98.
- Kerr, Lewis, 340.
- Kerr, R. W., *Government Printing Office*, 295.
- Keyes, Gen. E. D., *Fifty years*, 418, 442.
- King, D., *T. W. Dorr*, 355.
- King, Horatio, 435.
- King, Joshua, *Thoughts*, etc., 203.
- King, Rufus, and the Lake of the Woods boundary, 180; opposes a federal convention, 227; portraits, 230; accedes to the advocates of a convention, 231; candidate for the presidency, 279; portrait, 297; in Congress, 313; on the Indians, 447; in England, 480, 520; defends Jay's treaty, 517; letter from W. Dane, 537.
- Kirkland, J. T., 314; *Fisher Ames*, 310.
- Kirkland, Mrs., *Washington*, 301.
- Kisselman, F., 575.
- Kissimee River, 440.
- Kitchen Cabinet, 349.
- Kitchin, Thos., *General Atlas*, 182; *New Universal Atlas*, 182, 460; *Map of No. America*, 182.
- Knapp, S. L., 181; *Life of A. Burr*, 316.
- Knox, Henry, 172; *Life*, 312; Sec. of War, 357; makes treaty with the Creeks, 447; would establish mil. posts, 453; plan for organizing the militia, 451; painted by R. Peale, 568.
- Knox, J. J., *U. S. Notes*, 81.
- Knox, T. W., *Decisive Battles since Waterloo*, 442.
- Knoxville, Tenn., 530.
- Knyphausen, Gen., 22.
- Koch, *Traité de Paix*, 17, 74, 83.
- Könnecke, Dr., 75.
- Kuffner, A. W., 575.
- LA BALME, 455.
- La Colle, affair at, 458; block-house, 385.
- La Salle, on the coast of Texas, 550.
- Latour, A. L., *War in West Florida and Louisiana*, 436.
- La Tour, Baron de, *Théâtre de la Guerre*, 184; *Carte des Colonies Angloises*, 184.
- Labatut, 574.
- Laboulaye, Ed., preface to Chocteau, 48; *Etats-Unis*, 265, 308; *Etudes*, 219.
- Lacoc's Report, 438.
- Ladd, H. O., *War with Mexico*, 441.
- Ladies' Repository, 430.
- Lafayette, in Paris (1779), 48, 58; designs to obtain Canada, 58; addresses the Canadian Indians, 58; his career and family, 58; recommended to Louis XVI, 84; a favorite in France (1779), 59; receives a regiment of dragoons from the Queen, 59; portraits, 59; autog., 59; appearance in the campaign of 1781, 59; proposes descent on England, 60; urges Vergennes to send an army to America, 60; returns to America, 60; and the proposed treaty with Spain, 127; his tour in 1784, 218; life by J. Q. Adams, 316; visit to the U. S. (1824), 344; on the condition of France, 514; painted by C. W. Peale, 566; and portraits of Washington, 566, 568; painted by R. Peale, 568.
- Lafitte, the pirate, 403, 437.
- Laing, Thos., 570.
- Lake Champlain, battle of, 433.

- Lake Erie, battle of, 432; controversies, 432; plans, 433.
- Lake of the Woods, boundary line connecting it with Lake Superior, 180, 480; not connected with Lake Superior, 554; map, 555; boundary line westerly from, 554, 555; map of, 555.
- Lake. See names of Lakes.
- Lakes, British and American armament on, 489.
- Lalor, J. J., translates Von Holst, 264; *Cyclopedia*, 297.
- Lamar, L. O. C., on Calhoun's doctrine of nullification, 255.
- Lamb, Mrs. M. J., on the framers of the Const., 257; *Wall Street in History*, 329; on Lafayette's tour, 345.
- Lambert, Gen., 404; at New Orleans, 437.
- Lambert, John, *Travels*, 175.
- Lamdin, J. R., 352.
- Lamphere, Geo. L., *U. S. Govt.*, 264, 297.
- Land cessions by the Indians, 446.
- Land we love*, 528.
- Lang, Wm., 574.
- Lang, W. B., 574.
- Langworthy, Asahel, *R. M. Johnson*, 432.
- Langman, Chas., *Webster*, 325.
- Lansdowne, Marquis of, his picture of Washington, 570.
- Lansing, John, Jr., 256.
- Lansing, Mich., 455.
- Lardier, J. A., 344.
- Larkin, T. O., his papers, 444; his agency in the conquest of California, 444.
- Larwill, Jos. H., 439; his journal, 439.
- Latimer, D. B., 572.
- Lathrop, J., *Late War*, 422.
- Latrobe, H. B., 576.
- Latrobe, J. H. B., *Three Great Battles*, 442.
- Lattre, *Atlas Moderne*, 182.
- Lauck and Clarke, *Table of Cases*, 261.
- Laughton, J. K., *Studies in Naval History*, 26.
- Laurens, Henry, portraits, 66; captured, 67; in the Tower, 66; petitions the British government, 66; papers captured with him, 66, 67, 86; satirical prints, 67; on the peace commission, 92; released from the Tower, 100; sent to confer with John Adams in Holland, 100; joins the peace commissioners at Paris, 144.
- Laurens, Henry, Jr., 66; portrait, 67.
- Laurens, Col. John, Jr., sent to Europe, 72.
- Lavater, *Physiognomy*, 565.
- Law, Richard, 248.
- Lawrence, James, 38; in the "Hornet," 381; portrait, 386; killed on the "Chesapeake," 386; his medal, 386; tomb, 386; lives, 457; "Don't give up the ship," 457.
- Lawrence, J. W., *Footprints*, 213.
- Lawrence, Wm. Beach, 120, 266, 547; *Right of Visitation and Search*, 494.
- "Lawrence," war-ship, 391, 392.
- Lawton, G. W., 297.
- L'Enfant, Major P. C., 331; lays out Washington city, 336.
- L'Espion dévalisé*, 76.
- Le Paon, portrait of Lafayette, 59; picture of Washington, 566.
- Le Rouge, *Pilote Amér. Sept.*, 183.
- Le Roy, J., 568.
- Leach, J., *Field Services*, 437.
- Lear, Tobias, 575.
- Leavitt, Joshua, 344; *Monroe Doctrine*, 524.
- Lecky, on the peace negotiations of 1782-83, 150; on Vergennes, 169; on Washington, 302.
- Ledyard, Isaac, 209.
- Lee, Arthur, 564; his offer to France reported by Beaumarchais, 28; agent of the committee of correspondence, 28; in Paris, 31, 41; quarrels with Deane, 31; his character, 31; autog., 41, 47; his commission, 41; in Spain, 42; in Prussia, 42; his papers stolen in Berlin, 42; signs treaty with France, 45; correspondence with Schulerberg, 43; his temper, 47; views regarding him, 47; his life by R. H. Lee, 47; his family, 47; MSS., 73; calendared, 73; letters, 79; advocate of State rights, 220; treats with Indians, 447.
- Lee, C. C., 303.
- Lee, Eliza Buckminster, 325.
- Lee, Francis Lightfoot, 571.
- Lee, G. W. C., 564, 577, 578.
- Lee, Henry (Mass.), 284.
- Lee, Henry (the younger), *Observations on Jefferson*, 303.
- Lee, Gen. Henry, 569; eulogy on *Washington*, 301; attacked by Jefferson, 303.
- Lee, Col. James, 580.
- Lee, R. H., embarrassing the Confederation, 217, 218; autog., 218; opposed to regulating commerce, 221; *Observations on the late Convention*, 258; and the Ord. of 1787, 538.
- Lee, Robert E., 443.
- Lee, William, appointed to Berlin, 42; refused audience by Frederick, 42; his commission, 42; makes treaty with an Amsterdam merchant, 64, 67, 68.
- Lee, Z. C., 571.
- Leech, Samuel, *Thirty Years*, 425.
- Legaré, H. S., *Writings*, 323.
- Leggett, Abraham, 88.
- Leggett, Wm., *Politi. Writings*, 350.
- Letter, L. Z., 166.
- Lemarchant edits Walpole's *George III*, 95.
- Lenox, Jas., buys Washington's Farewell Address, 333; his pictures of Washington, 567, 570.
- Leonard, Daniel, 186.
- Lester, C. E., *Houston and his Republic*, 551.
- Lester, W. W., *Public Land Cases*, 533.
- Letter to the Earl of Chatham*, 51.
- Letter to the English Nation*, 51.
- Letter to the people of America*, 51.
- Letters of marque (see Privateers) of England, 426.
- Lévis, Duc de, *Souvenirs*, 4, 41.
- Levi, Leone, *Internat. Law*, 514.
- Lévesseur, A., *Lafayette en Amérique*, 344.
- Lewis, Andrew, statue, 580.
- Lewis, Sir G. C., *Administrations of Gt. Britain*, 101.
- Lewis, J. B., *Public Land Laws*, 533.
- Lewis, J. D., 570.
- Lewis, Mrs. Lawrence, 574, 575.
- Lewis, Meriwether, portrait, 556; life of, 556.
- Lewis, Samuel, *Map of U. S.*, 460; *Map of N. W. Territory*, 544.
- Lewis, Dr. S. C., 573.
- Lewis, W. D., 570.
- Lewis and Clarke expedition, 556; *Hist. of the Exped.*, 556; bibliog. of, 557; *Travels*, 558; *Voyages and Travels*, 558; *Journal*, 558; their map, 558; expeditions since theirs, 558.
- Lewiston (N. Y.), 390.
- Lexington, Ky., 456.
- Liberator* (Garrison's), 287, 326.
- Liberty party, 288.
- Lieber, Francis, *Our Constitution*, 262.
- Lighthouses of the U. S., 268.
- Liguest, Pierre Laclède, 550.
- Lincoln, Abraham, 292.
- Lincoln, Benj., 172; treats with Indians, 452; puts down Shays Rebellion, 229; his papers, 231; painted by R. Peale, 568.
- Lincoln, Levi, 337.
- Lincoln, Worcester, 231.
- Lindsay, Col., 407.
- Linn, P., *Serious Considerations*, 337.
- Linn, of Missouri, on the Oregon question, 559.
- Lith, Von der, 75.
- Littell, Wm., *Kentucky*, 541.
- Little, Capt. Geo., in the "Boston," 456.
- Little, Lucius P., *Ben. Hardin*, 299.
- Little, Michael, 569.
- "Little Belt" affair, 522.
- Little Turtletown, 455.
- Livermore, A. A., *War with Mexico*, 355.
- Liverpool, Lord, 321, 486, 522.
- Livingston, Edw., life by Hunt, 317, 550; writes Jackson's nullification proclamation, 322; at battle of New Orleans, 436; withdrawn from France (1836), 496; in France, 525; in Louisiana, 550; his code, 550.
- Livingston, Mrs. Edw., life, 550.
- Livingston, R. R., portraits, 68; secretary of foreign affairs, 68; friendly with Luzerne, 95; in France, 478; the purchase of Louisiana, 479; on Jay's treaty, 517.
- Livingston, Wm., *Examen du gouvernement*, 260.
- Lloyd, Thomas, *Cong. Register*, 295.
- Loan office certificates, 81.
- Lockwood, R. I., *Insurgents*, 231.
- Locofoco party, 351. See Democrats.
- Lodge, Henry Cabot, on the *Federalist*, 259; on its authorship, 260; reviews Von Holst, 264; edits *Hamilton's Works*, 308; *Hamilton*, 308; *Studies in History*, 308; on Pickering, 312; *Geo. Cabot*, 313, 322, 341; on Caleb Strong, 313; on Cobbett, 315; on Gallatin, 316; *Daniel Webster*, 325.
- Lodge, John E., 311.
- Loftus, Chas., *My youth*, 424.
- Logstown, 456.
- Löher, Franz, *Deutschen in Amerika*, 77.
- Loménie, L. de, *Beaumarçais*, 79.
- London, J. Q. Adams in, 525.
- London New Monthly Magazine*, 430.
- London, Tower of, view of, 65, 66.
- Long, A. L., *Robert E. Lee*, 443.
- Long, S. H., *Expedition*, 558, 559.
- Long Island, Tories, 190; histories of, 190.
- Longhi, G., 571.
- Longwood, expedition, 459.
- Loring, Joshua, autog., 88.
- Lorne, Marquis of, 170.
- Lorraine, A. M., siege of Fort Meigs, 430.
- Los Angeles, Cal., 410.
- Losantiville (Cincinnati), 535.
- Lossing, B. J., *Mount Vernon*, 224; on the Const. U. S., 256; on the executive depts., 297; edits Washington's diary, 328; on And. Jackson, 349; his histories, 414; *War of 1812*, 421; *Hull's Surrender*, 429; *Empire State*, 465.
- Lottery established by the government, 15.
- Loughborough, Lord, on the treaty of, 1782, 162.
- Loughrey, Col., defeated, 456.
- Louis XVI, portrait, 3; his relations to the Amer. Rev., 78.
- Louis XVIII, medal of, 525.
- Louisiana, letters from (1776-79), 54; Spanish operations (1781-83), 54; admitted as a State, 280; invaded (1814), 403; intrigues of Genet to recover, 464; purchase of, by U. S., 273, 479, 547; vague boundaries, 479, 531; place of deposit in, 497; southern bounds in dispute, 497, 547; Florida territory annexed, 498; acquisition inevitable, 546; transferred to France, 547; necessity of the purchase by U. S., 547; bibliog. of, 547; descriptions of, 550; made a State, 550; district of, 550; western bounds, 550, 552; Long's explorations, 550;

