


CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY





Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.







HENRY J. RAYMOND

AND

THE NEW YORK PRESS,

FOR

THIRTY YEARS.

PROGRESS OF AMERICAN JOURNALISM
FROM 1840 TO 1870.

With Portrait, Illustrations, and Appendix.

By AUGUSTUS MAVERICK.

Published by Subscription only.




HARTFORD, CONN.:
A. S. HALE AND COMPANY.
CHICAGO:
GEO. W. ROGERS.
1870.

~~EAH~~

115

TN
4874
R26
M06



X

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1869, by

AUGUSTUS MAVERICK,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District
of New York.

TO THE READER.



PREFACES are not to my taste : — perhaps not to yours. .

I have tried to tell in a simple way the story of a life which had within it much that seemed to me worth the telling ; and so this picture of my friend goes forth to his friends and mine.

A. M.

NEW YORK, December, 1869.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

No.	Page.
1. PORTRAIT.	
2. HOW HENRY J. RAYMOND STUDIED HIS LESSONS AS A SCHOOL Boy, - - - - -	18
3. THE GENESEE WESLEYAN SEMINARY IN LIMA, - - -	22
4. THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT IN BURLINGTON, - - -	26
5. FAC SIMILE OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE, APRIL 10, 1841,	38
6. THE PILOT BOAT WM. J. ROMER IN THE ICE, - - -	42
7. PRESENT CONDITION OF THE RAYMOND HOMESTEAD IN LIMA, New York, - - - - -	77
8. FAC SIMILE OF THE NEW YORK TIMES, SEPTEMBER 18, 1851,	88
9. FIRST OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK TIMES, 113 NASSAU ST., 1851,	95
10. SECOND OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK TIMES, CORNER NASSAU AND BEEKMAN STS., 1854-7, - - - - -	142
11. THE BUILDING NOW OCCUPIED BY THE TIMES, - - -	154
12. MR. RAYMOND'S SANCTUM IN THE PRESENT TIMES BUILDING,	193
13. RESIDENCE OF MR. RAYMOND, 12 NINTH ST., NEW YORK,	205
14. FAC SIMILE OF MR. RAYMOND'S EDITORIAL COPY, - - -	225
15. FAC SIMILE OF AN AUTOGRAPH LETTER FROM MR. RAYMOND,	323

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE BOY.

	PAGE
Western New York Fifty Years ago — Birthplace and Parentage of Henry J. Raymond	
— The Raymond Family — The Old Homestead in Lima — Rev. Dr. Barnard's Church — Early Years of Henry J. Raymond — Thirst for Knowledge — His Teachers — The District School — Raymond a Reader at Three Years of Age — A Speaker at Five — How he Studied — A Picturesque Attitude — The Favorite Cat — Raymond's Academic Course — Opening of the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary in Lima — His Schoolmate, Alexander Mann — Raymond Looking for Employment — Brief Experience in a Country Store — He Forsakes Trade — In Charge of a District School — "Boarding Round" — Raymond a Poet at Sixteen — Ode Written for the Fourth of July Celebration in Lima in 1836 — Raymond's Departure for College	13

CHAPTER II.

IN COLLEGE.

Raymond Prepared for College at Fifteen — His Father's Farm Mortgaged to Provide Means — Raymond as a Collegian — The University of Vermont — Incidents — Mr. E. A. Stansbury's Recollections — Henry Clay and Henry J. Raymond — Raymond's Graduation and Return to Lima	23
---	----

CHAPTER III.

ADRIFT.

Out of College and in Politics — "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" — Raymond as a Whig Campaigner — Political Speeches in the Genesee Valley — An Indignant Democratic Schoolmaster — Raymond again in Search of Employment — Determines to	
--	--

try his Fortune in New York — Calls upon Horace Greeley — Repulsed — Does not Give Up — Studies Law — Advertises for a School — Gets a Foothold in Greeley's *New-Yorker* — Greeley finally Engages Him — Raymond Working for Eight Dollars a Week — Becomes a Writer of Pill Advertisements and a Newspaper Correspondent — Establishment of the *New York Tribune* — Raymond Fast-Anchored in Journalism 28

CHAPTER IV.

ANCHORED.

The *New York Tribune* — Horace Greeley's Tribute to Henry J. Raymond — A Mistake Corrected — Raymond's Work on the *Tribune* — Signal Successes — Dr. Dionysius Lardner's Lectures — Severe Illness of Raymond — Greeley Calls upon Him — Raymond's Wretched Pay — What he Said to Greeley — Results of an Interview in a Sick-room — Raymond as a Reporter — Thomas McElrath's Reminiscences — Raymond Secedes from the *Tribune* 32

CHAPTER V.

PROGRESS OF JOURNALISM IN NEW YORK — 1840 TO 1850. ✓

Easy-Going Newspapers — The Old "Blanket-Sheets" — Editorial Duels and Horse-whippings — Mr. W. C. Bryant's Reminiscences — The *Courier and Enquirer* — The *Journal of Commerce* — The *Evening Post* — The *Commercial Advertiser* — The *Herald* — How Bennett Startled the City of New York — The *Sun* — The *Tribune* as a Cheap and Respectable Paper — Fierce Rivalries — Old Methods of Getting News — Sharp Practice — Pony Expresses — Stealing Locomotive Engines — Carrier-Pigeons — Setting Type on Board of Steamboats — How Raymond Reported Webster's Speech — The Voyage of Monroe F. Gale across the Atlantic — The Pilot-Boat William J. Romer in the Ice — Personalities — James Watson Webb's Ridicule of Horace Greeley's Personal Appearance — Greeley's Reply — The *Tribune's* "Slievegammion" Hoax — Burning of the *Tribune* Office — The Tide Changing . . 36

CHAPTER VI.