- his *Account*, 550; northern bounds, 491, 552; did it extend west of the Rockies? 556; Marbois's map, 556; explored by Lewis and Clarke, 556.
- Louisville, Ky., 456; daily view, 542.
- Lounsbury, Prof., *James Fenimore Cooper*, 432.
- Lourd, *Dress of the British Soldier*, 425.
- Louterburg, W., 577.
- Lovell, Vice-Admiral, 424.
- Low, A. A., 341.
- Low, Charles R., *Indian Navy*, 423.
- Lowell, Edward J., "The political struggles of the United States and their relations with Europe," 1; *Hessians*, 75; *Introd.* to Pausch, 75.
- Lowell, J. R., on Josiah Quincy, 313; *Study Windows*, 313; *Biglow Papers*, 355.
- Lowell, John, *Remarks*, 311; *New England Patriot*, 314; wrote against the war of 1812, 342; *Appeal to the people*, 342, 523; *Mr. Madison's War*, 343, 523; *Peace without Dishonor*, 343, 523; *Antigallican*, 515; *Diplomatic policy of Madison*, 520; *Ten Hints*, 520; *Analysis of the late Correspondence*, 523; *Supplement*, 523; *Thoughts upon the Administration*, 523; on the attack on the "Chesapeake," 523; *Remarks on Adams's Review of Ames*, 523; *Perpetual War*, 523; *Impartial Inquirer*, 546.
- Lowrie, W., 294.
- Loyalists, to be protected by Shelburne, 101; aims of Shelburne to protect them, 131, 142, 204, 205; both sides firm, 138; the American commissioners unyielding, 139, 143; North and others regret their neglect, 160, 209; history of their fortunes, 185; various classes of, 186; newspapers of, 186; writers, 186; *Loyalist poetry*, 186; numbers and proportions of, 187, 192; the *Black list*, 187; in Mass., 187, 193, 195; in New Hampshire, 187, 213; in Rhode Island, 187; in Vermont, 187; in Connecticut, 189; Simsbury prison, 189; in New York, 189, 191, 197; in Long Island, 190, 193; in Pennsylvania, 190; in New Jersey, 190, 198; in Maryland, 193; in Virginia, 190; in No. Carolina, 190; in So. Carolina, 190; in Georgia, 190; report on treason, 191; confiscation acts, 191; indignities offered, 191, 198, 206; their military organizations, 194, 196; banished, 195; went off from Boston, 195; from Philad., 195; treated with severity by British troops, 195; "Associated Loyalists," 197; shipped to Nova Scotia, the Bahamas, etc., 199; fate of those in the South, 199, 203; pledges to them of the British government, 199; fate in England, 199; meetings at the N. E. Coffee-House, 200; sources of our information on those in London, 200; records of their meetings, 202; *Declaration and Address* of a Tory meeting at Newport, 202; partial efforts of the British government to relieve them, 202; aid during the war, 202; abandoned in the treaty, 203; helped afterwards, 203; pamphlets growing out of the case, 203; provisions of the treaty for them, 204; their claims offset by the damage done by the British troops, 204; the "recommendation" of Congress futile, 205, 207; Philip of Spain cited as securing indemnification for his adherents in his treaty with Holland, 209; the States oppose restitution, 209; efforts to mitigate the acts of severity, 209; those in England organized to recover of the Brit. government, 210; "Compensation Act," 211; less than one third of the amount claimed allowed, 211; number of those expatriated, 212; "United Empire Loyalists," 213, 214; accounts of the loyalists in Canada, 213; allotments at Passamaquoddy, 213; settlers in Upper Canada, 214.
- Luden, H., 346.
- Ludlow, Israel, 535.
- Lull, E. P., on the Gosport navy yard, 416.
- Lundy, Benj., 287, 325.
- Lundy's Lane, map of, 383; battle, 394; sources, 459.
- Lunt, Geo., *Origin of the late War*, 324.
- Luzerne, Chev. de, portrait, 57; autog., 57; in Philad., 58; credentials, 58; instructions, 58; his papers, 73; and the navigation of the Mississippi, 91; intriguing with Congress, 92; gains ascendancy over Sullivan, 93; influence in Congress, 94; his effect on Livingston, 95; his pledges to the United States, 118; returns to France, 218.
- Lyman, Theo., 350; *Diplomacy of the U. S.*, 74, 168, 513; suit with Webster, 322; on the Hartford Convention, 321.
- Lyman, T. P. H., *Jefferson*, 304.
- MACAULAY, T. B., on Thos. Jefferson, 304.
- Macdonald, Wilson, 572.
- Macdonough, Thomas, portraits, 397, 399; medal, 399, 433; his house, 399; on Lake Champlain, 433.
- "Macedonian," frigate captured, 372, 380, 457.
- Mache, Matthew, *Vancouver island*, 562.
- Mackay, Capt. John, 440.
- Mackenzie, Alex., explorer, 556.
- Mackenzie, A. S., *life of Decatur*, 417, 419; *life of Perry*, 417.
- Mackenzie, W. L., *Van Buren*, 352.
- Maclean, held by the British, 462.
- MacKnight, Thomas, *Life of Burke*, 111.
- Maclay, Wm., *Sketches of Debate*, 295.
- Macomb, Gen. Alex., 397, 433; medal, 434; *Memoir*, 434.
- Madison, Mrs. Dolly, 434; *Memoirs*, 315; portrait, 342.
- Madison, James, "The vices of the polit. system of the U. S.," 215; defends the dependence on France (1782), 94; portrait of, by C. W. Peale, 216; his influence in shaping views for a federal convention, 226; his influence, 227; opposed a national bank, 235; debates in the Fed. Convention, 257; his letters on it, 257; anxiety over the Virginia Convention, 259; revised his part of the *Federalist*, 259; his distinction between a republic and a democracy, 260; his share of the letters, 260; his uncertain views on the Constitution, 262, 263; withdraws from the Federalists, 268; draws the Virginia Resolutions (1798), 270, 320; as President, 274, 297; yields to war party, 275; on nullification, 286, 323; his papers, 315; lives of, 315, 341; *Writings*, 315; *Madison Papers*, 315; *Letters*, 315; *Selections from private Correspondence*, 315; *Eulogy and Life*, by J. Q. Adams, 315; *Life*, by Rives, 315; his politics, 315; life by Gay, 315; domestic life, 315; his widow, 315; *Report*, 320; buys Henry's papers, 321; on the Alien and Sedition laws, 334; references on his administration, 341; portraits, 341; messages, 341; rupture with Robt. Smith, 341; on internal improvements, 345; his military policy, 375; at Bladensburg, 402; and war of 1812, 422; as "Helvidius," 515; opposes Jay's treaty, 517; corresponds with Erskine, 520; *Examination of the British Doc-*
- trine*, 521; confers with Mr. Rose, 522.
- Magaguadavic River claimed as the St. Croix, 172.
- Magruder, A. B., *John Marshall*, 313.
- Maguaga, 429.
- Malhoning Valley, *Hist. Coll.*, 534.
- Maillard, N. D., *Texas*, 551.
- Maine, Sir Henry, *Pop. Government*, 205.
- Maine, boundaries of, and the treaty of 1782-83, 137; claimed by the English commissioners in 1782, 171; her position in the N. E. boundary controversy, 177; admitted, 280; slavery in, 326.
- Malcolm, Gen., 226.
- Malden, Canada, 384.
- Mallory, Timothy, 431.
- Mallet, Abbé, 516.
- Mallory, Daniel, 324.
- Malmesbury Correspondence, 52.
- Malmesbury. See Harris, James.
- Maltzan, correspondence, 81.
- Manchester, Duke of, made commissioner for the definitive treaty of 1783, 162.
- Mangum, W. P., 288.
- Manigault, G. E., on Gen. Izard, 428.
- Mann, Col. Gotther, 175.
- Mansfield, E. D., *Mexican War*, 355, 441; *Winfield Scott*, 427, 441.
- Mansfield, Lord, likenesses, 97.
- Manufactures, increase of, 278.
- Marburg, Germany, MSS., at, 75.
- Marbois, his intercepted letter, 119, 168; copies, 168; in France, 478.
- March, C. W., *Remin. of Congress*, 295; on Webster, 325.
- March 4th, inauguration day, 267.
- Marcy, Gen. R. B., *Thirty Years*, 418; *Border Reminiscences*, 418.
- Marcy, W. L., 283.
- Margry, Pierre, *Découvertes*, 553.
- Marie Antoinette, her favor of Franklin, 40.
- Marietta, Ohio, 456, 549; site of, 449, 532; named, 536; surveys and plan of, 540; mounds at, 540.
- Marine corps, U. S. navy, 363, 416; in Mexico, 442.
- Marquesas Islands, 395.
- Marriott, Sir James, 54; his opinion on neutral rights, 65.
- Mars Hill, 173, 177.
- Marshall, E. C., *U. S. Naval Acad.*, 460.
- Marshall, Humphrey, *Kentucky*, 541.
- Marshall, John (American), argues the case *Ware v. Hiltou*, 218; life in Flanders' *Chief Justices*, 261; portraits, 262, 300; *Writings*, 261; *Washington*, 300, 302, 303, 313; a Federalist, 302; relations with Jefferson, 303; *Life* by Magruder, 313; eulogies, 313; statue, 313, 580; Sec. of State, 337; presided at Burr's trial, 340; sent to France, 472; writes the Amer. case, 518; his journal in France, 518; on neutral rights, 520.
- Marshall, John (Englishman), *Royal Naval Biog.*, 423; *Naval Biog.*, 423.
- Martens, Baron Ch. F. de, abridgment of his coll. of treaties, 74, 83; *Causes Célèbres*, 83; *Novelles Causes Célèbres*, 83.
- Martens, G. F. de, *Cours diplomatique*, 83.
- Martin, David, portrait of Franklin, 37.
- Martin, Luther, and the Federal Convention, 256; his letter on the Const., 257; life by Goddard, 258; accounts of, 313; called Federal Bull Dog, 340.
- Martineau, Harriet, *Society in America*, 350; *Retrospect of Western Travel*, 350.
- Maryland, Tories in, 193; adopted the Constitution, 249; Constitutional Convention, 258; opposed to the claims of Western lands, 527; joins

- the Confederation, 528; influence on the land cessions, 534.
- Mascoutens, 542.
- Mason, A. B., 264.
- Mason, D. H., on protection, 330.
- Mason, Geo., in the Fed. Convention, 257; objections to the Constitution, 259; statue, 580.
- Mason, Jeremiah, *Life*, 313; on the Harford Convention, 321; on the Missouri Compromise, 325.
- Mason, John., 571.
- Mason, J. M., *Voice of Warning*, 303; *Writings*, 303.
- Mason, Cain and Stamp Collector's Manual, 81.
- Massachusetts, her interest in the N. E. boundary question, 177; Tories in, 187; action against Tories, 195; sends delegates to the Fed. Convention, 227; Shays Rebellion, 228 (see Shays); arms of the State, 228; opponents of the Constitution, 248; that instrument ratified, 248; her Const. Convention, 258; centennial of, 258; *Debates*, 258; slavery in, 326; Washington's reception, 328; coast warfare in 1812-14, 458; disputes Virginia's Western claims, 527; cession, 530, 532; lands in N. Y., 530, 533; her Constitution the pattern of the Ord. of 1787, 538.
- Massey, Wm., *England*, 166; on the loyalists, 204.
- Matamoras, 408.
- Mathews, Alfred, 536; on Rufus Putnam, 536.
- Mathews, John, 92.
- Mathurins, order of, 359.
- Matthews, John, 536.
- Maumee City, 454; River, battles on, plan, 454. See Miami.
- Maumee of the lakes, 545.
- Maumees, town of, destroyed, 450; plan of battle, 450.
- Maurault, *Abénakis*, 427.
- Maurepas, Comte de, 4; his drifting system, 26; wished for peace, 40.
- May, Capt. Chas., 408.
- May, Erskine, *Const. Hist. England*, 166.
- May, Col. John, journal, 536.
- May, Samuel J., 288, 323; *Recoll.*, 326.
- Mayer, Brantz, *Mexico*, 441; *War with Mexico*, 441.
- Mayo, Robert, *Eight Years in Washington*, 350; *Fragments of Jacksonism*, 350.
- Mazatlan captured, 410.
- Mazzei, letter, 306; *Recherches*, 516.
- McAfee, R. B., *War in the Western Country*, 428.
- McAllister, J. A., 568.
- McAlpine, J., *Adventures*, 198.
- McBride, Jas., 450.
- McCall, E. R., 458.
- McCall, Gen. Geo. M., *Letters from the Frontier*, 443.
- McCall, J. B., 571.
- McCall, Peter, 571.
- McClane, Col. Allen, journal, 434.
- McClure, Gen. Geo., 390; *Niagara Frontier*, 428.
- McCornish, *State of Parties*, 342.
- McCulloch's Rangers, 442.
- McCulloch, John, *Hist. America*, 529.
- McDonald, Gen. Wm., 572.
- McDowl, Mr., 450.
- McGillivray, Alex., 446.
- McGuire, J. C., 315, 578.
- McHenry, Col. James, 575.
- McHenry, J. Howard, 575.
- McIlvaine, J. H., on the Confederation, 215.
- McKean, H. P., 566.
- McKean, J. P., 576.
- McKean, Thos., 247; speech on the Const., 257.
- McKenney, T. L., *Armstrong's resignation*, 434.
- McKenney and Hall, *Indians of No. America*, 454.
- McKnight, Chas., *Our Western Border*, 454.
- McLane, Lewis, 492.
- McLeod case, 494, 525.
- McMaster, J. B., on the Constitution, 257; on Washington, 302; on the Confederation period, 221; on Shays Rebellion, 231.
- McRae, Sherwin, *Washington*, 572.
- McRee, G. J., *Iredell*, 313.
- McSherry, Dr. Richard, *El Puchero*, 443.
- McVicar, A., ed. of Lewis and Clarke, 558.
- Mead, Edwin D., *Const. U. S.*, 256.
- Meade, Richard, 578.
- Mechlin and Winder, *Navy registers*, 417.
- Meigs, Josiah, 314.
- Meigs, R. J., portrait, 537.
- Meigs, W. M., 314.
- Meigs, Fort, plan, 430.
- Mein, John, 186.
- Melish, John, *Descrip. of U. S.*, 345; *Travels*, 332, 542, 547; his map, 548.
- Melshimer, F. V., *Tagebuch*, 75.
- Menziés, Wm., 573.
- Mercer, Gen., killed at Princeton, 566.
- Meredith, G. F., 571.
- Meredith, Thomas, 575.
- Meredith, Sir Win., his pamphlet, 51.
- Mermentan River, 497.
- Merriam, J. M., 337.
- Merritt, W. H., life of, 427.
- Mesa River, 410.
- Mesilla Valley, 553.
- Metis River, 174.
- Métra, *Correspondance*, 77.
- Meusnier on the Cincinnati Soc., 219
- Mexican War, political aspects, 292, 355; the Mexican view, 356; campaigns, 408; sources, 440; losses, 441; maps, 442; Mexican accounts, 442, 443; *The Other Side*, 442, 443; *Apuntes para la historia de la guerra*, 443; California conquered, 444.
- Mexico (country), alleged expedition against (1806), 340; bounds (1819), 499, 553; treaty with (1828), 505; war with, 506; Trist negotiates a treaty, 506; diplomacy of the war (1846), 525. See Mexican.
- Mexico (city), captured by Scott, 412, 442; valley of, map, 442; plans, 442.
- Miami Rapids, treaty, 454.
- Miami River, 545, 548. See Maumee.
- Michigan, 50; British plan to buy the lower peninsula, 451; made a State, 287, 543; bounds, 543; enlarged, 543.
- Michillimackinac, surprised, 429; map, 429.
- Middleton, Wm., 578.
- Middleton, 510.
- Milbert, J., *Sketches in America*, 345.
- Milburn, W. H., *Ten Years*, 355.
- Military land (N. W. territory), 528, 545.
- Military and Topog. Atlas of the U. S.*, 460.
- Militia, plan of, 358.
- Mill, John Stuart, *Rep. Government*, 205.
- Miller, F. W., *Cincinnati's Beginnings*, 535.
- Miller, Gen. James, 394, 428; medal, 459; at Maguaga, 429.
- Miller, S. F., *Bench and Bar of Ga.*, 345, 346.
- Mills, Clark, 572; statue of Jackson, 349; equestrian statue of Washington, 581.
- Mills, Elijah, 345.
- Minnesota Hist. Soc., catalogue of library, 430.
- Minnesota territory, 543.
- Minora, Spain seeks its restoration, 55.
- Minot, G., 296.
- Minot, Geo. R., *Insurrections in Mass.*, 230.
- Minto, Lady, *Hugh Elliot*, 43, 51.
- Miquelon, island, 3.
- Mirabeau, *L'Espion*, 76; *Considerations on the Cincinnati Soc.*, 219; on Dr. Price, 234.
- Miralles, letters, 54.
- Mississinewa, 455.
- Mississippi River, free navigation of, 89, 90, 91, 107, 471, 477, 487, 491, 546; as a boundary, 107; in the treaty of 1782, 145; Jay's plan to surrender its navigation, 223; political value of, 273; surveyed by Elliott, 530; its sources, 553; source of, below 49°, 554.
- Mississippi Territory, 498, 546; State, 280, 546.
- "Mississippi," steam frigate, 460.
- Missouri and the slavery question, 280; admitted, 280; the Compromise, 281, 323, 325; territory, 550; State, 550.
- "Missouri," steam frigate, 460.
- Mitchell's map of 1755, used by the commissioners of the treaty of 1782, 180; *Atlas of No. America* (1758), section of, in fac-simile, 181; Oswald's copy in the British Mus. 181; known to Lord Melbourne, 181; other copies marked by the commissioners in 1782, 181; fac-similes, 181.
- Mobile, Spain seeks to recover, 55, 109; bay, 403; seized by Gen. Wilkinson, 498, 546.
- Molino del Rey, 412.
- Monchacht-Apé, 557.
- Monro, P. J., 570.
- Monro, Robt., *Genesee Country*, 533.
- Monroe Doctrine, 281, 502, 524; history of, 524; bibliog., 524.
- Monroe, James, gov. of Virginia, 272; becomes President, 279, 297; bibliography, 316; life by J. Q. Adams, 316; by D. C. Gilman, 316, 344; references on his administration, 344; *Messages*, 344; papers, 344; portrait, 344; "Era of good feeling," 344; his tour, 344; Lafayette's visit, 344; on internal improvements, 345; at Bladensburg, 402; *The People the Sovereigns*, 263; on the capture of Washington, 434; sent to France, 471, 478, 514; *View of the Conduct of the Executive*, 472, 514; in London, 480; failure of his treaty of 1806, 482, 558; discussions with Onís, 498; the "Monroe Doctrine," 281, 502, 524; *Claims upon the U. S.*, 514; foreign despatches, 520; on British oppression, 520; interviews with Canning, 522; diplomatic measures, as President, 524; sent to buy Louisiana, 547; his views, 547.
- Montana, 561.
- Montbary, Prince de, *Mémoires*, 34, 79.
- Monterey (California), Com. Sloat at, 410, 445.
- Monterey (Mexico), Gen. Taylor at, 409; battle at, 442.
- Montesquieu, *Spirit of the Law*, 1.
- Montgomery, Commander, 410.
- Montgomery, Henry, *W. H. Harrison*, 353, 454; *Gen. Taylor*, 441.
- Montgomery, J. T., 571.
- Monthly Military Repository*, 566.
- Montmorin, correspondence, 54, 73; in Spain, 109; on the treaty of 1779, 170.
- Moody, Lieut. James, *Sufferings, etc.*, 198.
- Moody, Loring, *Mexican War*, 441.
- Moore, C. C., *Observations on Jefferson*, 303.
- Moore, Geo. H., *Slavery in Mass.*, 326.
- Moore, H. N., *Gen. Wayne*, 453.
- Moore, J. B., 441.
- Moore, S. S., and Jones, T. W., *Traveler's Directory*, 333, 336.
- Moore, W. V., *Indian Wars*, 455.
- Moose Island, 173.
- Morales, Gen., 471.
- Moran, Benj., 573.
- Moravian missions, 456.

- Moreau, C. C., 575.
 Morehead, Jas. T., *Boonesborough*, 541.
 Morgan, Col. Geo., 536.
 Morgan, H. J., *Celebrated Canadians*, 427.
 Morgan, Wm., murdered, 524.
 Morner, correspondence, 522.
 Morison, John H., *Jeremiah Smith*, 313.
 Morley, *Burke*, 10.
 Mormon battalion in California, 444.
 Morocco, treaty with (1787), 234, 361, 461; war with, 420.
 Morphis, J. M., *Texas*.
 Morris, Chas., Com., his *Autobiog.*, 367, 417.
 Morris, Gouverneur, 89; his report on the Conciliatory Acts, 51; portrait, 71; in the finance department, 71; plan for a coinage, 236; in the Fed. Convention, 257; on Hamilton, 308; *Finances of the U. S.*, 328; supports the Judiciary Act, 338; sent to England (1789), 462, 514; minister to France, 471, 514; recalled, 471; *Answer to War in Disguise*, 521; *British Treaty*, 521.
 Morris, Robert, signs Deane's instructions, 27; head of the finances, 69, 82, 235; portrait, 70; autog, 70; his house, 70; his accounts, 70, 82; *Statement of Receipts*, etc., 82; *Statement of Accounts*, 82; his plan of bank, 82; his system of finance, 82; letters, 82; buys land in N. Y., 533.
 Morris, Com. R. V., 419; sent to the Mediterranean, 370.
 Morris, Thos., 291, 533.
 Morris, T. H., 569.
 Morris Reserve (N. Y.), 533.
 Morse, A. D., 349.
 Morse, Rev. Jed., *Thanksgiving Sermon*, 175, 515; *Report on Indian Affairs*, 455; on French intrigue, 515.
 Morse, J. T., Jr., *Johu Adams*, 57, 310; *Jefferson*, 307; *Hamilton*, 308; on Boston lawyers, 314; on Gallatin, 316; *J. Q. Adams*, 347, 521.
 Marse, Col. Robt., report on Nova Scotia, 214.
 Moseley, E. S., *Henry Oxnard*, 200.
 Mosquito flotilla, 444.
 Mott, Jas., 326.
 Mott, Lucretia, 326.
 Mounds at Marietta, 549.
 Mount Vernon, view of, in Washington's time, 224; accounts of, 224; tomb, 224; plans of the lands and grounds, 224; designs for altering the buildings, 224, 225.
 Moustier, Count, succeeds Luzerne, 218.
 Mowry, W. A., on the extent of Louisiana, 557.
 Mudge and Featherstonhaugh survey the Maine boundary, 178.
 Mulford, Elisha, *The Nation*, 263.
 Muller, Frederick, *Americana*, 68; *Topographie Ancienne*, 533.
 Mullinger, *Eng. Hist. for Students*, 423.
 Mullins, Col., 438.
 Murdoch, D. C., *True Title to Oregon*, 586.
 Murray, A., *Admiral Durham*, 423.
 Murray, Capt., on a cruise, 364.
 Murray, W. M., 530.
 Murray, Wm. Vans, minister to France, 474.
 Muscat treaty, 508.
 Muscogees. *See* Creek Indians.
 Muskingum River, 535; 544; mouth of, 440.
 Myers, Samuel, 571.
 Myers, Theodorus B., *Tories in America*, 106.
 Myers, *Index, U. S. Sup. Ct.*, 261.
 NANTUCKET, neutrality of, during the Revolution, 187.
 Napier, Sir Chas., *Life*, 424.
 Napier, Gen. E., 424.
 Naples, Perry collects spoilation claims, 519.
 Napoleon, *Bulletins*, 77; his diplomatic tricks, 275; his Russian disasters noticed in Boston, 314.
 Nassau Hall, Princeton, 595.
 Natches Indians, 448.
National Gazette, 316.
National Intelligencer, 341.
National Register, 342.
 National Republican party, 282.
 Naval Academy founded, 460.
 Navy Island, 383.
 Navy, development of, 359, 415; frigates built, 360; cause of their success, 361; department of, 362, 414, 415; marine corps, 363; terms of enlistments, 365; reduced (1801), 367; in the War of 1812, 378; records of, 413, 414; department burned, 414; reports of the African squadron, 414; of marine corps, 414; commissioners, 414; its bureaus, 414; navy-yards, 414, 416; gunboats, 414; court-martials, 414; beginnings of, 415; histories of, 415; library of department, 416; *Naval Registers*, 416; British seamen in Amer. ships, 424; in the Mexican war, 443; frigate actions (1812-14), 457, 458.
Nederlandsche Mercurius, 58.
 Neff, J. K., *Army and Navy*, 417.
 Neilson, Jos., *R. Choate*, 354.
 Nelson, John, 513.
 Nelson, Thomas, statue, 580.
Nestle Americo-Sept., 183.
 Neptulode, 511.
 Netherlands, 512; character of the people, 8; their government, 8; English treatment of, 63, 64; declines American advances, 64; at war with England, 67; joins the Armed Neutrality, 68; prints the important papers of their negotiations, called *Verzamelingen van politieque werkjjes*, 68; paper of Dumas, the American agent, 68; king of, arbitrates on the N. E. boundary controversy, 177; tracts on the relations with the United States, 68; treaty of commerce with the United States, 72, 87, 461; treaties with Great Britain, 83, 87; forbids privateering, 85; relations with Gt. Britain (1780), 85; answers Russian declar. of neutrality, 85; memorial on St. Martin's, 86; accedes to armed neutrality, 86; succor asked, 86; placard on privateers, 86; war ordinance, 86; counter-manifesto, 86; treaty of Paris, 87.
Neue Militar-Zeitung, 77.
 Neufville, De, 67.
 Neutrality, armed. *See* Armed neutrality.
 Neutrals, rights of, 74, 84, 85, 461, 464, 466, 487, 520; American Neutrality Act, 465; *Conduct of Great Britain*, 520; defended by Russia, 61.
 Neuville, M. de, 496.
 Nevada annexed, 553.
 New Archangel, 510.
 New Brunswick, created, 172; in part settled by loyalist troops, 106, 213.
 New England, and Republicanism, 272; affected by the embargo, 273, 340; in war of 1812, 277; Federalism, 313; anti-Federalists, 318, 522; threatened secession, 320; nullification originated in, 323; opposition to the war of 1812, 342, 343, 487; her fishermen, 425; privateers of, 426. *See* Massachusetts and the other N. E. States.
 New England Anti-Slavery Society, 287.
New England Journal of Education, 557.
 New Grenada, 504.
 New Hampshire, act on bills of credit, 81; her territory increased by the treaty of 1842, 179; Tories in, 187; adopts the Constitution, 249, 258.
 New Haven, her commerce destroyed, 274; forts, 458.
 New Ireland, 214.
 New Jersey, Tories in, 190; refused to pay Federal taxes, 223; adopted the Constitution, 247; in the Fed. Convention, 288; centennial of, 258; opposed to Virginia's claims to Western lands, 527.
 New London, Conn., forts, 458.
 New Mexico, conquest of, by S. W. Kearny, 444; maps of, 553; territory, 553.
 New Orleans, campaign of, 436, 487; British plan, 437; view of battle, 437; as port of entry for Americans, 477, 478, 546. *See* Louisiana, Orleans.
 New York, city, prisoners in, 88; occupied by the British, 189; *New York City during the Rev.*, 189; delays in evacuating, 206; made the capital city, 267; Washington inaugurated in, 326; Federal edifice in, 331; accounts of the city, 331; City Hall, 331; view of Government House, 332; old Fort George, 332, 465; views of the town, 332; landmarks, 332; plans, 332; forts, 458; view of battery and harbor, 465; evacuated (1783), 568.
 New York (province), favored by Parliament, 11.
 New York (State), laying her own import taxes, 223; opposes a Federal Convention, 231; finally accedes, 231, 250; opposed the Constitution at first, 246; her convention to adopt the Constitution, 259; Jay's *Address*, 259; in national politics, 348; anti-rent, 353; invaded in 1814, 397; her claims to Western lands, 527; cedes them, 527, 528, 530; Tories, 189, 191.
New York Courier and Inquirer, 350.
New York Evening Post, 341.
 Newell, C., *Rev. in Texas*, 551.
 Newfoundland, fisheries and the treaty of 1782, 120; French rights in, 44.
 Newspapers on the loyal and Tory side, 186.
 Newport, R. I., Tories, 187; Washington in, 328.
 Newton, E. C., 570.
 Niagara River, battle of (*see* Lundy's Lane); falls, map of, 383; maps of, 382, 383; campaigns on, 459; map, 459.
 "Niagara," war-ship, 391, 392.
 Nicaragua, 504.
 Nicholas, Geo., 334.
 Nicholas, J. (Decius), 259.
 Nichols, David, 576.
 Nicholson, made captain, 360; in the "Constitution," 363.
 Nicolas, P. H., *Royal Marine Forces*, 423.
 Nicolay, J. G., 306.
 Nicollet, J. N., map of the Upper Mississippi, 553.
Nieuwe Nederlandsche Jaerboeken, 68.
 Niles, J. M., *O. H. Perry*, 432.
Niles' Register, 542, 413, 420, 443.
 Nimi, J. B., medalion of Franklin, 39.
 Noah, M. M., *Travels*, 419, 438.
 Noailles, Duc de, in London, 48.
 Noël le Mire, 59.
 Non-intercourse act, 274.
 Nootka Sound, Spaniards at, 555; convention, 555; position of, 557.
 Norcross, Jona., *Democracy*, 310.
 Norman, C. B., *Corsairs of France*, 426.
 Norman, J., the Boston engraver, 565; engraves Franklin, 37; Lafayette, 50.
 Norris, Dr. Herbert, 571.
 North, Lord, in power, 10; defends use of mercenary soldiers, 23; his proposals for peace commissioners, 49; acts of conciliation, 50; his

- speech, 50; debates on, 50; instructs the commissioners, 51; their manifesto, 51; attempts to circulate papers, 51; Congress reports on them, 51; his character, 74, 95; resigns, 96; likeness, 96; caricature, 98; his compact with Fox, 159; attacks the treaty, 160; on the abandonment of the Tories, 209.
- North, *Report on the Census of 1880*, 334.
- North America, maps of, 175, 182, 183.
- North American Pilot*, 183, 460.
- North Bend (Ohio River), 544.
- North Carolina, Tories in, 190; paper money in, 235; delay in adopting the Constitution, 251; const. convention, 259; cedes Western lands, 528; the ceded territory sets up a government, 529, 530; cession annulled, 530; but finally completed, 530.
- North eastern boundary controversy. *See* Boundaries.
- North Western territory, military sites in, map, 455; proposed States in, under Ordinance of 1784, 528; map of, 529; map of cessions, 530; ordinance for disposing of lands, 533; travels in, 536; movements toward the Ordinance of 1787, 537; St. Clair, Governor, 539; map of, 542; divided into States, 543. *See* Ordinance.
- Norton, J. N., 570.
- Nourse, Col. Michael, 70; on Robt. Morris, 82.
- Nova Scotia, not to be sought (1779), 57; loyalist refugees in, 199; New England settlers in, 212; loyalists go to, 212, 213; trials for treason, 213; Akins's *MS. Docs.*, 214; Colonel Morse's Rept. on, 214.
- Nugent, H. P., 436.
- Nullification, 252, 253; not included in the import of the Va. Resolutions of 1798, 252; origin of, 270, 320; formulated by Calhoun, 286; in Virginia Resolutions of 1798, 320; movement in South Carolina, 322; distinct from states rights, 323.
- O'BYRNE, W. R., *Naval Biog. Dict.*, 423.
- O'Connor, T., *Hist. of the War*, 422.
- O'Fallon, Dr., 534.
- O'Neal, J. B., *Bench and Bar of So. Carolina*, 323.
- O'Neill, J. A., 573.
- O'Reilly, *Rochester, N. Y.*, 533.
- Ochs, General von, *Neuere Kriegskunst*, 75.
- Ocklawaha River, 407.
- Oconee war, 446.
- Odell, Jona., his verses, 186.
- Offley, David, 508.
- Ogden, Chas. S., 584.
- Ogden, Uzal, 335.
- Ogdensburgh attacked, 458.
- Oglethorpe, James, 233.
- Ohio Company, maps of its territory, 532, 544; their settlements, 535; records, 536.
- Ohio (State), seven ranges of townships, 532; Western Reserve, 534; county histories, 534, 536; "Firelands," 534; *Map of N. W. Ohio*, 534; travels in, 536; first white child, 536; first house, 536; name of, 536; first mill, 541; made a State, 280, 543; bounds, 543; Rufus Putnam's map of, 544-5; Melish's map, 548.
- Ohio River, history of its navigation, 536; steamboats on, 536; rapids of, 542.
- Okechobee, fight of, 407.
- Olavid, 6.
- Oliver, Andrew, 186.
- Oliver, James, 571.
- Oliver Oldschool, 299.
- Oneidas, treaties, 447. *See* Six Nations.
- Onis, Luis de, 498; corresponds with J. Q. Adams, 524, 550; *Memoria*, 524.
- Onondagas, treaties, 447. *See* Six Nations.
- Ontario, Lake, war-vessels on (1813), 388.
- Orange, the Prince of, solicited by George III for troops, 18.
- Orders in Council, British, 276, 482, 522.
- Ordinance, of 1784, 528; for disposing Western land, 533. *See* North Western Territory.
- Ordinance of 1787, movements toward, 537; authorship, 537; where found, 538; powers, 538; relations to slavery, 538; to education, 538. *See* North Western Territory.
- Ordway, Albert, 296.
- Oregon, question of bounds, 555; bibliog., 555; origin of the name, 555; various claims to, 555; maps, 557; settlers poured in by U. S., 559; in politics, 559; American and British counter-statements, 559, 562; Pioneer Association, 559; Pioneer and Hist. Soc., 559; route of immigrants, 559; bounds under treaty of 1846, 560; modern map, 561; principal sources, 562.
- Orleans, Isle of (New Orleans), 478, 547.
- Orleans, territory, 550; becomes State of Louisiana, 550.
- Ormsby, R. McK., *Whig Party*, 299.
- Osborne, J. H., 35.
- Osceola, 407; dies, 407; accounts of, 440.
- Osgood, David, attacks Samuel Adams, 318.
- Osgood, Samuel, 217; letters, 235.
- Oswegatchie, 462.
- Oswego, 462; attacked, 459 (*see* Fort Oswego); captured, 397.
- Oswald, Richard, sent to Paris, 99, 101; his instructions, 101; diary and letters, 101; not sustained by Fox, 104; again sent to Paris, 104; thought Canada should be ceded, 104; to be made separate commissioner, 105, 109; empowered to treat, 112; his commission objected to, 113; receives a new commission, 125; assents to a treaty, 129; joined by Strachey, 131; friendly and confidential relations with the American commissioners, 137, 147, 150; not satisfactory to Richmond, 141; his letters, 165; his plan for bounds, 171.
- Otis, H. C., 308, 314, 319; suggests Hartford Convention, 321; draws answer to the governor's speech, 321; *Letters on the Hartford Convention*, 321; letter from J. Q. Adams, 523.
- Otis, Jas., 186.
- Otogamies, 542.
- Ottawas, treaty, 450.
- Ottoman Porte. *See* Turkey.
- Ouisconsin (Wisconsin), 542.
- Overton, Judge, 438.
- Oxnard, Henry, diary in London, 200.
- PACIFIC FUR CO., 558.
- Pacificus (Hamilton), 515.
- Pageot, 497.
- Paige, *Cambridge*, 231.
- Paine, Thomas, reply to Silas Deane, 331; on Tories, 186; intimacy with Jefferson, 338; life, 338; *Letters*, 338; his pamphlets, 515; *Letter to Washington*, 515; replies to it, 515; in Paris, 515; *Rights of Man*, 516; *Public Good*, 527.
- Paine, Thomas, later Robert Treat, *Oration*, 517.
- Pakenham, Gen. Sir E., 403; killed, 404; not reinforced at New Orleans, 426.
- Palairt, I., *Cartes des possessions Angl. et Françaises*, 179; *Map of No. America improved by Rocque*, 180; maps, 182.
- Palfrey, J. G., on the N. E. boundary, 182.
- Palmer, T. H., *Hist. Register*, 420.
- Palo Alto, 408, 442.
- Panama Isthmus, free passage over, 504.
- Panama Congress, 503; bibliog., 524.
- Panic. *See* Financial.
- Panin, Count, on England's positiveness, 61.
- Panuco, 550.
- Papal states, edict on commerce, 84.
- Paper money of the Revolution, 13; during the Confederation, 235.
- Paris, American agents at, during the Rev., their papers, 73; peace of (1763), 3, 10, 83. *See* France.
- Parish, Daniel, 323.
- Park, R., *West Point*, 460.
- Parker, Isaac, on Theophilus Parsons, 258.
- Parker, J. M., *Rochester*, 533.
- Parker, Sir Peter, *Biographical Memoir*, 435.
- Parker, Samuel, *Journal*, 557.
- Parker, Theo., 323; *Historic Americans*, 301, 310; on Jefferson, 307; *Lives*, 326.
- Parker, Capt W. H., *Recollections*, 443.
- Parkman, Samuel, 570.
- Parliamentary Register*, 83.
- Parsons, Gen. S. H., alleged traitorous conduct, 189; in the Ohio Co., 534, 536.
- Parsons, Theophilus, notes of debates in the Mass. Fed. Con., 258; life by his son, 258, 313; sketch by Isaac Parker, 258.
- Parsons, Dr. Usher, *battle of Lake Erie*, 433; his speech, 433.
- Parton, Jas., *Life of Franklin*, 169; on Washington's character, 300; *Jefferson*, 307; *Aaron Burr*, 316; *Famous Americans*, 324, 559; on Clay, 324; on Calhoun, 324; on Webster, 325; *Andrew Jackson*, 349; *J. F. Astor*, 559.
- Partridge, George, 172.
- Paschall, Geo. W., *Const. of the United States*, 256.
- Passamaquoddy bay, division of islands in, between U. S. and New Brunswick, 176, 177; map of, by Pownall and Evans, 184.
- Patterson, Robt., 535.
- Paulding, J. K., *Washington*, 301; *Letters from the South*, 317; *Literary Life of*, 317.
- Pausch, *Tageluck*, 75; translated by W. L. Stone, 75.
- Payne, J. L., 188.
- Payne, *Universal Geography*, 460.
- Payne's Landings, 406.
- Peabody, A. P., on Jefferson, 306; *Life of Plumer*, 320; on M. Cutler, 536; on removal of Judge Pickering, 338.
- Peace of 1782-83, 89. *See* Paris, Treaty.
- "Peacock," action with the "Epervier," 396, 458.
- Peale, Chas. W., portrait of Franklin, 39; of Lafayette, 59; of Henry Laurens, 66; early miniature of Washington, 563; early standing portrait, 564; his various portraits of Washington, 564, 582; engravings of them, 564; Valley Forge picture, 564, 565; engravings, 565; his last picture of Washington, 566; his pencil sketch, 567.
- Peale, James, paints Washington, 566, 567.
- Peale, Raphael, paints Washington, 566.
- Peale, Rembrandt, his portrait of John Marshall, 262; paints Washington, 566, 567, 569; his type-picture of Washington, 558; "W. before Yorktown," 568; his own accounts of his portraits, 568.
- Pearl River, 531.
- Pease, Seth, *Map of the Western Reserve*, 547.
- Peck, C. H., 316.