PROGRESS OF JOURNALISM IN NEW YORK — (CONTINUED.)

Periods in Journalism — The Expansion of the Press and the Progress of Civilization — The Pioneer followed by the Printer — Useless Papers Dead — Condition of the

New York Press Twenty Years Ago — How the <i>Herald</i> and the <i>Tribune</i> fell into Disrepute — Henry J. Raymond Creating a New Era in Journalism — The Germ of his Future Success	49
---	----

CHAPTER VII.

AN OLD TAIN'T.

The Socialists Twenty-two Years Ago — Horace Greeley and Albert Brisbane — The <i>Tribune</i> , the <i>Future</i> , and the <i>Harbinger</i> — Zealous Iconoclasts — The False Pretences of Fourierism — Socialistic Failures — The <i>Tribune</i> in Disrepute — Raymond's Attacks upon Socialism — The Celebrated Discussion between Greeley and Raymond — The Merits and Demerits of Socialism	54
---	----

CHAPTER VIII.

RAYMOND AT TWENTY-EIGHT.

His Filial Devotion — Burning of the Homestead in Lima — Mr. Raymond's Letters to his Parents and his Brother Samuel — His Visit to Lima — His Solitude for his Father and Mother — A Touching Tribute	77
--	----

CHAPTER IX.

RAYMOND'S ENTRANCE INTO POLITICAL LIFE.

Election to the New York Legislature in 1849 — A Good Beginning — Return to the <i>Courier and Enquirer</i> — Re-election to the Legislature in 1850 — Remarks on assuming the Speakership of the Assembly — Sudden End of the Session — An Incident in Raymond's Life — Quarrel between Webb and Raymond — Departure of Raymond for Europe — His First Impressions of the Old World — Letter from London	81
---	----

CHAPTER X.

FOUNDATION OF THE NEW YORK *TIMES*.

Origin of the <i>Times</i> — Thurlow Weed's offer of the Albany <i>Evening Journal</i> to Raymond and Jones — Failure of a Negotiation — Project of a New Whig Paper in New	
---	--

Yerk — The Winter of 1850-51 — A Walk upon the Ice on the Hudson River — A Baking Law which Produced a Newspaper — George Jones, E. B. Wesley, and Henry J. Raymond — The <i>Times</i> Copartnership — Eight Stockholders — Raymond's Shares Presented to Him — The <i>Times</i> Announced — Commotion among New York Newspapers — Raymond's Visit to Europe — His Return to New York — The Prospectus of the <i>Times</i> — A Building Selected — How the First Number of the Paper was Made Up — Mr. Raymond's Salutatory Address — "Only Sixpence a Week" — The Money Sunk in the First Year — Mr. Raymond's Statement of Results	88
--	----

CHAPTER XI.

THE FIRST WORKERS ON THE *TIMES* — A RETROSPECT.

The Journalists who Joined Raymond — Alexander C. Wilson — James W. Simonton — The <i>Times</i> and its Charges of Corruption in Congress — A Page of History — The <i>Times</i> Triumphant — Nehemiah C. Palmer — Caleb C. Norvell — Michael Hennessey	103
---	-----

CHAPTER XII.

KOSSUTH — RAYMOND — WEBB.

Arrival of Louis Kossuth in New York in 1851 — Enthusiastic Reception — Municipal Banquet in the Irving House — Raymond and James Watson Webb — A Lively Altercation — Webb Defiant — Police Restoring Order — Webb's Suppressed Speech Subsequently Printed — The Press Banquet to Kossuth in the Astor House — Admirable Speech by Mr. Raymond — His Advocacy of the Cause of Hungary	109
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BALTIMORE CONVENTION.

Mr. Raymond the Central Figure of an Exciting Scene — A Remarkable Episode in his Life — How he Became a Member of the Convention — Northern Subserviency and Southern Arrogance — Attempt to Expel Mr. Raymond from the Convention — A Despatch to James Watson Webb, and what came of it — Mr. Raymond's Defence — His Final Triumph	120
--	-----

CHAPTER XIV.

THE *TIMES* IMPROVED, AND RAYMOND ELECTED LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

Raymond's Resolution to Devote his Life to Journalism — New Writers Engaged for the *Times* — Charles C. B. Seymour — Fitz James O'Brien — Dr. Tuthill — Charles Welden — Charles F. Briggs, Hurlburt, Godkin, Sewall, and DeCordova — Raymond again in Politics — Elected Lieutenant-Governor — Address as President of the Senate — Declines the Nomination for Governor 142

CHAPTER XV.

BIRTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY — THE PITTSBURG CONVENTION.

The Free-Soil Struggle — Causes of the Convention in Pittsburg in 1856 — Preliminary Action — The New Party — An Address to the People of the United States Submitted by Mr. Raymond — Its Adoption — The Presidential Contest — Fremont Defeated — Raymond's Discussion with Lucien B. Chase 147

CHAPTER XVI.

THE *TIMES* ENLARGING ITS BOUNDARIES.

The Old Brick Church Property in New York — Old Knickerbockers' Reminiscences and Regrets — A Large Purchase for the *Times* in the Panic Year — The Wonder of the Day in New York — Unheard-of Extravagance — How the Old Newspapers had been Housed — Dying and Decay — The New Order of Things — Visitors Thronging the *Times* Office — Full Description of the Building 154

CHAPTER XVII.

SLAVERY, DISUNION, AND THE WAR.

Raymond's Return from Europe and his Encounter with Secession in 1860 — His Unwavering Loyalty — Clear Foresight — Prophetic Utterances — Speech in Albany in 1860 — His Letters to William L. Yancey — War — Raymond's Patriotism — The Riot Week of 1863 and the *Times* — Raymond's Attitude 160

CHAPTER XVIII.

RAYMOND IN CONGRESS, AND THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION.

Raymond in 1862-64 — Speech in Wilmington, Delaware — Election to Congress in November, 1864 — The Vote in his District — Opening of the Thirty-Ninth Congress — Andrew Johnson's Conflict with the Republican Party — Raymond in the Philadelphia Convention in 1866 — The Philadelphia Address — Raymond's Explanatory Speech at the Cooper Institute — A Nomination to the Fortieth Congress Declined — Letter from Mr. Raymond — His Opponents — Injustice . . . 168

CHAPTER XIX.

OUT OF POLITICS, AND BACK TO JOURNALISM.

Mr. Raymond's Withdrawal from Public Life and his Return to Editorial Duty — Departure for Europe in 1867 — A Farewell Dinner — Letter from Rev. Henry Ward Beecher — Speeches by Mr. Dana and Mr. Roosevelt — A Jingle of Rhyme — Speech by Mr. Raymond — The Press Dinner to Charles Dickens — Mr. Raymond's Speech — Increased Value of the *Times* 193

CHAPTER XX.

DEATH.

Sudden Death of Mr. Raymond — Tributes to his Memory — His Enemies Confessing their Error 205

CHAPTER XXI.

AT REST.

Funeral Ceremonies -- Eloquent Address by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher 215

CHAPTER XXII.

THE MAN.

Mr. Raymond's Career — His Early Ambition — His Application — Newspaper Requirements — The *Times* — Raymond's Treatment of Subordinates — His Hospi-

tality — Incidents — Raymond's Tact — His Habit of Discipline — His Idea of Journalism — His Errors — His Methods of Literary Labor — The Biography of Daniel Webster — A College Address — Religious Faith — "Gates Ajar" — Domestic Life	219
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIII.

ANECDOTES AND INCIDENTS.

How Bennett was Beaten at his own Game — The Loss of the Collins Steamer "Arotio" in 1854 — Mr. Burns's Narrative of the Disaster, and How the <i>Times</i> Secured it — A Ride in a Horse-Car — Adventures of a Night — The Italian Campaign of 1859 — Mr. Raymond's "Brilliant Run" — The <i>Times</i> and the "Elbows of the Mincio" — A Bohemian Trick — How the <i>Times</i> Caricatured Bennett — Incidents of the Cable Excitement in 1858 — The War Correspondents — Newspaper Reporters — "Jenkins" — George William Curtis on "Jenkins" — Precision in Journalism — The <i>Evening Post's</i> "Index Exprobratorius"	230
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIV.

A DIGRESSION CONCERNING NEWSPAPER BORES.

How Editors are Bored — The Different Classes of Bores — The Poets, and what Mr. Bryant said of Them — Political, Inquisitive, and Clerical Bores — The "Strong-Minded" Women — The Persons Afflicted by Bores	266
--	-----

CHAPTER XXV.

A HISTORY OF NEWSPAPER HOAXES.

Famous Deceptions — The "Moon Hoax" of 1835 — The Polk Campaign and the "Roerback" — The Lincoln Proclamation Hoax	273
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE PRESS OF TO-DAY.

Papers Published in New York at the Close of 1869 — A Classified List — Peculiarities of Different Journals — Upwards of One Hundred and Fifty Dailies and Weeklies in Existence — What Was, Is, and Is to Be	323
---	-----

HENRY J. RAYMOND

AND

THE NEW YORK PRESS



CHAPTER I.

THE BOY.

WESTERN NEW YORK FIFTY YEARS AGO — BIRTHPLACE AND PARENTAGE OF HENRY J. RAYMOND — THE RAYMOND FAMILY — THE OLD HOMESTEAD IN LIMA — REV. DR. BARNARD'S CHURCH — EARLY YEARS OF HENRY J. RAYMOND — THIRST FOR KNOWLEDGE — HIS TEACHERS — RAYMOND A READER AT THREE YEARS OF AGE — A SPEAKER AT FIVE — HOW HE STUDIED — A PICTURESQUE ATTITUDE — THE FAVORITE CAT — RAYMOND'S ACADEMIC COURSE — OPENING OF THE GENESEE WESLEYAN SEMINARY IN LIMA — HIS SCHOOLMATE ALEXANDER MANN — RAYMOND LOOKING FOR EMPLOYMENT — BRIEF EXPERIENCE IN A COUNTRY STORE — HE FORSAKES TRADE — IN CHARGE OF A DISTRICT SCHOOL — "BOARDING ROUND" — RAYMOND A POET AT SIXTEEN — ODE WRITTEN FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY CELEBRATION IN LIMA IN 1836 — DEPARTURE FOR COLLEGE.