- Peck, J. M., *Annals*, 536, 547.
- Peel, Sir Robt., and the red-line map, 180.
- Peet, S. D., on the Indian tribes, 455.
- Peninsula, battle of, in the Western Reserve, 430.
- Penn family recompensed one half for their loyalty, 212.
- Pennsylvania adopts the Constitution, 247, 257; *Debates of the Convention*, 257; Federal Convention, 257; *Reasons of Dissent*, 257; *Remarks on*, 257; Tories in, 190; would appropriate Continental funds, 217.
- Pensacola, Spain seeks to possess, 55, 109; surrenders (1781), 55; the Creeks treat at, with the Spaniards, 447; seized by Jackson, 498, 546.
- Perdido River, 531, 546.
- Perkins, Augustus T., 564, 572.
- Perkins, J., on the Western Reserve, 534.
- Perkins, Jas. H., 261; *Annals of the West*, 536; later eds., 536; *Fifty years of Ohio*, 536; *Memoir and Writings*, 536.
- Perkins, Samuel, *Late War*, 422; *Hist. Sketches*, 344, 422; *Gen. Jackson in the Seminole War*, 438.
- Perkins, Thomas H., 572.
- Perrault, J. B., his travels, 450.
- Perrin du Lac, *Voyage*, 550.
- Perry, A. L., *Polit. Economy*, 330.
- Perry, Com. M. C., in the Mexican war, 411; life, 417, 443; develops steam navy, 460; on the "Little Belt" affair, 522.
- Perry, Oliver H., at Fort Niagara, 389; on Lake Erie, 391, 432; portrait, 391; medal, 391, 432; criticised by Roosevelt, 424, 433; quarrel with Elliott, 432; *Documents rel. to the difference*, etc., 432; his famous despatch, 432; his flag, 432; lives, 417, 432; fate of his ships, 432.
- Perrysburg, 454.
- Peter, Maj. Geo., 435.
- Peter Porcupine. See Cobbett, Wm.
- Peters, Richard, 296, 575; *Reports*, 261; *Condensed Reports*, 261; *Cerokee Nation*, etc., 322.
- Peterson, C. J., *American Navy*, 417; *War with Mexico*, 441.
- Pettis, Kit Carson, 444.
- Pfister, Ferd., *Der Nordamerikanische Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, 77; *Jäger-Bataillons*, 77.
- Phelippeaux, *Carte générale*, 171.
- Phelps, R. H., *Newgate of Conn*, 88, 89.
- Phelps, W. D., *Fore and Aft*, 444.
- Phelps and Gorham purchase, 533.
- Philadelphia, evacuated (1778), 60; Tories leave the city, 195; Federal Convention at (1787), first motion towards, 226 (see Federal Convention); pageant on acc. of nine States adopting the Constitution, 258; appearance of, and life in, 332; public buildings, view of, 333; State House, 333; library company, 333; maps, 333; defences (1812), 458.
- "Philadelphia," frigate lost at Tripoli, 371; destroyed, 372, 419, 420.
- Philadelphia Packet*, 23.
- Phillips, Henry, Jr., *Paper Currency*, 15, 81; *Continental paper money*, 81.
- Phillips, Capt. Isaac, his *Case*, 420.
- Phillips, Samuel, 571.
- Phillips, Wendell, 288; on Webster, 325; *Memorial on his death*, 326.
- Pliocion, on neutral trade, 521.
- Picaroons, 365.
- Pickell, John, *New Chapter in the Early Life of Washington*, 531.
- Pickering, Judge, removed, 338.
- Pickering, Octavius, 312.
- Pickering, Timothy, 314; his *Life*, 312; papers, 314; leaves Adams's Cabinet, 335; *Review of the Cunningham Correspondence*, 335; meets Adams, 336; life by Pickering and Upham, 336; *Letter to Gov. Sullivan*, 340, 523; *Interesting Correspondence*, 340; treats with Indians, 447, 451; on Jay's treaty, 468; corresponds with Adet, 472, 518; Secretary of State, 518; *Review of the Administration*, 518; on the French mission, 518; senator from Mass., 523; *Letters addressed to the people*, 523; interested in Western settlements, 528; memoir on the northern boundary, 554.
- Pickle, N., 566.
- Pierce, Bradford K., 258.
- Pierce, Maj., notes on the Federal Convention, 256.
- Pierrepont, H. E., 570.
- Pierson, H. W., *Jefferson*, 306.
- Pigeon Roost massacre, 456.
- Pike, Gen. Z. M., killed at York (Toronto), 389; life of, 428, 533; sent to explore the Upper Mississippi, 553, 558; *Expedition*, 553; *Exploratory Travels*, 553; portrait, 554.
- Pilling, J. C., *Proof-sheets*, etc., 439; *Siouan languages*, 555.
- Pillow, Gen., in Mexico, 411.
- Pillsbury, Parker, *Anti-slavery apostles*, 326.
- Pim, Capt. Bedford, on the naval war of 1812, 424.
- Pinckney, Charles, 497; *Observations*, 258.
- Pinckney, C. C., in France, 472, 518; portrait, 456; "Millions for defence," etc., 519; owned picture of Washington, 571.
- Pinckney, Thomas, minister to England, 462, 467; sent to Spain, 476.
- Pine, R. E., portrait of R. Morris, 70; of Washington, 573.
- Pinkney, Wm., lives, 317; on manumitting slaves, 325; favors the war (1812), 342; sent to England, 480; portrait, 481; corresp. with Canning, 520; draws up merchant's memorials, 521.
- Pinkney, Rev. Dr. Wm., 317.
- Pirates in the West Indies, 365, 406, 439; war on, 413; suppression of, 468.
- Pitkin, Timothy, *Hist. U. S.*, 255.
- Pitman, Jos. S., *Trial of Dorr*, 355.
- Pitt, Thomas, 160.
- Pitt, William (*Chatham*), his character, 10, 11.
- Pitt, William (*the younger*), introducer of Reform Bill (1783), 106; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 111; portraits, 111; *Tomline's Life of Pitt*, 111; Stanhope's, 111; defends the treaty of 1782, 162.
- Pizarro, Spanish Sec. of Foreign Affairs, 498.
- Plattsburg, fight at, 397, 433, 434.
- Plumer, Wm., life of, 320; on the war (1812), 342.
- Pocket Mag.*, 576.
- Poinsett, J. R., 501, 503, 504.
- Point Isabel, 408.
- Point Pleasant, 549.
- Poitiaux, M. B., 576.
- Political parties, in the U. S., 267; necessity for, 296; periodicals, 296.
- Politique Hollandais*, 68.
- Polk, C. P., 564.
- Polk, James K., 290; President, 297; references on his administration, 355; lives, 355; his policy towards Mexico, 506; the Texas Question, 551; the Oregon Question, 560.
- Pollock, Oliver, his letters from Louisiana, 54.
- Pomeroy, J. N., *Const. Law of the U. S.*, 215, 263.
- Ponce Passu, 455.
- Pond, S. W., 439.
- Poole, Wm. F., *Anti-slavery opinions*, 325; on M. Cutler, 537; *Ordinance of 1787*, 537.
- Poore, Ben: Perley, *Descrip. Catal.*, 80; *Constitutions*, 256; on Washington city, 336; *Reminiscences*, 336.
- Porcupine, Peter, 314. See Cobbett.
- Port-au-fer, 462.
- Porter, C. T., *Mexican War*, 355.
- Porter, David, 508; midshipman, 364; in the "Essex," 381, 395; portrait, 381; *Cruise to the Pacific*, 434; *Memoir*, 417, 418; *Trial*, 439.
- Porter, D. D., *Memoir of Com. Porter*, 418.
- Porter, J. A., *Washington city*, 330.
- Porter, L. H., *Outlines of Const. Hist.*, 264.
- Porter, Gen. P. B., medal, 459.
- Porter, Wm., British commissary of muster, 23.
- Portland, Duke of, his ministry, 162.
- Portsmouth, N. H., navy yard, 416.
- Portugal, answers Russian declaration of neutrality, 85; order on privateers, 86; accedes to armed neutrality, 87; protects American ships in the Mediterranean, 234; diplomatic relations, 501.
- Post-office, 294.
- Potemkin, 61.
- Potomac River, 531.
- Potomac River, capital city on, 330; joint use of, by Maryland and Va., 226.
- Potter, E. R., *R. I. currency*, 81; *The R. I. question*, 355.
- Potter, R. M., 551.
- Potter, Woodbourne, *War in Florida*, 440.
- Powell, Mrs. E., 573.
- Powell, H. Y., on James and Cooper, 424.
- Powell, J. H., 573.
- Powell, Adm. L. M., 566.
- Powell, Samuel, 573, 577.
- Pownall, *Topographical Description*, 184.
- Preble, Com. Edw., sent to the Mediterranean, 370; before Tripoli, 372; death, 378; his influence in the navy, 378; his papers, 419; portraits, 419; lives, 417, 419; medal, 418; his campaign against Tripoli, 419; his journal, 419.
- Preble, Adm. G. H., on the Charlestown navy yard, 416; edits *Edw. Preble's journal*, 419; "Ships of the Nineteenth Century," 425; list of U. S. vessels, 425; on the "Essex," 434; on the "Chesapeake" and "Shannon," 457; *Three Historic Flags*, 458; *Steam Navigation*, 530.
- Preble, W. P., *Decision of the King of Netherlands*, 177.
- Prentiss, Chas., *Life of Wm. Eaton*, 418.
- Prentiss, Geo. L., 299.
- Prentiss, S. S., *Memoir*, 299, 354.
- President of the U. S., method of choosing, 269; how nominated, 269; his title, 327.
- "President," frigate built, 363; under Barron, 375; captured, 405, 458; and "Little Belt," 522.
- Presqu'isle, 456, 534.
- Preuss, Chas., 557.
- Prevost, B. L., 575.
- Prevost, Sir George, attacks Sackett's Harbor, 389; invades New York, 397, 399, 400; his campaigns criticised, 427; *Public Life*, 427; MS. memoir, 427; *Some Account*, 458.
- Prevost, J. B., 501.
- Price, Col., in New Mexico, 409.
- Price, Dr. Richard, 234; *Observations*, 234; on negro slavery, 234.
- Price, Sterling, at Santa Fé, 444.
- Prices, during the Rev., increase, 15; limitation of, attempted, 69.
- Priestley, Jos., controversy with Cobbett, 314; *Letters*, 315; his reply to Burke, 516; comes to America, 516; traduced by Cobbett, 516; on John Adams, 516; letters to Geo. Thacher, 516; *Memoirs*, 516.
- Prime, N. S., *Long Island*, 190.
- Princeton, Peale's picture of the battle, 566.
- Pring, Capt., on battle of Lake Erie, 433.
- Prison ships, 87, 88.

- Prisoners of war, exchange between England and France (1780), 85; act of 1782 in Great Britain, 87; history of, 87; exchanges, 87; treatment by the British, 87; correspondence of commissaries, 88; in the war of 1812, 426.
- Pritt, Jos., *Border Life*, 453; *Mirror of Olden Time*, 453.
- Privaters, 416; American, 306; histories, 426; in American diplomacy, 461, 469; Genet's, 464; restrictions, of, 468; of England, robbing neutral vessels, 61; Dutch vessels, 64; instructions of U. S. to, 83; acts of Great Britain, 84; instructed by commissioners of U. S. in Paris, 84; orders of France, 84; forbidden by Netherlands, 85; against Spain, 85.
- Prizes, acts of Great Britain, 84, 85; of France, 84, 85.
- Proctor, Gen., at Frenchtown, 387; beaten by Harrison, 392; on the Maumee, 454.
- Prophet, the (Indian), 375.
- Protection of manufactures, started, 278; Jackson's course, 284; and Webster, 325; history of, 329; references, 330. *See* Tariffs.
- Prussia, J. Q. Adams in, 525; her position in Europe, 7; her finances, 8; ordinance on commerce, 86; convention with Russia, 86; treaty with, 461, 504.
- Pruyn, J. V. L., 571.
- Public domain of the U. S., 533. *See* Public lands.
- Public lands of the U. S., 294, 533; laws, 533; *Report of the land com.*, 533.
- Puebla, 411.
- Pulaski, Casimir de, autog. and seal, 36; portrait, 36.
- Pulteney, Wm., *Thoughts on the present state of affairs*, 51.
- Pulteney, Sir Wm., 533.
- Pulteney estate (N. Y.), 533.
- Put-in-bay, 392, 433.
- Putnam, A. W., *Middle Tennessee*, 447, 530.
- Putnam, Gen. Israel, in command in Philadelphia, 15.
- Putnam, Gen. Rufus, 172; treats with the Indians, 452; prominent in the Western settlements, 528, 534; portrait, 528, 536; correspondence, 528; *Life* by Cone, 536; surveys of Marietta, 540; map of Ohio, 544; his interview with Daniel Shays, 231.
- QUAKERS, refuse paper bills, 15; attitude towards the Amer. Rev. 192.
- Quallah Batoo, 439.
- Queen's Rangers, 196.
- Queenstown, position of, 383; battle, 384, 459.
- Quincy, Edmund, *Josiah Quincy*, 313.
- Quincy, Josiah (the Federalist), 186, 313; in Congress, 272; his relations with Randolph, 317; leads the Federalists, 337; opposes the embargo, 340, 523; pitted with Clay in debate, 342; *Life of J. Q. Adams*, 313, 347; painted at J. Q. Adams's defection, 523; speeches, 523; his picture of Washington, 571.
- Quincy, Josiah (the younger), *Figures of the Past*, 314.
- Quincy, Samuel, autog., 200; in London, 200.
- Quitman, Gen., 442; in Mexico, 412; life by Claiborne, 442.
- RABUN, Gov., 436.
- Radière employed, 34.
- Rae, W. P., *Wives, etc.*, 106.
- Rainsford, Col., his letters on the Hessians, 23.
- Raisin, river, massacre, 387, 431, 455.
- Ralfe, J., *Naval Chronology*, 423.
- Rambouillet Decree, 276.
- Rammage, John, 574.
- Ramsay, David, *Washington*, 300; *Cession of Louisiana*, 547; *United States*, 422.
- Ramsey, Alb. C., 443.
- Ramsey, James, controversy with Fitch, 536; *Short Treatise*, 536; *A Plan*, 536.
- Ramsey, John, 530.
- Ramsey, J. G. M., 528; *Tennessee*, 530.
- Ranck, Geo. W., *Lexington, Ky.*, 541.
- Randolph, Beverly, treats with Indians, 452.
- Randolph, Edmund, Sec. of State, 466; instructions as to Jay's treaty, 467; the Fauchet despatch, 517; his *Vindication*, 517.
- Randolph, John (of Roanoke), 272; his duel, 282; his character, 317; lives, 317; portraits, 317; domestic life, 317; his sanity, 317; opposes the Republicans, 337; during Monroe's administration, 344; his death, 344; in J. Q. Adams's administration, 348; in Jackson's time, 349; on impressment, 521; on non-importation, 521; on Russia, 525; opposes Yazoo claims, 534.
- Randolph, Miss S. N., *Domestic Life of Jefferson*, 306; on the Resolutions of 1798, 320; *Thomas J. Jackson*, 443.
- Randolph, T. J., *Jefferson*, 303.
- Rantoul, R. S., 337, 339.
- Rapalye, *Fed. Ref. Digest*, 261.
- Ratford, Jenkin, 522.
- Rattermann, H. A., 78.
- Raumer, F. von, 301; *Geschichte aus dem brit. und französischen Staatsarchiv*, 80.
- Rawle, Wm., 571; *View of the Constitution*, 260.
- Rawle, W. H., on John Marshall, 313.
- Raymond, D., *Const. Law*, 263.
- Raynal, Abbé, *L'Espion*, 76; *Two Indies*, 121; *Hist. Philosophique*, 184.
- Rayner, B. L., *Jefferson*, 303.
- Rayneval, Gérard, in the peace negotiations, 118; his mission to England, 122, 123, 133; his account of it, 126, 128; his narrative of his mission, 168; his instructions, 168.
- Rector and Roberdeau's map, 558.
- Red Jacket, accounts of, 447; portraits, 447; speeches, 447; his remains, 447.
- Red Lake, 529, 542.
- Red River country, 557.
- Red-line map, 180.
- Redmond, Wm., 386.
- Redstone, old Fort, 456.
- Reed, Sir E. J., *Naval War of 1812*, 424.
- Reed, Henry, *Const. of 1787, etc.*, 264.
- Reed, Jos., receives letter from Lord Howe, 12; bribed by Johnstone, 51; *Remarks on Johnstone's Speech*, 51; on Continental money, 69.
- Reed, W. B., on R. Morris, 82.
- Reeve, Henry, 264.
- Réfugiés during the Amer. Rev., 200. *See* Loyalists.
- Reid, Maj. John, 436.
- Reid, Capt. S. C., at Fayal, 426; *Attack on the "Gen. Armstrong"*, 426.
- Reid, S. C., *Scouting Expeditions*, 442.
- Reigart, J. F., *Fulton*, 425.
- Reilly, A. R., 560.
- Removal of the deposits, 285, 351.
- Rendon, letters, 54.
- Renwick, James, *Hamilton*, 308; *Robert Fulton*, 425.
- Republican party (Democrats), under Jefferson, 268, 310; its policy, 272, 514; are called Democrats, 278; divisions, 282; leading members, 315; and the whiskey insurrection, 330; favor France, 465, 514; so called, in 1855, 282, 288.
- Resaca de la Palma, 408, 442.
- Restigouche River, 174.
- Reveille, *The*, 77.
- Revere, Lieut. Jos. W., *Tour of Duty*, 444; *Keel and Saddle*, 440, 444.
- Revolution, war debt of the, 329. *See* American Revolution.
- Revue des deux Mondes*, 337.
- Reynolds, Sir Joshua, his likenesses of Fox, 97; engraved works, 97.
- Reynolds, J. G., on the marine corps in Mexico, 442.
- Reynolds, J. N., *Voyage of the Potosiac*, 439.
- Rhind, Chas., 508.
- Rhode Island, defeats measures for an impost, 15; paper currency, 81, 235, 236; Tories in, 187; embarrases the Confederation, 217; refuses to join in the Federal Convention, 231; adopts the Constitution, 251, 259; her opposition, 259; Washington in, 328; Dorr rebellion, 355; her character, 355; proposed Constitution, 355; opposed to Virginia's claim to Western land, 527.
- Riall, Gen., 394.
- Rice, Harvey, *Pioneers of the W. Reserve*, 534.
- Rice, John, 530.
- Richard, G. H., *Alex. Macomb*, 434.
- Richards, W. C., *Geo. N. Briggs*, 350.
- Richardson, C. H., 571.
- Richardson, John, *War of 1812*, 427.
- Richardson, Wm. H., *Journal*, 445.
- Richman, T. C., *Thomas Paine*, 338.
- Richmond, Dean, 283.
- Richmond, Duke of, 96; answers Chat-ham, 52.
- Riddle, A. G., 430.
- Rider, S. S., 81; on the Dorr war, 355.
- Ridge, *Map of N. Amer.*, 175; *Map of Brit. Dominions*, 182.
- Ridley, Matthew, his papers, 73.
- Ridley, W., 569.
- Riedesel, Baron F. A., accounts of, 75.
- Riedesel, Baroness, *Berufs-Reise*, 75.
- Rietmüller, C. J., *Hamilton*, 308.
- Right of search, British claim, 494.
- Ripley, Gen. E. W., 394; medal, 459; on the Niagara frontier, 459.
- Ripley, Gen. R. S., *War with Mexico*, 441, 508.
- Ripon, Earl, 488.
- Ritchie, A. H., 570, 572.
- Rivardi, 358.
- River, F. R., 569.
- River of the West (Columbia River), 556.
- Rivers, H., *Maritime Scraps*, 417.
- Rives, J. C., 295.
- Rives, W. C., 496; *Madison*, 307, 315.
- Rivington, Jas., 186; his printing-office destroyed, 180.
- Robarts, W. H., *Mexican War Veterans*, 441.
- Roberts, Edmund, 508; his *Embassy*, 508.
- Roberts, E. H., *New York*, 348.
- Roberts, W. C., *Leading Orators*, 298.
- Robertson, Archibald, portrait of Washington, 574, 582.
- Robertson, C. F., on Burr's conspiracy, 340; *Acquisition of the Valley of the Mississippi*, 546; *Attempts to separate the West*, 546; *Louisiana Purchase*, 547.
- Robertson, David, 259, 339.
- Robertson, Gilbert, 571.
- Robertson, Gen. James, *Times of*, 447.
- Robertson, W., *Oregon*, 557.
- Robertson, Walter, 574.
- Robertson, Wm. (England), on the ministerial side, 16.
- Robertson, Wyndham, *Oregon*, 562.
- Robin, Augustus, 573.
- Robin, C., *Voyage*, 550.
- Robinson, Chas. Fred., 488.
- Robinson, Fayette, *Organization of Army*, 441.
- Robinson, Hon. J. Beverly, 214.
- Robinson, J. S., *Journal*, 445.
- Rochambeau, painted by R. Peale, 568.
- Roche, Maj. de la, 578.

- Roche de Bœuf, 454.
 Rochefontaine, 358.
 Rochester, N. Y., 533.
 Rockingham, Lord, would let America go, 51; succeeds Lord North, 96; portraits, 96; references on his ministry, 96; caricature, 98; his character, 100; dies, 105; reforms of his ministry, 106.
 Rockwell, Rev. Chas., *Foreign travel*, 417.
 Rocky Mountains, early names of, 558.
 Rodenbough, T. F., *From Everglade to Cañon*, 440.
 Rodgers, John, on a prize, 364; before Tripoli, 370; succeeds Barron, 375; makes a treaty with Tripoli, 375; in war of 1812, 379; court-martial, 522.
 Rodney, C. A., 501.
 Rodney, defeats De Grasse, 102, 130; ordered to capture St. Eustatius, 68.
 Rogers, Edmund L., 568, 571, 574.
 Rogers, F. Law, 571.
 Rogers, Robert, and the Queen's Rangers, 196; his career, 196.
 Romanzoff, 510.
 Roos, Fitzgerald de, *Travels*, 439.
 Roosevelt, Theo., *Gouv. Morris*, 313; *Ben-ton*, 324; *Naval War of 1812*, 424.
 Ropes, John C., 36.
 Rosario straits, 500.
 Rose, minister to U. S., 482, 522.
Rose Correspondence, 52.
 Rosengarten, J. G., *German Soldiers*, etc., 75.
 Rosenthal, *America and France*, 260, 514.
 Ross, Alex., *Adventures*, 559; *Fur Hunters*, 559.
 Ross, Gen., in the Chesapeake, 400; killed, 403.
 Rothermell, P. F., 572.
 Rouge, Sieur le, *Théâtre de la Guerre*, 183.
 Rouquette, A. E., 437.
 Rous, Sir John, 96.
 Rouse's Point, map of, 178.
 Rousseau, *Social Contract*, 1.
 Royal, *Jackon and the Bank*, 532.
 Royalists. See Loyalists.
 Royce, Josiah, *California*, 444.
 Ruggles, Col. Tim., 196.
 Rulhière, *Comte de Vergennes*, 4.
 Rumford, Count. See Thompson, Benj.
 Ruschenberger, W. S. W., *Notes and Commentaries*, 417.
 Rush, Benj., 525.
 Rush, Richard, 283, 296; *Domestic Life of Washington*, 301; on the capture of Washington, 435; in London, 489; *Court of London*, 525; various eds., 525; diplom. papers, 525.
 Rush, Wm., his statue of Washington, 579.
 Russel, Wm., *Hist. America*, 582.
 Russell, A. P., *Characteristics*, 317.
 Russell, Maj. Benj., report of Mass. Const. Convention, 258; *Columbian Centinel*, 314.
 Russell, J., map, in Winterbotham, 175, 557.
 Russell, J., *Hist. of the War*, 420.
 Russell, Jona., in London, 483; commissioner, 484; corresponds with Castlereagh, 522.
 Russell, Lord John (later earl), *Memoirs and Life of Fox*, 106.
 Russia, her position in Europe, 6; offers mediation, 55, 92, 483; treaties with Great Britain, 83; declaration, (1779), 85; of Armed Neutrality (1780), 85; memorial to Netherlands, 85; ordinance on merchantmen, 85; explains to Sweden, 85; convention with Denmark, 85; with Sweden, 85; with Prussia, 86; treaty with the Empire (1781), 86; excites Vergennes's fears (1782), 101; treaty with U. S., 510, 511; bounds, 510; J. Q. Adams in, 525; John Randolph in, 525; Jas. Buchanan in, 525; treaty with U. S. regarding the N. W. coast, 559; with England, 559. See Catherine II.
 Russian-American Trading Company, 510.
 Rutgers, Col. H., 571.
 Rutledge, Edw., meets Lord Howe, 12.
 Rutledge, John, portrait, 241; life in Flanders' Chief Justices, 261; offers neutrality, 189.
 Ryerson, A. E., *Loyalists of America*, 213.
 SEBASTIANI, HORACE, 496.
 Sabine, Lorenzo, 458; *Amer. Loyalists*, 214; *Duelling*, 308; *Life of Edw., Preble*, 417, 419.
 Sachsen Weimar-Eisenach, Duke of, *Keese*, 346.
 Sacketts Harbor, 388; attacked, 389, 458.
 Sacs and Foxes, war with, 406. See Blackhawk.
 Sadd, H. S., 570.
 Safford, W. H., *Blennerhassett*, 338.
 Sagadahock, 170.
 Sage, Bernard J., *Republic of Republics*, 263.
 Saginaw, treaty, 454.
 St. Augustine, 499.
 St. Clair, Arthur, on the infractions of the treaty by Great Britain, 218; made major-general, 357; speech at Marietta, 536; favors ord. of 1787, 539; gov. of N. W. territory, 539; his treaty at Fort Harmar, 449; map of his defeat, 450; sources, 451; urges increase of army, 451; his *Observations*, 451; *Narrative*, 451; his papers, 451; *St. Clair Papers*, 451.
 St. Clair, Matthew, *Land Latas*, 534.
 St. Croix River, chosen in 1782 as the bounds of Maine, 138; controversy over its identity, 171; monument on, 172.
 St. Domingo to be repossessed, 55.
 St. Eustatius, 64.
 St. Helens, Lord. See Fitzherbert.
 St. John, N. B., loyalists, 213.
 St. John River (New Brunswick) held to be the western bounds of Acadia, 171.
 St. Joseph mission, 455.
 St. Lawrence River, islands in, divided between United States and Canada, 176.
 St. Louis, its relations to Louisiana, 559.
 St. Louis River (Lake Superior), 180.
 St. Mary's, treaty of, 454.
 St. Mary's River, Florida, 543.
 St. Matthew, J. H., on the Oregon question, 562.
 St. Memin, J. F. de, his portraits, 578; his drawings, 578.
 St. Pierre, island, 3.
 St. Regis, 458; captured, 385.
 Sainte-Beuve on Jefferson, 307.
 Salazar, 503.
 Salem, Mass., forts, 458.
 Salmon, Lucy M., 297.
 Salt, a government monopoly in Spain, 6.
 Salt Lake basin, 558.
 Sallilo, 410.
 San Antonio, 411.
 San Diego, Kearny at, 410.
 San Gabriel, 410.
 San Jacinto, 551.
 San José, 446.
 San Juan d'Ulloa, 411.
 San Juan, boundary question, 560; map of, 560.
 San Pasqual campaign, 410, 444.
 San Pedro, 410.
 San Salvador, 504.
 Sandusky, 545.
 Sandwich, Earl of, portrait, 62; caricature, 98.
 Sanger, Geo. P., 296.
 Santa Anna, Gen., 409; made President of Mexico, 411; in the Mexican war, 442; *Apelacion al Buen Criterio de los Nacionales y Estrangeros*, 443.
 Santa Fé, Kearny at, 409; Col. Price at, 444; traders, 553.
 Sargeant, John, 503.
 Sargent, Ignatius, 570.
 Sargent, L. M., *Samuel Dexter*, 313; *Dealings with the Dead*, 326, 522.
 Sargent, Nathan, *Public Men*, 299, 345.
 Sargent, Lieut. Nathan, 456.
 Sargent, Winthrop (writer), *Stansbury and Odell*, 13, 51, 186; edited *Loyalist verses*, 186.
 Sargent, Col. Winthrop, diary, 451; and the Ohio Co., 534.
 Sartain, John, 566, 507.
 Sato, Shosuke, *Land Question in the U. S.*, 533.
 Saussure, H. W. de, 568.
 Savage, Edw., his portraits of Washington, 573; "The Washington Family," 574; his pictures popular, 574.
 Savage, James, recoll. of the Mass. Fed. Convention, 258.
Savannah Georgian, 256.
 Sawtell, *Townshend*, 231.
 Saxony, treaty, 512.
 Sayer, Robt., 183.
 Sayer and Bennett, *American Atlas*, 183.
 Sayles, F. C., 574.
 Sayre, Stephen, papers, 80.
 Scammon, E. P., 442.
 Schaff, Philip, on the Constitution and religious liberty, 258.
 Scheffer, Ary, likeness of Lafayette, 59.
 Scheither, Lt.-Col., 18.
 Schell, F. B., 574.
 Schiller, F., *Kabale und Liebe*, 77.
 Schimmelfennig, 511.
 Schlieffen, M. E. von, 21; *Des Hessois en Amérique*, 76; *Einige Betreffnisse*, 76.
 Schlitter, Hans, *Die Beziehungen Oesterreichs zu den Vereinigten Staaten*, 78.
 Schlözer, Aug. L., *Briefwechsel*, 75.
 Schoell, F., 83.
 Schoodic lakes, 173.
 Schoolcraft, H. R., *Travels through the N. W. Regions*, 553; *Exped. through the Upper Mississippi*, 553; *Summary Narrative*, 553.
 Schöpf, J. D., *Keese*, 529.
 Schöpf, surgeon, letters, 75.
 Schouler, James, on the Confederation period, 221; on Washington, 302; on Hamilton, 308; on Lafayette's tour, 344; *United States*, 414.
 Schroeder, Francis, *Shores of the Mediterranean*, 417; *Washington*, 301.
 Schucker, J. W., *Finances of the Rev.*, 81.
 Schulenberg, Baron, 42; letters, 81.
 Schurz, Carl, *Henry Clay*, 299, 324, 521.
 Schuyler, Eugene, *Amer. Diplomacy*, 513.
 Schwedeaner, Dr. F., 38.
 Scioto Company, 535; map of its territory, 532; their purchase, 535; their agencies in France, 535; advertisements, 535.
 Scioto River, 544.
 Scott, Austin, on New Jersey in the Fed. Conv., 258.
 Scott, James, *Recollections*, 424.
 Scott, Jos., *United States Gazetteer*, 175, 542.
 Scott, Nancy N., 349.
 Scott, Gen. Winfield, sent to pacify opposing parties on the N. E. boundary line, 177; at Fort Niagara, 389; portrait, 297, 389; on the Niagara frontier (1814), 394, 459; commands Eastern division, 407; in the Mex-

- ican war, 411, 442; his *Memoirs*, 442; lives of, 427.
- Scott, W. M., 261.
- Scribner, B. F., *Campaign in Mexico*, 442.
- Scudder, H. E., *Noah Webster*, 314; *Hist. U. S.*, 552.
- Sears, Isaac, 189.
- Sears, Mrs. Morton, 577.
- Seaton, W. W., 294.
- Secession, 319; in New England, 320, 321.
- Sedgwick, Theodore, on the Tories, 207; *Stat. and Const. Law*, 263; prefaces Leggett's *Writings*, 350; *Annexation of Texas*, 551.
- Ségur, Comte de, *Mémoires*, 4, 41, 79.
- Selfridge, T. O., 318; trial, 319.
- Sellar, Robt., *County of Huntingdon*, 427.
- Seminoles, war with, Eaton's acc. of, 349; refuse to be removed, 406; war (1817), 406; ends (1842), 408; documentary sources, 413, 438, 439; maps, 440; bloodhounds in, 440.
- Semmes, Raphael, *Service Afloat*, 443; *Gen. Scott in the Valley of Mexico*, 444.
- Senate of the U. S., sat with closed doors, 295; *Journals*, 295; debates, 295.
- Senecas, treaty, 447. *See* Six Nations.
- Senegal, 55.
- Séraent, A. F., 576.
- Sergeant, John (Penna.), 284.
- Sergeant, Thos., *Const. Law*, 263.
- Seume, Johann G., in America, 78; *Mein Leben*, 78; *Werke*, 78.
- Sever, naval captain, 360.
- Sevier, A. H., 507.
- Sevier, John, relations with the Creeks, 447; and the statue of Franklin, 530.
- Sewall, Jona., 186.
- Seward, W. H., 284; *Autobiog.*, 299, 351; on the Federalists, 309; *John Q. Adams*, 347; *Works*, 355.
- Seybert, Adam, *Statistical Annals*, 329.
- Shaler, N. S., *Kentucky*, 541.
- Shannon, Geo., 558.
- Sharpless, Mrs. Elizabeth, portrait of Washington, 575, 577.
- Sharpless, James, his portraits of Washington, 575, 577; alleged pictures, 575.
- Sharswood, G., 296.
- Sharswood, ed. of Blackstone, 265.
- Shattuck, *Concord*, 231.
- Shawnees, treaty, 450; *History of*, 450.
- Shays, Daniel, 229; his rebellion, 227, 229; references, 230, 231.
- Shea, J. G., edits *Catholic Address to Washington*, 574.
- Sheafe, Gen., 385, 459; at York, 389.
- Sheffield, Lord, *Commerce of the Amer. States*, 233.
- Sheffield, W. P., *Privateersmen of Newport*, 426; on statue of Perry, 433.
- Shelburne, Lord, seeking (1782) German mercenaries, 24; home sec., 97; his character, 99; caricature, 98; likeness, 99; sends Laurens to Holland, 100; Oswald to Paris, 100, 101; and the loyalists, 101; organizes ministry, 105; opposed to independence, 105; changes his ground, 106; succeeds Rockingham, 111; attacked by Fox, 111; visited by Rayneval, 122, 124; receives Vaughan, 124; gives new commission to Oswald, 126; sends Strachey to join Oswald, 131; would protect the loyalists, 131; expected attacks in Parliament, 132; his distrust of France, 149; attacked for the treaty, 159; resignations in his ministry, 159; defends the treaty, 161; resigns, 162; his papers, 165; autog., 205.
- Shelby, Isaac, his medal, 432.
- Shepard, Gen. Wm., 536.
- Sheridan, R. B., denounces the treaty of 1782, 160.
- Sherman, J., 534.
- Sherman, Roger, MS. on paper money, 81; protests against John Adams's *Constitutions*, 260.
- Sherman, Roger M., 322.
- Sherman, Gen. W. T., *Memoirs*, 446.
- Sherwood, Capt. Justus, 188.
- Shields, Gen., in Mexico, 442.
- Shields, J. D., S. S. *Frontiss*, 354.
- Shielding Mountains. *See* Rocky Mountains.
- Shippin, Edw., 572.
- Shippin, Jos., 572.
- Shoemaker, Samuel, 202.
- Shoemaker, S. M., 572.
- Shorey, Paul, 264.
- Short, John T., 537.
- Shoulderbone, treaty at, 446.
- Shubrick, Com., in the Pacific, 410.
- Siam, treaty, 508.
- Sibley, J., on Lewis and Clarke's expedition, 557.
- Simcoe, Gen. J. G., journal in Canada, 196, 197, 427; commands the Queen's Rangers, 196.
- Simitière, E. P. du, profiles of Washington, 575; *Thirteen Portraits*, 575; *Heads of Illustrious Americans*, 575.
- Simolin, Dutch ambassador, 100.
- Simpson, Alex., *The Oregon territory*, 562.
- Simpson, John, 571.
- Simsbury, Conn., prison-mine, 88, 189.
- Six Nations, bounds of, at the close of the Rev. War, 447; cede lands at Fort Schuyler, 447; treaty at Fort Hammar, 450. *See* names of the several tribes.
- Skinner, Gen., New Jersey Tory brigade, 198.
- Skinner, Orrin, *American Politics*, 298.
- Skottow, B. C., *Short Hist. of Parliament*, 166.
- Slade, Wm., *Vermont State Papers*, 188.
- Slave-trade, 292; and the Constitution, 243; abolished, 325, 439, 487, 492; declared piracy, 493.
- Slavery in American politics, 279, 293; its system compared with the free system, 280; its supporters and opposers, 323; bibliog., 323; collections of books on, 323; debates in Congress, 324; compromises of the Constitution, 325; in Massachusetts, 326.
- Slaymaker, Amos, 574.
- Sloat, Com., on the California coast, 410, 445.
- Smith, Ashbel, *Texas Republic*, 551.
- Smith, Aaron, *The Pirates*, 439.
- Smith, Gen. Benj., 571.
- Smith, Benj. G., 575, 578.
- Smith, C. A., 566.
- Smith, C. C., on Sabine's *Loyalists*, 214.
- Smith, Edw., *Wm. Cobbett*, 315.
- Smith, Gerrit, 288, 326.
- Smith, Goldwin, on the American Statesmen series, 298.
- Smith, H. W. (Philad.), *Andreana*, 566.
- Smith, H. W., engraver, 571.
- Smith, Jeremiah, *Life*, 313.
- Smith, John, his connection with the Burr conspiracy, 340.
- Smith, John R., 575.
- Smith, J. S., *De Kalb*, 78.
- Smith, Meriwether, 89; *Narrative*, 426.
- Smith, Robt., 341; *Address to the People*, 341; Sec. of State, 522.
- Smith, Seba, *Maj. Jack Downing*, 340.
- Smith, Wm. (So. Carolina), 283.
- Smith, Wm. (Tory), 190.
- Smith, Wm. (Alabama), 288.
- Smith, W. H., *Charles Hammond*, 324.
- Smith, W. H., edits *St. Clair Papers*, 451.
- Smith, W. L., *American Arguments*, 521.
- Smith, W. L. G., *Lewis Cass*, 429.
- Smith, Pittsfield, 231.
- Smucker, Isaac, 543; on the South-western territory, 530; on the Zane family, 536; on the government of the N. W. territory, 539.
- Smucker, S. M., *Hamilton*, 308; *Webster*, 325.
- Smyth, Gen. Alex., 385.
- Smyth, Wm., *Lectures*, 299.
- Snellings, Capt. Josiah, *Remarks*, 429.
- Snowden, J. R., *Cornplanter Memorial*, 447; *Medals of Washington*, 582.
- Soley, James Russell, "The Wars of the United States," 357; *Autobiog. of Chat. Morris*, 417; *Mediterranean Squadron*, 419; on the frigate actions in the war of 1812, 425; *U. S. Naval Acad.*, 460.
- Solins, Count de, 573.
- Somers, Richard, 373.
- Sons of Liberty, 191.
- Soule, C. C., *Lawyer's Reference Manual*, 261.
- South Carolina, Tories, 190; adopted the Constitution, 249; her Const. Convention, 258; *Debates*, 258; nullification ordinance, 257, 286, 322; Indians in, 448; cession of lands, 539, 534.
- Southern Bivouac*, 320.
- Spain, her condition, 5; taxes in, 6; population, 6; hostile to England, 26; would send money to America, 26; offers made to, by Franklin, 41; Arthur Lee in Spain, 42; the government non-committal, 42; refuses to join France in the alliance with America, 53; signs treaty with France (1779), 54; references on the diplomatic relations, 54; *Exposé des motifs de la conduite de sa Majesté tres-chrétienne*, 54; answered by Gibbon, 54; declares war against England, 55; must have Pensacola and the Mississippi, 55; loans to America, 71; treaties with France (family compact), 83; declaration about French commerce, 84; alliance with France (1779), 85; declares war with England (1779), 85; rules for privateers, 85; for neutrals, 85; answers Russian declaration of neutrality, 85; swans to Denmark, 86; preliminary treaty with Gt. Britain (1783), 87; peace of Versailles, 87; desirous of Gibraltar, 90; promises money to U. S., 91; would deny independence to the U. S., 114, 148; would restrict her boundaries, 118; refuses to recognize the independence of the U. S., 127, 128; later mission of Gardoqui, 128; her demands of England, 131; her wish to carry on the war till her purposes were secured, 146; her agreement with France, 148; must lower her terms for peace, 152; treaty with France (1779), 170; her claims of territory shown in a copy of Mitchell's map, 223; negotiations with (1790), 476, 477; treaty (1802), 477; not ratified by the king, 497; diplomatic relations suspended, 498; resumed, 498; treaty ratified, 498; treaty of 1819, 499; wishes the U. S. not to recognize the independence of her South American colonies, 499; damages American commerce, 501; relations of the U. S. with her American colonies, 501; intrigues to secure the Mississippi Valley, 530, 540, 541; cedes Florida, 546; her claim to Oregon, 555; cedes her rights to the U. S., 559; relations with the Creeks, 446. *See* Blanca, Florida.
- Spalding, R. P., *Oration*, 433.