FIFTY years ago, that part of Western New York which became the birthplace of Henry Jarvis Raymond was remote and almost unknown. The great lines of land and water communication which now give it ready access to the centres of population, and to profitable markets, had not yet been opened. No telegraph existed; cables under the ocean had not been conceived, even in dreams. The Erie Canal was still in process of construction, and De Witt Clinton, who watched its progress with keen attention, was Governor of the State.

In the year 1820, the whole population of New York was

but one million, three hundred and seventy-two thousand eight hundred and twelve, — or in the proportion of thirty inhabitants to the square mile, — and ten thousand and eighty-eight slaves remained in captivity within its borders. James Monroe was President of the United States; Maine had just been admitted into the Union; the people of the Territory of Missouri had been formally authorized to form a State constitution; the country had lately emerged from the war with England, and the ravaged frontier of New York was relapsing into quiet after the long and violent shock of arms.

Thirty miles from the frontier, sequestered even from the small business centres of that day, lay the little hamlet of Lima, now a part of Livingston County, — a county which had no existence fifty years ago, nor until it was born of the adjacent counties of Ontario and Genesee in the early part of the year 1821. Lima is an old village, begun in 1789, and although its growth has been slow,* it has steadily held its own, and its people can boast that it has suffered no material retrogression, — a boast which does not apply to many places in New York more celebrated and pretentious. Nature has been generous to this region. A fertile soil, rippling water-courses, crystal lakes, leafy woods, and distant views of charming landscapes, appeal alike to the artist's sense of the beautiful, and the farmer's love of the useful. The village of Lima, distant seven miles from the railroad station of Avon, on the Buffalo Division of the Erie route, now forms the north-eastern corner of the County of Livingston; and as the traveller jogs slowly towards it, committed to the most uncomfortable of old-fashioned stage-coaches, he is agreeably impressed by the signs of thrift and industry which meet the eye at every step of the well-kept country road. If not Arcadia, the place is pastoral, and undeniably attractive.

One mile and a half from the centre of the little post-village of Lima, is the old homestead upon which Henry J. Raymond was born — January 24th, 1820. The dwelling was destroyed

* The present population (January, 1870) is about fifteen hundred. The town was formed in January, 1789, under the name of Charleston. In 1808, the name was changed to Lima.

by fire twenty-eight years later, but the boundaries of the farm remain unaltered, and the fine grove of spreading locust-trees which shaded the old house remains to adorn the new. The farm passed into other hands upwards of twenty years ago, but ancient memories still cluster there.

The progenitors of the Raymond family, as the name implies, were of French extraction. The pedigree has not been preserved, for pride of ancestry is not a characteristic of the Raymond blood; and if some future Dryasdust should exhume the mouldy record of lines of crusading lords, it is certain he would get no aid from any researches undertaken by existing members of the family. Jarvis Raymond, father of Henry Jarvis, was a farmer in Lima fifty years ago, — that is all the record his descendants want; they see a perpetual halo about the father's head, and ask for no older, stronger, or purer ancestral line.

Jarvis Raymond was married in the year 1819 to Lavinia, daughter of Clark Brockway, of Lima. The first child born to them was Henry Jarvis Raymond, and five others followed. Of these but two survive, and the father himself is numbered with the departed. In the order of birth, the children were: —

1. Henry Jarvis Raymond.
2. Eliza Raymond.
3. Samuel Brockway Raymond.
4. James Fitch Raymond.

5 and 6. Two who died very young, and were never named.

Samuel is now a prominent and prosperous citizen of Rochester, New York, — the senior member of the firm of Raymond & Huntington, bankers and insurance agents. James is a photographer in Detroit, Michigan, having removed to that city from Ypsilanti, to which latter place he emigrated on leaving Lima fifteen years ago. The mother's home is now with her son James, but she occasionally revisits Lima, her birth-place; and when the writer had the pleasure of an interview with her in that village, a few months since, the venerable and excellent lady dwelt with keen zest upon the memories of her youth. Heaven send all such good mothers length of days and full measure of prosperity!

The home life on the eighty-acre farm in Lima, half a century ago, was simple, honest, and kindly. The father and mother were both professing Christians, and moreover consistent in their Christian character:—all professing Christians are not entitled to this high praise. Mr. Raymond, who is described by old inhabitants of the place, still surviving, as a man of sterling integrity, possessed of a remarkably clear mind and a happy faculty of imparting ideas, long occupied positions of trust in the little rural community in which he dwelt. He was for many years a Justice of the Peace in Lima, and a Ruling Elder in the First Presbyterian Church, of which the Reverend John Barnard, D. D., was pastor,* and was also for a considerable time the Superintendent of Dr. Barnard's Sabbath school. A plain, unlettered man, his sound sense, honesty of purpose, and decision of character gave him command, and to this day his name is never mentioned save with honor. He died in Detroit in 1868, in the house purchased for him by his son Henry, after the removal of the family from the old homestead in Lima.

The first-born, Henry Jarvis Raymond—the subject of this volume—inherited much of his parents' solid sense, quick apprehension, and strong purpose. True, he was born to an inheritance of poverty; but he was not the worse for that. Very few men possessed of strong will are sufferers from the troubles of a cloudy youth; they make their own sunshine later on in life, and the difficulties of their early days are to their maturer fame what shadows are to art,—points of contrast and backgrounds for brilliant color.