- Sparks, Jared, his MS. collections, 73; on diplomacy, 73; his library, 73; works ed. by, 73; intended to write a history of the diplom. of the Rev., 74; *Dipl. Corres. of Rev.*, 82; uses government publication to enforce his views, 170; his views on Vergennes and the treaty of 1782-83, 170; and the red-line map, 180; on the Constitution, 263; *Washington*, 300; on Washington's ancestry, 302; *Gouverneur Morris*, 312; at the burning of Havre de Grace, 426.
- Spaulding, M. C., *Handbook*, 297.
- Spaulding, M. J., *Cath. Missions of Kentucky*, 541.
- Specie circular, 289.
- Spectateur Militaire*, 442.
- Spence, James, *Amer. Union*, 260.
- Spencer, Herbert, his theory of government, 268.
- Spofford, A. R., *American Almanac*, 294; *Founding of Washington*, 330.
- Spoils system, 351.
- Sprague, John T., *Florida War*, 440.
- Sprague, Peleg, 323, 351; *Speeches*, 177, 524.
- Sprague, Wm. B., 36.
- Squatter sovereignty, 293.
- Stadnitski, P., *Voorsafgaand Bericht*, 533.
- Stage-coach, picture of, 339.
- Stanhope, *Life of Pitt*, 111.
- Stansbury, Gen., on the capture of Washington, 434.
- Stansbury, Joseph, his verses, 186.
- Stansbury, P., *Pedestrian Tour*, 384.
- Stanwood, Edw., *Presidential Elections*, 297; on impressions, 342.
- Staphorst, I. G. von, 575.
- Staples, H. B., *Names of States*, 555.
- Stapleton, E. J., *Official Corresp. of Geo. Canning*, 559; *Polit. Life of Canning*, 525, 559; *Canning and his Times*, 521.
- State sovereignty, 271, 278; as defined by Calhoun, 286.
- Staten Island, interview of Howe and Franklin on, 12, 13.
- State's rights, 271, 323; distinct from nullification, 323.
- Steam war-vessels, early, 460.
- Steamboat, invented, 273; prediction of, 536; earliest, 536; *The Original Steamboat*, 536.
- Stebbins, D., 231.
- Stephen, J., *War in Disguise*, 521.
- Stephens, A. H., 355; *Constitutional View of the late War*, 262; *War between the States*, 324.
- Stephens, J. W., *Algiers*, 418.
- Sterne, Simon, *Const. Hist.*, 264.
- Sterrett, Lieut., 370.
- Steuben, Baron, Washington upon, 34; his reasons for coming to America, 35; his oath and autog., 36; portrait, 36; *Letter on a Militia*, 218; life by Kapp, 78.
- Stevens, B. F., his catalogue of papers, 73; his copies of documents relating to the treaty of 1782-83, 165.
- Stevens, Henry, *James Lenox*, 333.
- Stevens, Isaac I., *Campaigns of the Rio Grande*, 441.
- Stevens, J. A., on the N. Y. Convention to adopt the Const., 259; *Galatin*, 316.
- Stevens, Jas. Henry, 576.
- Stevenson, James, 342, 458.
- Stewart, And., *Chesapeake and Ohio Canal*, 531.
- Stewart, Com. Chas., acc. of, 418; portrait, 404; medal, 404; in the "Constitution," 458.
- Stewart, C. S., *Visit to the South Seas*, 417.
- Stickney, *Amos Kendall*, 349.
- Stiles, H. R., on the prison-ships, 88.
- Stillé, Chas. J., *Beaumarchais and the lost million*, 33, 80.
- Stockton, Com. Robert F., in California, 410, 444, 446; life, 417; his *Despatches*, 446; accounts of, 446.
- Stockton, S. W., "Areas of the U. S.," 552.
- Stoddard, Amos, *Louisiana*, 550.
- Stodert, Benj., Sec. of Navy, 362.
- Stoode, Dr. E. M., 536.
- Stone, W. L. (the elder), *Red Jacket*, 447.
- Stone, W. L. (the younger), translates life of Riedesel, 75; edits Pausch, 75.
- Stonington, Conn., forts, 458.
- Stony Mountains, 557. See Rocky Mountains.
- Stormont, Lord, 64; in Paris, 41; his correspondence with his gov't, 41; portrait, 41; recalled from Paris, 49; exchanges prisoners, 87.
- Story, Joseph, life by W. W. Story, 261; *Commentaries*, 262; *Familiar Exposition*, 262; edits *Statutes U. S.*, 296; on Sam. Dexter, 313; *Misc. Writings*, 313; on Wm. Pinkney, 317; an abolitionist, 326; letters from Washington, 350; eulogy on Capt. Lawrence, 457; on the Ord. of 1787, 538.
- Story, W. W., *Life of Joseph Story*, 261; owns Houdon's mask of Washington, 572.
- Strachan, John, 435.
- Strachey, Henry, sec. of the commissioners (1776), 13; sent to Paris, 131; his instructions, 131, 132; his urgent efforts in the negotiations, 139.
- Strieder, *Grundlage zu einer Hessischen Gelehrten*, 78.
- Strong, Caleb, 313; his papers, 322.
- Strong, M. M., *Wisconsin*, 543.
- Stryker, Gen. W. S., *New Jersey Volunteers*, 198; *Washington's reception in N. Y.*, 328.
- Stuart, A., *Succinct Acc., etc.*, 182.
- Stuart, Gilbert, paints portraits of John Jay, 91, 312; Jefferson, 305; Fisher Ames, 311; James Sullivan, 319; Madison, 341; Mrs. Madison, 342; Decatur, 372; Isaac Hull, 378; Bainbridge, 380; Henry Dearborn, 385; James Lawrence, 386; Isaac Chauncey, 388; O. H. Perry, 391; Macdonough, 397; his likenesses of Washington, 569-572; usually in civic dress, 569; used in medals, 569; his first picture of W., 569; the "Gibbs" picture, 569; the "Lansdowne" and the "Boston Athenæum" head, 569, 570; his half-lengths, 570; "Tea-pot" picture, 570; "W. at Dorchester Heights," 570; "Pitcher" portrait, 570; engravings, 572.
- Stuart, James, *Three Years in N. Amer.*, 175.
- Stuart, Jane, on her father's portraits of Washington, 569.
- Sturgis, Jas., 572.
- Sturgis, Russell, 572.
- Sturgis, Wm., *Oregon Question*, 562.
- Sub-Treasury system, 289, 353.
- Suffolk, Earl of, Sec. of State, 18; tries to get German troops, 18.
- Sufford, Lord, 64.
- Sullivan, George, 342.
- Sullivan, Gov. James, 173, 319; controversy with Pickering, 340; life by T. C. Amory, 177, 318; *Government of the U. S.*, 260, 318; *Altar of Baal*, 318; portrait, 319; on Mass. lands in N. Y., 533.
- Sullivan, Gen. John, in Congress, 92; subservient to Luzerne, 93; sent to Congress by Gen. Howe, 12.
- Sullivan, J. T. S., 305.
- Sullivan, Wm., 314; *Familiar Letters*, 304; *Public Men*, 304.
- Sully, Thomas, 571; paints Decatur, 372; Jackson, 437.
- Sumner, Chas., 323, on the N. E. boundary, 178; on Washington's ancestry, 302; opposes Mexican war, 355.
- Sumner, Geo., *Fourth of July Oration*, 33.
- Sumner, W. G., on party politics, 298; *Hist. of Protection*, 330; *Andrew Jackson*, 349; *American Currency*, 353.
- Surplus revenue, 289.
- Swaine, Gov., of N. C., 198.
- Sweden, treaty with the United States, 87, 461; ordinance on commerce, 84; declaration to England and France, 85; asks explanation of Russia, 85; convention with Russia, 85; accedes to convention (1780), 86; memorial to Russia, 86.
- Sweet, M. A., 570.
- Swiss soldiers, in the French service, 166; offered for America, 35.
- Symmes, John Cleva, buys Ohio lands, 535.
- Symons, John, *Queenstown Heights*, 459.
- TABASCO, 411.
- Tache, Sir E. P., 458; *Bataille Navale du Lac Champlain*, 433.
- Taine, *Origines de la France Contemporaine*, 5; Jefferson, 307.
- Talbot, Silas, made captain, 360; in the "Constitution," 365; life, 418.
- Talladega, 436.
- Talleyrand - Périgord, Marquis de, *Etude*, 265; negotiations with American commissioners, 472.
- Tallmadge, Col. Benj., 577.
- Tallmadge, James, Jr., 438.
- Tallushatchee, 436.
- Tammany Hall, 283, 310.
- Tampa Bay, 407.
- Tampico, 411.
- Taney, R. B., 285; chief justice, 288; life of, 349.
- Tanguy de la Boissière, *Observations*, 578; *Situation commerciale de France*, 222.
- Tappan, Arthur, 326.
- Tariff (see Protection) of 1816, 345; of 1824, 345; of 1828, 286; of 1832, 286; of 1842, 290, 355; of 1846, 293; legislation, 329; history, 329; references, 329, 330; E. Young's Report, 329; in Monroe's time, 345; not to be regulated by treaty, 512.
- Tarver, M., 550.
- Tattall, Com. Josiah, life, 417; in the Mexican war, 444.
- Taussig, F. W., *Protection to Young Industries*, 278; *References on Tariff Legislation*, 330; *Tariff Hist. of the U. S.*, 330.
- Taylor, Col. John, 571.
- Taylor, F. W., *The Flagship*, 417; *Broad Pennant*, 444.
- Taylor, Geo., *Martyrs of the Rev.*, 88.
- Taylor, James W., Ohio, 536.
- Taylor, John, *Principles of U. S. Govt.*, 320.
- Taylor, Zachary, his defence of Fort Harrison, 430; President, 293, 297; defeats Indians at Okechobee, 407; in the Mexican war, 408, 442; lives of, 441; portraits, 441; medals, 441, 442; Mexican despatches, 442.
- Tazewell, L. W., 290.
- Tecumseh, his campaign (1811), 375; killed, 392, 432; acc. of, 427, 430; his speeches, 432, 454; stirred up war, 435; home of, 451; his plot, 454.
- Teeter H. B., 535.
- Tehuantepec, isthmus, rights over, 508.
- Temple, H. J., *Treaty of Washington*, 181.
- Temple, John, in America, 51.
- Tennessee, admitted, 280; created, 530; histories, 530; bounds of, 530.
- Tergiversations in politics, 299.
- Tétot, *Repertoires des Traités*, 74, 83.
- Texas Almanac*, 551.
- Texas, diplomatic relations, 505; independence recognized, 505, 551; first treaty of annexation not sanctioned, 506; annexed, 290, 506, 551; claimed by France and Spain, 550; rights of the U. S. acquired from France, 550;