Henry J. Raymond, as an infant, differed in no material respect from thousands of other children; and when he began to run about in pinafores he was chiefly noteworthy for great natural quickness and indomitable nervous energy. The induction into his first pair of trowsers, however,

* Dr. Barnard is still living in Lima, at an advanced age. He retired from the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in that village, in 1857, after an active and useful service of fifty years. To his courteous kindness and the vividness of his recollections, the writer is indebted for valuable assistance in the preparation of these pages.

marked a period in his young life. A thirst for the acquisition of knowledge came éarly to him, and grew in intensity until the day of his death. He never wearied of studying, examining, analyzing. His active mind—too active at times—began to take form at the age of three, when he read simple lessons fluently, to the boundless delight of doting parents and admiring friends. He was not, perhaps, so precocious as Horace Greeley, who has uttered a moving lament over the stupidity of certain New Hampshire folk, who caused him to read print upside-down at the tender age of four; but Raymond's early skill in letters is to-day traditional in the place of his birth.

His first teacher—Charlotte Leech, now dead—was proud of her little pupil, and he profited so well by her careful tutelage that at the age of three years and a half he was considered eligible for admission to the privileges of the district school. Those privileges were in no sense remarkable, for the district school of that day was an exceedingly inferior institution:—reading, writing and arithmetic were the principal studies; books of instruction were dear and poor; and neither teachers nor pupils were noted for wisdom. But the lad thrrove upon such meat as was given him, and the loving eyes of kindred and friends still linger upon the site of the little old house, a stone's-throw across the turnpike from the homestead, in which the future editor took his first degree in learning. No relic is now left of the rusty, old-fashioned school; in its place stands a trim white building, populous and noisy with the school-boy life of the latter half of the nineteenth century. Who knows but the editor of the future great newspaper of America, or he who was born to rule the destiny of this nation, is to-day a pupil in roundabout jacket in that unpretentious school-house?


Raymond was a reader at three. At the age of five he was a speaker, — a speaker in a very small way, but yet a speaker. For, in the winter of 1824–5, while under the teaching of Mr. Fosdick, he appeared in the public exhibition of the scholars as the reciter of two pieces; one of which was a satire upon lawyers, couched in terms severe but simple, as befitted a youth of such tender years.

At the age of eight, the lad began to attend Mr. Hutton's classical school in the village of Lima, studying the elementary lessons during the summer, and remaining at home in the winter months. After the winter of 1829, he was in school constantly, living at home and learning rapidly. He mingled but little in the sports of his fellows, preferring his books rather than the company of the roystering country boys. Chestnutting had no charms for him; bird's-nesting was a joy of which he never tasted; even the exhilarating pastime of coasting was but seldom indulged in. He was eminently studious and sober. An omnivorous reader, he remembered and was able to use all he read. His remarkable power of memory and faculty of assimilation, which contributed in no small degree to his success later in life, thus had an early development, and he was unwearied in application.

His method of study at that early age was peculiar. Always choosing the evening for committing his lessons, he assumed a position so picturesque that our artist has been directed to make the accompanying sketch from the minute and vivid descriptions furnished by surviving members of the family. Picture the plain, old-fashioned room of a country-house, — a wood-stove roaring merrily while stormy blasts swept by unheeded, — father and mother and brothers gathered around the table, at one corner of which Henry was engaged in study, — his knees upon a hard chair, his elbows upon the table, his hands supporting his head, his eyes fixed intently upon his book, and a favorite cat mounted upon his friendly back. This cat, according to the family tradition, was very fond of the studious lad, and as regularly as he assumed his favorite position, so regularly did the feline companion arrive to complete the winter evening's tableau.

Meanwhile, projects had been in preparation to enlarge the educational facilities of Lima. In the year 1829, the Genesee Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal denomination of the State of New York, at its annual session, appointed a committee to take steps for establishing a seminary of learning within the territorial limits of the Conference; and subscriptions of funds for that purpose were solicited in the towns of Perry,

HOW HENRY J. RAYMOND STUDIED HIS LESSONS AS A SCHOOL-BOY.



Brockport, Henrietta, Le Roy, and Lima, which places were competitors for the location of the seminary. The conditions of subscription were that the seminary should be erected in the place where the greatest amount of money should be subscribed. The sum of twelve thousand dollars was subscribed and paid by the citizens of Lima and its neighborhood. The subscribers were Samuel Spencer and about one hundred and fifteen other citizens, and in pursuance of the terms and conditions of subscription the seminary was in the year 1830 located at Lima. As a further inducement to build the institution in Lima, the citizens of the town procured to be sold and conveyed to the seminary, for its site, about seventy-four acres of land, situated within the limits of the village, at the nominal price of two thousand four hundred and twenty-six dollars and thirty cents, — much less than the actual value, — upon which the seminary erected its buildings, and went into operation in the year 1832. By an act of the Legislature of the State of New York, passed May 1, 1834, it was duly incorporated by the name of the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary.

Henry J. Raymond was among the first students who entered the new institution in 1832. His age was twelve, and he had profited so well by the instruction previously received in smaller schools that he was perfectly qualified to undertake a broader course of study. His most intimate schoolmate in the seminary was Alexander Mann, through whose urgent solicitation Raymond subsequently went to college. They remained fast friends; and it is an interesting fact, that, many years later, Mr. Mann was employed by Mr. Raymond as an editorial writer upon the *New York Times*. Mr. Mann was in no sense brilliant, but he possessed a well-informed mind, and his uniform integrity and agreeable social qualities endeared him to all who knew him. Those who were associated with him in the service of the *Times* cherish pleasant memories of the relation.

Emerging from the seminary, Raymond began to cast about for employment. His common-sense way of looking at the affairs of life suggested the reflection that it was his duty to

contribute towards the expense of his own support; and accordingly he obtained a place in a country store. The pay was at the rate of seventy-five dollars a year, — not an extravagant reward for the intelligent service performed, — but the lad did not like the business, and not long afterwards he and trade parted company forever. In his sixteenth year he began to teach, procuring the charge of a district school, for three months, in Wheatland, Genesee County, fifteen miles north-west of Lima. In country phrase, he “boarded round” — taking such accommodations of food and lodging as the universal custom of the day afforded to impecunious young teachers, but thriving under circumstances which were not altogether agreeable. The pay was small, and he was very young to hold the place of pedagogue; many of his scholars excelled him in size and weight as well as in age; and his path was not strewn with roses. But he had a strong will, and his experience in teaching was not a failure.

In the following summer, his school contract having expired, he returned to the homestead in Lima; and on the Fourth of July made his first appearance as a poet. The celebration of the National Anniversary in Lima, that year, was exceptionally grand. The patriotic citizens, determining that “the Fourth” should be honored with all due observance, devoted much thought and time to the celebration; and in response to a pressing invitation, young Raymond wrote the subjoined ode, which was sung by the village choir with immense spirit, to the accompaniment of a swelling chorus: —

O D E.

JULY 4, 1836.

Air — “Hail Columbia,”

HAIL! holy Truth: Hail! Sacred Right,
Whom heav'n gave birth ere dawn'd the light!
That art with heav'n coeval — firm:
That art with heav'n coeval — firm.
Thus thundered forth Truth's Sov'reign God
As high 'mid sky and earth he trod.

In heaven thou hast a during home,
 On earth thy name is scarcely known;
 Her sons too base, too blindly low,
 Thy spirit's boldest, proudest foe.

Hail Truth, Justice, Liberty!
 Heaven's sons are greatly free.
 Saints — 'tis not beneath your praise,
 Strike your harps to noble lays.

Columbia heard his thundering voice,
 The despot's dread, the freeman's choice.
 Hail! holy Truth: Hail! sacred Right!
 Hail! holy Truth: Hail! sacred Right!
 Through earth's domain the echo ran,
 And upward coursed the heaven's broad span.
 In this fair land doth Freedom live;
 In this fair land her champions thrive:
 O'erwhelmed be Kings' united powers,
 That vainly strive to conquer ours.

Hail! Truth, Justice, etc.

Hail! heavenly Science — glorious Ray
 Of bright effulgence — mental Day:
 Great pledge of lasting Liberty!
 Great pledge of lasting Liberty!
 The lordly tyrant's fiercest shock,
 The freeman's firm unshaken rock,
 Heaven's mighty orbs in ceaseless rounds
 Thy flat wheels — their limit bounds:
 Gloom shrouds the earth: thy brightest ray
 Pierces the shade — her night is day.

Hail! Truth, Justice, etc.

Again the land of Patriots heard
 His mighty voice — the well-known word;
 Hail! heav'nly Science — glorious Ray!
 Hail! heav'nly Science — glorious Ray!
 Welcome to Freedom's 'holy land';
 Welcome to Justice' num'rous band.
 Let Eastern climes content remain
 'Neath tyrants' slavish galling chain:
 But next our hearts let knowledge stay;
 Freedom's sure pledge — as light, of day.


Hail! Truth, Justice, etc.

Hail Columbia! Freedom's land!
 Hail her champions — mighty band!
 All hail her Institutions free!
 All hail her Institutions free!

But when your hearts with glory rise,
Forget not those who earned the prize;
Forget not him, the proudest one,
The great, the mighty Washington!
Forget not those who left their life;
Who met in War the last dark strife.
Hail! Truth, Justice, etc.

Considered as a literary production, not much can be said in praise of this ode; but when regarded as the work of a country boy of sixteen, whose whole life had been passed in the seclusion of a rural hamlet, without access to the higher schools of instruction, or the privilege of studying the works of great authors, it becomes exceedingly interesting. The original manuscript — written in a neat and flowing style in which chirographic students might trace resemblances to the *fac similes* which appear elsewhere in this volume — is now in the possession of Mr. Samuel B. Raymond, of Rochester.

With the writing of the Fourth of July Ode, in 1836, virtually ended Raymond's residence in Lima. In the following August he entered the Freshman Class of the University of Vermont, in Burlington, and his college life began.



THE GENESSEE WESLEYAN SEMINARY, IN LIMA.

James Smith's Lima Photo

CHAPTER II.

IN COLLEGE.

RAYMOND PREPARED FOR COLLEGE AT FIFTEEN—HIS FATHER'S FARM MORTGAGED TO PROVIDE MEANS—RAYMOND AS A COLLEGIAN—THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT—INCIDENTS—MR. E. A. STANSBURY'S RECOLLECTIONS—HENRY CLAY AND HENRY J. RAYMOND—RAYMOND'S GRADUATION AND RETURN TO LIMA.