- claim to, by U. S. abandoned (1819), 550; Mexico declined to sell, 550; Santa Anna's intrigue, 550; declared independent, 551; disputed bounds, 551; histories, 551; name of, 551 (see Samuel Houston); boundary disputes with U. S. after annexation, 553; maps, 553.
- Texas Scrap-book*, 551.
- Thacher, George, 516.
- Thacher, Oxenbridge, 186.
- Thacher, Thomas, on Sam. Adams, 318.
- Thames, battle of the, 392, 431, 455.
- Thatcher, B. B., *Ind. Biography*, 454.
- Theatre of the War in No. America*, 183.
- Thiers, *Le Consulat et l'Empire*, 80.
- Thomas, F. W., *Randolph*, 317.
- Thomas, Jos., 572.
- Thompson, B. F., *Long Island*, 190.
- Thompson, Benjamin, Count Rumford a Tory, 197; portrait, 197; *Life* by G. E. Ellis, 197; in London, 201.
- Thompson, David, *The late War*, 427.
- Thompson, J. L., *War of 1812*, 439.
- Thompson, L. O., *Presidents*, 298.
- Thompson, Waddy, 505.
- Thompson, Wm., 339.
- Thomson, Chas., autog., 167; his reports of debates, 168.
- Thomson, J. L., *The late War*, 422.
- Thorndike, Israel, 573.
- Thornton, Col., 404.
- Thornton, J. W., *Pulpit of Rev.*, 80.
- Thorpe, F. N., 221.
- Thorpe, Thos. B., *Our Army, on the Rio Grande*, 442; at *Monterey*, 442.
- Thrall, H. S., *Texas*, 551.
- Thurlow, Lord Chancellor, defends the treaty of 1782, 162.
- Thwaite, R. G., 543.
- Ticknor, Geo., visits Jefferson, 306; visits Madison, 315; on Webster, 325.
- Tiebout, Cornelius, 91, 572.
- Tilden, S. J., 306; *Public Writings*, 323.
- Tileston, E. G., *Administrations*, 297.
- Tilghman, Col., 566.
- Tilson, John, 535.
- Tingey, Capt., 364.
- Tiogua Point, treaty at, 447.
- Tippecanoe, fight at, 375, 455; sources, 454.
- Tobacco sent to France, 71.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de, *Democratie en Amerique*, 164.
- Todd, C. B., on Simsbury prison, 88; *Aaron Burr*, 316; *Reading, Conn.* 531; *Life of Barlow*, 531.
- Todd, W. C., 324.
- Tohopeka, fight at, 393, 436.
- Tomes, Robert, *Battles*, 422.
- Tomline, *Life of Pitt*, 111.
- Tompkins, D. D., Vice-President, 279; his papers, 428; memoir, 428.
- Tompkins, H. B., *Bibl. Jeffersoniana*, 393.
- Tories, estates confiscated, 15. See Loyalists.
- Toronto, 214. See York.
- Torpadoes, 413.
- Torrey, Henry W., on the text of the *Federalist*, 259.
- Toulmin, Henry, *Kentucky*, 542.
- Tousard, 358.
- Towle, N. C., *The Constitution*, 263.
- Townshend, Thomas, colonial secretary, 111.
- Tracy, Albert H., 347.
- Tracy, Uriah, *Scipio's Reflections*, 514.
- Travel by stage-coach, 339.
- Treat, Capt. Jos., *Vindication*, 459.
- Treaties, list of, concerning the Amer. Rev., 82; of commerce proposed (1784), 233; with Prussia, 233; with Morocco, 234; other treaties, 287, 296; of extradition, 292; with Indians, 296; with foreign powers, 461; with Great Britain (1783) not observed, 462; Jay's treaty, 467, 517; relations of the Ho. of Reps. to, 470, 518; with Spain, 476, 478; with France (1800), 519; St. Ildefonso, 488; with England (1803) rejected, 480; (1806) not sent to the Senate, 481, 519; of Ghent, 484; commercial treaty with England (1815), 488; of Washington (1842), 493, 525; of extradition, 493, 497; right of search abandoned, 493; with France (1822), 496, 525; (1831), 496, 519; with Spain (1819), 499; with Greece, 503; with Colombia, 504; with New Grenada, 504; with Cent. Amer. States, 504; with Chili, 504; Peru, 504; with Denmark, 504; Hanseatic League, 504; Prussia, 504; with Guatemala, 504; San Salvador, 504; Costa Rica, 504; Honduras, 504; Nicaragua, 504; with Mexico, 505; of Guadalupe Hidalgo, 507, 525; with Oriental powers, 508; with Turkey, 508; with China, 509; with Russia, 510; with Denmark, 511; with Hesse and Wurtemberg, 512; with Bavaria, 512; *Collection of Treaties*, 513; *Treaties and Conventions*, 514; *Digest of Internal Law*, 514; with the Indians, collections of, 446; of France and Spain (Apr. 12, 1779), 54; of 1782-83, one of "separation," 127, 147, 160; the first proposals, 129; effects of the relief of Gibraltar, 130; negotiations for bounds, 132 (see Boundaries); for paying debts, 132, 137; for fisheries (see Fishery Claims); the instructions of the commissioners, 134; the loyalist question, 138 (see Loyalists); preliminary articles, 141; new British instructions, 143; stipulation as to negroes, 144; treaty signed, 144; its articles, 144; separate article on Florida bounds, 145, 157, 158; West's picture, 145; skill of the American commissioners, 150; wars averted by it, 151; opinions of European diplomats, 152; discussed in Congress, 156, 168; Livingston's letter to the commissioners, 156; their reply, 157; their conduct criticised in Congress, 158; the articles attacked in Parliament, 159, 160, 161; defended by Townsend, 160; by Grafton, 161; by Shelburne, 161; called a "capitulation," 162; defended by Thurlow, 162; by Pitt, 162; debates in Parliament, 166, 209; commissions for the definitive treaty, 162; amendments refused, 163; negotiations for commercial reciprocity fail, 163, 164; the authority of Congress doubted, 163; definitive treaty signed, 164; facsimile of signatures, 164; territory secured, 165; sources of information on the negotiations, 165; Franklin's diary, 166; text of the treaty, 166; comments, 166; facsimile of the proclamation of the treaty, 167; list of medals on the peace, 167; treaty ratified by Congress, 168; by the king, 168; controversy over bounds, 172 (see Boundaries); provision as to carrying off slaves violated, 206; of 1842 (Webster and Ashburton), 170; vindicated by Webster, 170; with the Indians (1795), cession of land in the N. W. under, shown in map, 544-5; of Madrid (1795), 543; with Spain (1810), 546, 559; of Ildefonso, 547; bounds fixed by the treaty of 1819, 559; of Guadalupe Hidalgo, 552; with Great Britain (1782), bounds under, 554; (1842), as to bounds, 554; of 1846, as to Oregon, 560; to settle the San Juan boundary, 560. See names of treaties, of countries, and of Indian tribes.
- Tremenheere, H. S., *Const. of U. S.*, 266.
- Trenchard, I., 564.
- Trescot, Wm. H., *Diplom. of the Rev.*, 74; *Diplomatic Hist.*, 513; on the peace negotiations, 169.
- Trevet against Weedon, 236.
- Trimen, Richard, *British Army*, 425.
- Tripoli, her demands (1785) on the U. S., 234; treaty with, 361; described, 371; demands on the U. S., 368; Rodgers before, 370; Preble before, 371, 373, 418; treaty made, 375; war with, 418. See Barbary Powers.
- Trist, N. P., sent to Mexico, 412, 506.
- Trotter, J. B., *Latter Years of Fox*, 106.
- Troude, O., *Batailles Navales*, 418.
- Troup, Gov., of Georgia, 322.
- Truman, B. C., *Field of Honor*, 308.
- Trumbull, Benj., *Hist. of Connecticut*, 255.
- Trumbull, Henry, *Disc. of America*, 436.
- Trumbull, James H., on the name of Oregon, 555.
- Trumbull, Col. John, on Silas Deane, 33; picture of Ellsworth, 261; secretary to Jay, 518; made the best figure of Washington, 563; his portraits of W., 508-9; engraved by Cheeseman and others, 568, 569; his pictures of Revolutionary scenes, 569; his gallery, 569.
- Trumbull, Gov. Jonathan, on the French alliance, 48.
- "Trumbull," war-ship, 456.
- Truxton, Com. Thomas, and Burr's conspiracy, 339; made captain, 360; in the "Constellation," 363, 456; medal, 456; portrait, 456.
- Tucker, Dr., Dean of Gloucester, his *Plan of Pacification*, 210.
- Tucker, Geo., *Jefferson*, 303.
- Tucker, G. F., *Monroe Doctrine*, 524.
- Tucker, Randolph, on the Constitution, 263.
- Tucker, Capt. Samuel, his orders in fac-simile, 47; his log-book, 47.
- Tucker, St. George, ed. *Blackstone's Commentaries*, 263; *Const. Law*, 263.
- Tucker, S. G., 326.
- Tucker, Oregon, 562.
- Tuckerman, C. K., 525.
- Tuckerman, H. T., *Life of Talbot*, 418; *Character and Portraits of Washington*, 563; *Book of the Artists*, 563.
- Tudor, Wm., on Minot's *Insurrections*, 231.
- Tuley, Mrs. Jos., 570.
- Tunis, demands on the U. S., 368; treaty with, 361. See Barbary Powers.
- Tupper, Gen. Benj., 534.
- Tupper, E. W., 427.
- Tupper, Ferd. B., *Family Records*, 427; *Sir Isaac Brock*, 459.
- Turgot, his character, 5; *Euvres*, 5, 79; predicts the Amer. Rev., 5; on the American Rebellion, 25; on the condition of France, 25; removed, 26; his verse on Franklin, 40; views on the American Revolution, 175.
- Turkey, declaration of neutrality, 85; treaty, 508.
- Turner, J. C., 37.
- Turner, O., *Phelps and Gorham Purchase*, 533; *Holland Purchase*, 533.
- Turtletown, 455.
- Tuslancy, regulations on commerce, 84.
- Tuscarawas River, 456.
- Tuscarawas, 383. See Six Nations.
- Tuspan, 40.
- Tuthill, California, 444.
- Tuttle, C. K., *Border Wars*, 454.
- Tuttle, Jos. F., on the Ord. of 1787, 537.
- Twiggs, Gen., 409.
- Twining, W. J., 555.
- Twiss, Sir Travers, on the N. E. boundary, 182; *Oregon Question*, 562.

- Two Sicilies, regulations of commerce, 84; accede to armed neutrality, 87; treaty, 512.
- Tyler, Daniel, *Mormon Battalion*, 444.
- Tyler, John, 288; Vice-President, 289; President, 290, 297; references on his administration, 353; lives, 353; messages, 353; the Texas question, 551.
- Tyler, Lyon G., *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, 299, 353.
- Tyler, Sam., *R. B. Taney*, 349.
- UNITED STATES, its diplomacy during the Rev., 1, 73; small receipts of specie during the war, 16; bounds determined on (1779), 56; claims on the fisheries (1779), 56; paper money (1779), 69; failure to collect taxes, 69; debt in 1783, 70; index to publications of, 80; loans in Europe during the Rev., 81; finances during the Rev., 81; *Treaties and Conventions*, 83; asks money of France (1776), 84; Declar. of Independence, 84; Articles of Confederation, 84, 86; treaties with France (1778), 85, 84; secret articles, 84; proclamation about neutral vessels, 84; recommends Lafayette to Louis XVI, 84; congratulates Louis XVI, 85; accedes to armed neutrality, 86; requests loan of France, 86; promised, 86; contract with France, 87; treaty with Netherlands, 87; provisional treaty with Gt. Britain, 87; armistice, 87; treaty with Sweden, 87; procl. of cessation of hostilities, 87; ceremonial for receiving foreign ministers, 87; thanks Louis XVI for portrait, 87; treaty of Paris, 87; discussions as to boundaries in 1782, 118, 120, 121 (see *Boundaries*); fishery claims, 120; projects to abridge the American power, 124; boundaries proposed by Jay, 129; as urged by England, 132 (see *Treaty of 1782-83*); their territorial expansion, 165; her documentary history, 166; treaty of 1842, 179; under Articles of Confederation, 215; movement to revise them, 216; Hamilton defeated in his attempt, 217; commissioners to make treaties of commerce (1784), 233; finances during the Confederation, 235 (see *Constitution of the U. S.*); *Supreme Court Reports*, 261; *Opinions of the Attorneys-General*, 261, 296; *Statutes at Large*, 261, 296; *Revised Statutes*, 261; political parties in, 267, 294; government organized, 268; Bank of, 268 (see *Bank*); become manufacturing, 278; its official publications, 294 (see *Congress*); popular vote, 294, 297 (see *Senate*; *House of Representatives*); printing-office, 295; *Laws*, 296; compends, 296; unsuccessful candidates for the presidency, 297; *Presidential Counts*, 297; nominating conventions, 297; executive departments, 297; early symptoms of disunion, 310; secession, 319; lists of cabinet officers, 326; finances, 329; assumes Rev. debts of the States, 329; capital city, 330; counting the electoral vote, 347; wars of, 357; the army under the Confederation, 357; War Department, 357; treaty with France (1778) annulled, 363; quasi war with France, 363; convention of 1800, 366; war of 1812, 275, 376; loss of records, 402; war with Mexico, 408; critical essay on the wars, 413; documents, 413; war department archives, 413; destroyed by fire, 413; dealings with Indians, 413; maps of, after 1800, 460; diplomatic history, 461; opposes the Holy Alliance, 502; Secretaries of State, 513; territorial acquisitions and divisions, 527; shown in maps, 552; map of (1784), 529; public lands or domain, 533; bounds west of the Mississippi River, map of, 552; northern bounds, 552, 554; claims to Oregon, 555; agrees with Russia, 559; convention with England regarding Oregon, 559.
- "United States," frigate, built, 361; under Barry, 363; takes the "Macedonian," 380, 425, 457.
- Universal Asylum*, 336.
- Universal Mag.*, 565.
- Upham, C. W., *Washington*, 301; *Pickering*, 312.
- Upper Canada, centennial of the settlement, 214. See *Canada*.
- Upshur, A. P., 513; *Federal Government*, 262.
- Urquhart, David, *Boundary Differences*, 177.
- Ushant Island, fight near, 49.
- Utah annexed, 553.
- Utrecht, Treaty of (1713), 55, 83.
- VALENTINE AND COLLINS, surveys of the 45° parallel, 179.
- Van Berckel, 64, 67.
- Van Buren, Martin, 283; message on the N. E. boundary, 179; his view of the Constitution, 262; Vice-President, 284; President, 288, 297; opposes annexation of Texas, 291; again candidate for presidency, 293; *Political Parties*, 297, 352; portraits, 351; references on his administration, 352; lives, 352; messages, 352; on Texas, 551.
- Van Cleve, B., 451.
- Van Goens, R. M., *Politick Vertoog*, 68.
- Van Horn, John, 573.
- Van Horne at Brownsville, 429.
- Van Ness, W. P., *Charges against Burr*, 340.
- Van Pradelle's *Reflections*, 533.
- Van Rensselaer, Solomon, *Affair of Queenstown*, 422, 428, 459.
- Van Rensselaer, Gen. Stephen, on the Niagara River, 384, 422, 428.
- Van Santvoord, Geo., *Chief Justices*, 261.
- Van Schaack, H. C., *Life of Peter Van Schaack*, 201.
- Van Schaack, Peter, a Tory, 201; his life, 201.
- Vancouver, Capt. Geo., on the Columbia River, 556; *Voyage*, 556.
- Vancouver's Island, 562.
- Van der Legen, Henry, 566.
- Vanderlyn, portrait of Monroe, 344; of Jackson, 437; of Gerry, 474; of Washington, 569.
- Vanloo, portrait of Franklin, 39.
- Vansittart, 486.
- Vardill, John, 186.
- Vargas, 500.
- Varnum, J. B. Jr., 275, 330.
- Varnum, Jas. M., *The Case of Trevett against Weeden*, 236; *Oration at Marietta*, 536.
- Vaughan, Benj., sent to Franklin, 112; goes to England for Jay, 122.
- Vaughan, Samuel, 569; visits Mount Vernon, 224; his journal, 224.
- Vaughondy, Robert de, *Atlas*, 460.
- Vega, Gen., 411.
- Vehe, Ed., *Gesch. der deutschen Hölfe*, 19, 76.
- Venango, 456.
- Venezuela, 504.
- Venice, edict on commerce, 85.
- Vera Cruz reduced, 411, 443.
- Vérac, Russian minister, 101.
- Vergennes, Comte de, 79; his character, 4; references, 4; on the advantages of the war to the Bourbon princes, 24; his energetic counsels, 26; urged war, 40; double-faced, 41; his spies upon the American commissioners, 44; announces his readiness to make a treaty with them, 44; treaties signed, 44; his letters, 54, 73; likeness, 93; uneasy over England's advances towards Franklin, 100; to- wards the Dutch, 100; interviews with Thos. Grenville, 102; relations with Spain, 108; his suggestions as to the method of conducting the treaty with England, 110; on Oswald's commission, 113; his change of views, 114; seeks to control Jay, 115; on the boundaries of the U. S., 118, 120, 121; relations to Rayneval, 118; opposed the fisheries claims, 90, 120; his first proposals for peace, 131; disturbed by John Adams' success in Holland, 133; conceals his negotiations with Fitzherbert from the American commissioners, 136; complains of the American reserve, 140; his dissimulation, 146; his diplomatic skill, 148; his opinion of the English surrender, 152; complains of the Americans signing without French cognizance, 153; receives Franklin's apologies, 153, 154; writes to Luzerne, 154; his dislike of John Adams, 155; opposing views as to his situation, 169, 170; prompts England to the N. E. boundary controversy, 175.
- Vermont, Tory party in, 187; controversy with N. Y., 187; demands recognition by Congress, 188; her intercourse with the British, 188; admitted to the Union, 268, 280.
- Vernon, Thomas, 187; *Reminiscences*, 187.
- Verplanck, G. C., 576.
- Verri, Abbé, 38.
- Versailles, treaty of (1783), 87.
- Veto power, 284, 297.
- Victor, F. F., on the Oregon pioneers, 559.
- Viele, E. L., "Frontiers of the U. S.," 552; on the Mexican boundary, 553.
- Vincennes, 556; treaty at, 452.
- Virginia, Tories in, 190; earliest agreed to a federal convention, 227; Jefferson's *Notes on Va.*, 235; adopted the Constitution, 250; Resolutions of 1798, 252, 257, 270, 320; claims to Western lands, 527; her land office, 527; disputes with Mass. and Conn., 527; desires the territory of Kentucky to be guaranteed, 528; cedes lands, 528, 530; military lands, 548 (see *Military Lands*); convention to adopt the Constitution, 258; *Debates*, 259; *Proceedings of the Assembly*, 320.
- Vives, General, 500.
- Volney, *Etats-Unis*, 535.
- Voltaire, *Œuvres*, 77; his medal of Washington, 582.
- Von Hock, *Die Finanzen*, 329.
- Von Holst, H., *Const. Hist. U. S.*, 299; *Calhoun*, 324; on Andrew Jackson, 349; on the Oregon question, 562.
- Vose, Geo. L., *Early transportation*, 339.
- WABASH, forks of, 455.
- Wadsworth, Col. Jere., 575.
- Wadsworth, Gen. Wm., 459.
- Wagner, John, 574.
- Wagstaff, Dr. Alfred, 572.
- Waite, Chief Justice, on John Marshall, 313.
- Waite, Thos. B., *State Papers*, 294.
- Wakefield, J. A., *War with Sac and Fox Nation*, 439.
- Waldeck, Prince of, his soldiers in America, 23; his library, 75; treaty selling troops, 84.
- Waldo, S. P., *Tour of Monroe*, 344; *Naval Heroes*, 417; *Decatur*, 419.
- Walker, Adam, *Two Campaigns*, 428.
- Walker, Alex., *Jackson and N. Orleans*, 437.
- Walker, F. A., *Statistical Atlas*, 552; on the extent of Louisiana, 557.
- Walker, J. G., 575.
- Walker, Noah, 580.
- Wallabout Bay, 88.
- Wallabout Prison-ship Series, 88.