IN a fragment of autobiography found among Mr. Raymond's papers after his death,* he observes that at the age of fifteen he was better prepared for college than his father was to send him. But Jarvis Raymond knew the value of a good education, and at any cost to himself was always ready to give his children the advantages of the best instruction. When his son Henry had reached the age of sixteen, the father mortgaged his farm for the sum of one thousand dollars, and with the provision thus obtained, the lad was sent to Burlington.† The money devoted to this purpose was afterwards repaid to the father by the grateful son.

* See Appendix A. This fragment is evidently but an unfinished and crude series of notes. It needs revision, to remove obscurities and inelegancies of expression; but it is given in the Appendix to this volume, without alteration, as a pleasant memorial.

† The University of Vermont, an old and prosperous institution, situated on a commanding eminence in the city of Burlington, on the banks of Lake Champlain, has recently been enriched by an endowment of eighty thousand dollars. The subjoined passages, taken from the *Burlington Free Press* of October, 1869, show the purposes of this endowment, and also illustrate the generous sympathy of the citizens of Burlington and the alumni of the University in the good work it is performing:—

“We are sure,” observes the *Free Press*, “that our readers will share our pleasure at hearing that the attempt to obtain a subscription of at least eighty thousand dollars for the Treasury of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College has been crowned with success. Never before by any one effort was so large a sum raised for the Institution. When the University undertook, three years ago, to furnish education in the natural

Four years in college were not devoid of incident. It is still a tradition in the University of Vermont that Raymond was one of the best students of his class, and that metaphysical lore was his favorite subject. He clung to his books with the invincible tenacity of his earlier years, determining to master the grave problems set before him, and coolly disregarding temptations and allurements. Among his classmates were

sciences in their applications to agriculture and the mechanic arts, the Trustees saw the necessity of an important addition to the funds at their disposal. They therefore resolved to appeal to the public for the sum of one hundred thousand dollars. It was thought that the Alumni would be pleased to devote their subscriptions to the endowment of the Professorship of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy, which had been rendered so illustrious by the distinguished scholar who then filled it, Prof. Joseph Torrey, and by his venerated predecessor, President James Marsh. They were therefore invited to contribute at least twenty-five thousand dollars to the endowment of the Marsh Professorship. By the terms of that special subscription it was to be completed before Commencement, 1867. The sons of the University cheerfully responded to the call, filled the subscription within the allotted time, and have paid the larger portion of it into the treasury.

"It was decided to ask the citizens of Burlington and vicinity to subscribe at least thirty thousand dollars, and, if possible, to carry their subscriptions to forty thousand dollars. It was also thought wise to provide that none of the subscriptions, except those which should be made to the Alumni Fund, should be binding, unless the total amount of all the subscriptions, special and general, should be at least eighty thousand dollars. When a committee, consisting of Albert L. Catlin, John N. Pomeroy, and Peter T. Washburn, should declare that the sum of thirty thousand dollars had been subscribed in Burlington and vicinity, and that the total sum of eighty thousand dollars, in special and general subscriptions, had been subscribed, and that such subscriptions were, in their judgment, good and valid, then all such subscriptions were to be binding and payable according to the terms thereof. That declaration these three gentlemen have formally made.

"The gentlemen charged with the labor of raising the subscription wisely took the ground that before applications could successfully be made abroad, Burlington must show that she had a fresh and vital interest in the Institution, and confidence that under its new organization it had a career of promise before it. They therefore began their labors here. The citizens of Burlington promptly responded; and in a very short time the thirty thousand dollars asked of them were promised. But they did not stop at that. And to-day there stands against the names of the citizens of Burlington and vicinity (including Winooski and South Burlington), the sum of over forty thousand dollars (\$40,451), a considerable part of which has been paid before it was due. We think it may fairly be said that Burlington has shown her interest in the University. From New York city and Brooklyn subscriptions for twenty-one thousand seven hundred and ten dollars were received; from St. Johnsbury, six thousand two hundred and twenty-five dollars; from St. Albans, two thousand four hundred and fifty dollars; and from Rutland, one thousand four hundred and fifty dollars. Smaller sums were procured in various towns of Vermont."

President Angell, who has been at the head of the University since the year 1866, has directed its affairs with great skill and marked success. His scholastic acquirements and his genial temper assure to him alike the respect of the learned and the affection of the student.

James R. Spaulding,* of New York; Dudley C. Denison, of Royalton, Vermont; J. S. D. Taylor, of St. Albans, Vermont; Daniel C. Houghton, and others with whom Mr. Raymond always kept up the most cordial relations. Associated with him in college, but in other classes, were his old school-mate Alexander Mann, Professor W. G. T. Shedd, D. D., now a resident of New York; J. Sullivan Adams, late Secretary of the Vermont Board of Education; Rev. Calvin Pease, D. D.; John Gregory Smith; James Forsyth, of Troy, New York; Rev. John Henry Hopkins, Jr.; Charles P. Marsh, of Woodstock, Vermont; Torrey E. Wales, of Burlington, Vermont; Robert S. Hale, of New York; Rev. Charles C. Parker, of Maine; William Higby, of California; John N. Baxter, and C. M. Davey, of Rutland, Vermont; and Rev. Wm. T. Herrick, of Clarendon, Vermont.