- Wallace, W., 339.
 Wallcutt, Thos., *Journal*, 536.
 Wallenstein, Jules de, on the Diplom. Hist. of the Amer. Rev., 74; on the alliance with France, 74.
 Wallenstein, M. de, 75.
 Wallis, John, 447; *Map of the U. S.*, 175.
 Wallis, Sir Provo, 457.
 Walsh, Robert, *Relations of France and the U. S.*, 514; *American Review*, 514.
 Walter, A. B., 568.
 Walter, Major James, *Memorials of Washington*, 302, 575.
 Walworth, Ellen H., 442.
 Wansey, Henry, *Journal*, 333; 576.
 War of 1812, 275; finances, 329; opposition in New England, 342; political aspects, 342; jubilation over peace, 343; preparations for, 376, 377; declared, 482; officers of, 377; weakness of the Amer. army, 382; ended, 495; impressments, 420; official despatches, 420; *The War*, 420; Fay's *Collection*, 420; *Palmer's Register*, 420; vessels captured, 420, 421; single-ship actions, 421, 457; histories, 421, 422; *Congressional Reporter*, 421; *Examiner*, 421; British reports suppressed, 421; those published, 421; British accounts, 423, 424; its' ships, 425; British conduct of the war, 426; *Barbarities of the Enemy*, 426; treatment of prisoners, 426; forces employed, 426; British MS. docs., 427; expenses of, 427; losses of, 427; on the N. W. coast, 437; coast forts, 458; Northern frontier (1812-14), 458; Wellington's estimate of the British successes, 486; real object of, 522.
 War Department, organized, 357; the secretaries, 353; account of, 415 (see United States); its relations with the Indians, 446.
 Ward, A. H., *Shrewsbury*, 231.
 Ward, Geo. A., edits Curwen's journal, 200.
 Ward, Col. Jona., 185.
 Ward, J. H., *Manual of Naval Tactics*, 425.
 Ward, J. Q. A., 581.
 Ward, Fowensend, on the whiskey insurrection, 330.
 Warden, D. B., *Account of the U. S.*, 423.
 Warfield, E. D., *Kentucky Resolutions*, 320.
 Warhendoff, Baron von, 574.
 Warren, Edw., *J. C. Warren*, 319.
 Warren, G. K., *Explorations and Surveys*, 553, 558; *Memoir to accompany the map*, etc., 558.
 Warreo, Sir John, on the American coast, 385.
 Warren, John C., 319.
 Warren, Mercy, *Adulators*, 186; *The Group*, 186.
 Warrington, Capt. Lewis, 405, 458.
 Washburn, Emory, on slavery in Mass., 326; on the Ordinance of 1787, 538.
 Washburn, E. B., *Foreign Relations of the U. S.*, 514; *Edw. Coles*, 325.
 Washburn, Israel, Jr., on the N. E. boundary controversy, 177.
 Washington, George, his autog., 36; his fears of the combination of France and Spain, 58; on Vergennes and the treaty of 1782-83, 170; his opinion of Tories, 185, 207; his distrust of the Confederation, 215; urging measures (1783) of revenue, 217; his designs for altering the buildings at Mount Vernon, in fac-simile, 225; his influence for a federal convention, 227; advised as to Shays Rebellion, 231; presided in the Federal Convention, 237; his diary at the time, 257; anxiety over the Virginia Convention, 258; inaugurated President, 267; his death, 269; term as President, 297; held parties in check, 299; various estimates of his character, 299; lives, 299; by Marshall, 300; by Ramsay, 300; by Sparks, 300; by A. Bancroft, 300; by Irving, 301; by Guizot, 301; domestic life, 301; religious character, 301; minor lives, 301; eulogy by H. Lee, 301; by E. Everett, 301; as a soldier, 302; his various headquarters, 302; his military family, 302; his life-guard, 302; contemporary views of, 302; his ancestry, 302; his death, 302; *Washingtoniana*, 302; his will, 302; his swords, 302; bibliography, 302; and Jefferson, 305; disensions in his cabinet, 309; Gibbs's administration of, 312; opinion of Burr, 316; references on his administration, 326; inaugurated, 326; his speeches, 326; cabinet papers, 326; letters, 326; statue in N. Y., 326; reception at Trenton, N. J., 327; at Gray's Ferry, 327; his power to remove heads of departments, 327; discussion on his title, 327; on his Eastern tour, 328; *Diary*, 328; in Massachusetts, 328; in Rhode Island, 328; his Southern tour (1791), 328; whiskey insurrection, 330; social life of his administration, 331; his receptions, 331; his houses in N. Y., 331; urged not to retire, 322; *Farewell Address*, 333; composition of, 333; editions, 334; suggested for a third term, 335; his coach, 339; and the navy, 415; commander-in-chief (1798), 454, 473; his diplomatic policy, 461; proclamation of neutrality (1793), 464, 515; withholds papers on Jay's treaty, 470; on *Monroe's View*, 514; denounced Jacobin clubs, 515; attacks on, 515; urges Congress to pay the Rev. soldiers in Western lands, 528; explores N. W. of the Ohio, 530; meets Gallatin, 530; president of the Potomac Co., 531; *Washington-Crawford letters*, 531; portraits of, 563-582; his personal appearance, 563; his false teeth, 563, 572; his large hands, 563; his weight, 563; his gorget, 564; earliest likeness known in Europe, 566; Pitcher portraits, 570; *Monuments of Patriotism*, 573; miniatures, 574; a Freemason, 574; profile likeness, 575; on coins, 575; silhouettes, 576; "Goodhue" picture, 576; busts, 578; monument in Christ Church, Boston, 578, 579; medallions, 578; Manly medal, 578; haunts, 578; medals, 579, 582; statues, 580; equestrian statues, 580; fictitious likenesses, 581; coin-heads, 582; his set of Revolutionary medals, 582.
 Washington, H. A., 306.
 Washington, Mrs. L. W., 334.
 Washington, Dr. N. C., 568.
 Washington, Col. Wm., 576.
 Washington city, history of, 330; social life in, 331; plan of city by L'Enfant, 321, 336; views of, 336; appearance of the city, 336; first occupied, 337; views of the Capitol, 345, 346; plans of Capitol, 347; life in Monroe's time, 345; burnt by the British, 402, 424, 434; treaty of 1842, 493.
 Washington Sound, 560.
 Washington Territory, map, 561.
 Washita River, 558.
 "Wasp" captures the "Frolic," 380, 396, 457; and "Reindeer," 396, 458; and "Avon," 396, 458.
 Waterhouse, Dr. Benj., *Journal*, 426.
 Waterhouse, Samuel, 186.
 Waterloo Inn, 339.
 Watkins, Tobias, 524.
 Watson, Elkanah, 207, 578.
 Watson, E. F., 574.
 Watterson, Geo., 345.
 Wayne, Anthony, made major-general, 357; his treaty with the Indians, 451, 453; builds forts, 452; his style of camp, 453; his victory over the Indians, 453; sources, 453; plan of the battle, 454; lives, 453; his remains, 453; his line of march, 454.
 Wayne, Col. Isaac, 453.
 Weatherford, an Indian, 392.
 Webb, S. B., his journal, 12.
 Webster, Daniel, debate with Hayne, 254, 263, 286, 323; visits Jefferson, 306, 340; eulogy on Jefferson, 307; visits Madison, 315; and the Hartford Convention, 322; suit against Theo. Lyman, 322; speeches on nullification, 323; seventh of March speech, 323; his papers, 324; *Works*, 324; *Speeches*, 324; on protection, 325; *Private Correspondence*, 325, 343; *Life* by Curtis, 325; other lives, 325; statues, 181, 325; bibliog., 325; on the embargo, 340; during war of 1812, 343; on internal improvements, 345; in Luther *versus* Borden, 355; and the Mexican war, 355; views of the Constitution, 263; Treaty of Washington, 179, 493; on the McLeod case, 494; on the case of the "Creole," 494; diplomatic service, 525; on the Ordinance of 1787, 537, 538; on the purchase of Louisiana, 547; opposes the annexation of Texas, 551; relations to the Oregon question, 560.
 Webster, Fletcher, 525.
 Webster, Noah, *Sketches of Amer. Policy*, 217; life by H. E. Scudder, 217, 314; as a polit. writer, 314; *Minerva*, 314; on the Hartford Convention, 322; answers Hamilton, 335; *Vindication of the Vice-President*, 335; on Jay's treaty, 517; *Spelling Book*, 566.
 Webster, Pelatiah, 236; *Dissertation on the Polit. Union*, 217; *Political Essays*, 13, 81, 217.
 Webster, Wm. G., 577.
 Wee Town, 455.
 Weed, Thurlow, 284; *Autobiog.*, 299.
 Weems, M. L., *Washington*, 299.
 Weiss, John, *Theo Parker*, 326.
 Weissenstein, plan of pacification, 51.
 Welch, T. B., 66, 317, 571.
 Weld, Isaac, *Travels*, 224.
 Welles, Albert, *Washington Family*, 322.
 Wellesley, Lord, 522.
 Wellington, President, 323.
 Wellington, Lord, 274; *Supplementary Despatches*, 524.
 Wells, David A., on free-trade, 330.
 Wells, John, 308.
 Wells, W. V., *Sam. Adams*, 318.
 Welsh, Herbert, 385.
 Wenck, F. A. G., *Codex juris*, 74, 82.
 Wentworth, John, 429.
 Wertmüller, A. U., portrait of Washington, 574.
 West, Benjamin, his picture of the treaty of 1782, 145.
 West Indies, projected annexation, 546.
 West Point, Mil. Academy founded, 459.
 Westcott, Thompson, *Life of Fitch*, 536.
 Western Reserve. See Connecticut; Ohio.
 Weymouth, Lord, 64.
 Wharton, Francis, on the peace negotiations of 1782-83, 169; his *Digest of International Law*, 169, 514; *Commentaries*, 263; *State Trials*, 309.
 Wheatley, H. B., edits *Wraxall*, 95.
 Wheaton, H., 511; *Digest of Decisions*, 261; *Reports*, 261; *Wm. Pinkney*, 317; *British Claim to the Right of Visitation*, 494; on the "Creole" case, 495.
 Wheeler, G. M., *U. S. Geol. Survey*, 558; *Geog. Congress at Venice*, 558.
 Wheeler, H. G., *Hist. of Congress*, 295, 355.
 Wheeling, Va., 456.

- Whig party, 282, 344; wrecked, 293; history of, 299; rise of, 351.
- Whipple, E. P., *Washington*, 301.
- Whipple, Wm., letters to, 82.
- Whiskey insurrection, 268, 329, 330.
- White, A. D., on Jefferson, 397.
- White, Gen. A. W., 577.
- White, Geo., *Hist. Coll. Georgia*, 447.
- White, Horace, 298.
- White, Hugh L., 283, 288; *Memoir*, 349.
- White, Samuel, *Amer. Troops*, 459.
- Whitehead, secretary of Oswald, 136.
- Whiting, Henry, *Z. M. Pike*, 428, 553.
- Whiting, Wm., *War Powers*, 260.
- Whitney, Eli, his cotton-gin, 280.
- Whitney, Josiah D., *Names and Places*, 555.
- Whitridge, F. W., 297.
- Whittlesey, Chas., 430; *Fitch*, 530; *Title of the Western Reserve*, 534; on Dr. Hildreth, 536; on John Fitch, 539; on the Niagara campaigns, 459.
- Whittlesey, Elisha, *Fort Stephenson*, 431.
- Wiederhold, his diary, 75.
- Wilcocks, J. S., 501.
- Wild Cat Creek, 455.
- Wilkins, Isaac, 186.
- Wilkins, Wm., 284.
- Wilkinson, Gen. James, *Memoirs*, 338, 428; with Burr, 338; in command on the N. Y. frontier, 290, 428; invades Canada (1814), 393; his court-martial, 428; in the West, 456; seizes Mobile, 498; relations with the Yazoo frauds, 534; intrigues in Kentucky, 451, 540; seeks conferences with Spanish authorities, 540; seizes Mobile, 546; at New Orleans, 550; destroys Eel River village, 455.
- Williams, Cumberland, 572.
- Williams, Edwin, *Statesman's Manual*, 298; *Addresses and Messages*, 298.
- Williams, Geo. W., *Negro Race*, 323, 422.
- Williams, Israel, 187.
- Williams, Col. Isaac, his farm, 449.
- Williams, H. J., 37.
- Williams, J., *Hamilton*, 308.
- Williams, J. L., *Territory of Florida*, 440; *West Florida*, 440.
- Williams, J. S., *Capture of Washington*, 435.
- Williams, Samuel, 570; *Expedition of Brush*, 429.
- Williams, Stephen R., 261.
- Williams, Talcott, 296.
- Williams, W. W., on St. Clair, 539.
- Williams, *Middle Kingdom*, 509.
- Williams and Stafford, *England's Battles*, 425.
- Williamson, Chas., *Genesee Country*, 533.
- Williamson, Jos., on slavery in Maine, 326.
- Willis, N. P., *Famous Persons*, 353.
- Wilmot, David, his proviso, 292.
- Wilmot, J. E., *Historical View*, 212.
- Wilmot, Montagu, 175.
- Wilson, Henry, *Slave Power*, 323.
- Wilson, James, 247; in the Fed. Convention, 257; *Works*, 257; speech on the Const., 257.
- Wilson, Gen. J. G., on Com. Hull, 425; on Fort Dearborn, 429.
- Wilson, Thomas, *Mil. and Naval Heroes*, 417; *Naval Heroes*, 422.
- Wilson, Woodrow, *Cong. Government*, 263.
- Winchester, Gen., in the campaign of 1813, 387; at Frenchtown, 431; *Historic Details*, 431.
- Winder, Gen. W. H., 400; on the capture of Washington, 434; *Niagara Frontier*, 428.
- Wines, E. C., *In the Navy*, 417.
- Winship settlement in Oregon, 558.
- Winsor, Justin, on Greuze's Franklin, 38; notes on the fisheries, 170; on the Northern boundaries of the U. S., 171; maps of No. America, 1763-83, 182; "The Confederation, 1781-1789," 215; "Diplomacy in Europe, under the Confederation," 233; notes on the sources of information in regard to the Constitution of the U. S., 255; on the literature of American politics, 294; on "Indian Treaties and Wars," 446; "The French War of 1798," 454; episodes of the war of 1812, 457, 460; sources of the diplomacy of the U. S., 513; territorial acquisitions and divisions of the U. S., 527; portraits of Washington, 563.
- Winstanley, artist, 569, 570.
- Winterbotham, map in his *History*, 557, 558.
- Winthrop, R. C., on likenesses of Franklin, 38; on Henry Clay, 324; on Webster, 325; portrait by Huntington, 354; autog., 354; his career in Congress, 355; owns portrait of Washington, 572; *Address*, 555.
- Wirt, Wm., 284; portrait, 297; on Jefferson, 307; defence of Madison, 315; acc. of, by Thomas, 317; life by Kennedy, 318; on the Cherokee case, 322; *British Spy*, 337; on nullification, 323; counsel in Burr's trial, 340.
- Wisconsin, admitted, 291; territory, 543; a State, 543; bounds, 543.
- Wise, Henry A., *Seven Decades*, 353.
- Wither, *Border Warfare*, 453.
- Witherspoon of N. J., 89.
- Withlacoochee River, 407.
- Witt, Cornélis de, *Jefferson*, 79.
- Wolcott, Oliver, 248; papers, 312; Sec. of Treasury, 329; *Moneys drawn from the Treasury*, 329; treats with Indians, 447; *British Influence*, 518.
- Wolf Creek Mills, 541.
- Wolff, engraver of Washington's portrait, 566.
- Wood, Col. E. D., journal, 428.
- Wood, J., 300.
- Wood, John, *Administration of Adams*, 334; *Correct Statement*, 335; *Clintonian Faction*, 335; *Trial of Burr*, 339.
- Wood, Jos., 313.
- Wood, Silas, *Long Island*, 190.
- Woodbury, Levi, 175, 283; *Writings*, 349, 524; on And. Jackson, 349; on Polk, 355.
- Woodfall, *Debates*, 111.
- Woodward, W. Elliot, 582.
- Wool, Gen., at Chihuahua, 409, 444; accounts of, 442; on the Niagara frontier, 459.
- Woolsey, J. D., on the Oregon question, 562.
- Woolsey, Lieut., 388.
- Woolsey, T. D., "Experiment of the Union," 264.
- Worcester Magazine*, 231.
- Workman, James, 340.
- Worth, Gen., 442; in Florida, 408; in Mexico, 409.
- Worthy Women of our first Century*, 306.
- Wraxall, Sir N. W., *Memoirs*, 95.
- Wren, Rev. Dr., 88.
- Wright, Elizur, 288.
- Wright, Jos., his pictures of Washington, 573; his profiles, 576; his busts, 578; his medals, 579.
- Wright, Capt. Obed., 438.
- Wright, Mrs. P. L., models bust of Washington, 578.
- Wright, Silas, 283, 289, 291; *Life*, 298.
- Wright, *House of Hanover*, 98.
- Württemberg, treaty, 512.
- Wyandots, treaty, 450; history of, 454.
- Wyatt, Thomas, *Memoirs of Generals*, 417.
- Wyeth, J. B., *Oregon*, 559.
- Wynne, Thos. H., 198.
- Wyoming territory, 553.

X Y Z CORRESPONDENCE, 362, 472, 519.

YATES, ROBERT, and the Federal Convention, 256; his *Secret Proc. and Debates*, 256; *Notes on Fed. Conv.*, 257.

Yazoo River, 531; country, 534; "frauds," 534; occupied by Spain, 543.

Yeaman, Geo. H., *Study of Government*, 262.

Yellowstone National Park, 561.

Yeo, Sir James I., 390, 433; on Lake Ontario, 397.

Yoakum, H., *Texas*, 551.

Yonge, C. D., *British Navy*, 423.

York (Toronto), attacked, 389; capital burned, 435; captured, 458.

Yorke, Sir Jos., letter to Suffolk, 18; envoy to Netherlands, 64, 67; his papers, 68.

Yorktown, Col. Simcoe's conduct at, 197; loyalists at, 199; political effects of, 95; in England, 95.

Young, A. W., *Amer. Statesman*, 298; *Protective System*, 330.

Young, E., *Customs-tariff Legislation*, 278, 329.

Young, Hon. Geo., 572.

Young, Philip, *Mexico*, 441.

Young, W. T., *Lewis Case*, 349.

Yrujo, his controversy with the U. S. gov't, 497.

Yule, Patrick, *N. W. boundary of New Brunswick*, 177.

ZACHRISSON, *Bevåpnad neutralitet*, 83.

Zane family (early settlers of Ohio), 536.



GETTY RESEARCH INSTITUTE



3 3125 01498 6117