A writer, who has paid a pleasant tribute to the memory of Mr. Raymond, describes an incident which occurred in the second year of his college course:—

“Raymond was seventeen years old when he came to spend the long and dreary winter vacation with me in a temporarily deserted building of a Vermont college. He was ‘full up’ with his class, and there was no necessity for his devoting his time to Latin and Greek. There had just been received a splendid collection of the old English classics, and I was devoting my time to their careful study. Not so with Raymond. Boyish ambition to shine in his class determined his course and settled his character for life. The class had been reading the *Odyssey* of Homer. He had not read the *Iliad* in his preparatory course, and set about reading up. One book a day he assigned to himself as a task. But as these books were of unequal length, some days he had to overtask nature; and then began that system of overworking himself that at last ended in

* It is an interesting incident in the career of Mr. Raymond, that to three of the gentlemen with whom he was intimately associated in early life, he afterwards gave employment in the service of the *Times*. Mr. Spaulding was for several years an editorial writer for the *Times*; Mr. Mann’s connection with that journal has already been noted; and Mr. E. D. Mansfield, of Ohio, for whose journal Mr. Raymond had written correspondence from New York in 1840, became “The Veteran Observer.”


apoplexy. On one occasion he sat down to his task at four P. M. ; the book was a large one, and he read away through the entire night, and did not complete his task until four P. M. of the next day."

Mr. E. A. Stansbury, formerly editor of the *Burlington Free Press*, and now Secretary of the Homœopathic Life Insurance Company of the city of New York, also contributes a reminiscence of Mr. Raymond. He writes : —

"I knew him first as a young, delicate, intellectual-looking student at Burlington. It was at the Junior Exhibition in the beginning of August, 1839. The great Kentuckian, everywhere regarded as sure to be the nominee of the Presidential Convention to be held in the succeeding December, was making a sort of triumphal progress in advance through the Eastern States, to let his future supporters see the man they were to vote for. He happened to be at Burlington at Commencement, and, of course, was sought by the authorities as the crowning attraction of the occasion. He occupied the central seat upon the stage in front of the pulpit, in the full gaze of an assemblage comprising all that Burlington and its neighborhood for many miles around could boast of as charming and brilliant. Crowds surrounded the church, unable to get admission, but patiently waiting to greet with tumultuous voices the idol of the State.

"I remember the day of the Junior Exhibition well. It was oppressively hot. Mr. Clay, in black frock-coat, white vest and very wide brown drilling pantaloons, sat manfully contending against the combined assaults of the stifling air, the monotonous tones of the speakers, and the interminable length of the exercises — scarcely able, despite his best efforts, to keep securely awake for more than five minutes at a time ; and then, apparently, only by vigorously plying his large snuff-box, which had to do extra duty that day.

"At length a slender, boyish figure stepped gracefully out upon the stage, made his bow to the President, to the Faculty and Mr. Clay, and then to the vast audience. His reputation for ability was so well known that in an instant the buzz of conversation ceased, and the first sentences of Raymond's oration



THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT, IN BURLINGTON.

N. BURR - BOSTON

broke upon the ear, almost as clearly as if the church had been empty. I sat but fifteen or twenty feet from the front of the stage, so that the whole scene was like a picture to me.

"In a moment Mr. Clay's manner changed. He was wide awake. As the young speaker grew more animated, and recovered from the embarrassment, which he afterward confessed to me, almost overpowered him, at the thought of opening his lips in the presence of that great master of oratory, the statesman leaned forward in his chair in an attitude of intense interest, and so remained to the close. When, in those measured and beautiful sentences for which Mr. Raymond was even then remarkable, he brought his theme to a graceful and appropriate termination, Mr. Clay turned to one sitting next him to ask who the speaker was. 'That young man,' said he, 'will make his mark. Depend upon it, you will hear from him hereafter.'

"In the evening, at a reception in honor of Mr. Clay, the brilliant Junior was presented, and heard some words which, I doubt not, he treasured to the end of life."

These incidents serve to illustrate some of the striking points of the young collegian's character. As a little child, he was obedient, staid, and eager for instruction; as a well-grown boy, studious and industrious; as a young man in college, decorous and diligent, making warm friendships and amassing stores of information, which yielded rich returns in the days of struggle and of triumph. In August, 1840, he was graduated at the University, and returned home for a visit to his parents—laden with the honors fairly won by four years of study and application.

CHAPTER III.

ADRIFT.

OUT OF COLLEGE AND IN POLITICS—“TIPPECANOE AND TYLER TOO”—THE CAMPAIGN OF 1840—AN INDIGNANT SCHOOL-MASTER—RAYMOND AGAIN IN SEARCH OF EMPLOYMENT—HE TRIES HIS FORTUNE IN NEW YORK—INTERVIEW WITH HORACE GREELEY—THE NEW-YORKER—RAYMOND STUDYING LAW AND TEACHING—IN GREELEY’S SERVICE—INTRODUCTION TO JOUENALISM.

EMANCIPATED from college, Raymond began to make political speeches. The autumn of 1840 was the time of the Harrison campaign, and the familiar rallying cry of “Tippecanoe and Tyler too” rang through the Genesee valley as loudly as in other parts of the country. Raymond was too young to vote, but old enough to talk well. He had passed his twentieth birthday, and the experience he had had in four years of college training and Society declamation, grafted upon a natural fluency of speech, gave him the confidence and ready flow of words which he never afterwards lost. Warmly espousing the Whig cause, he performed excellent service in the campaign, addressing large audiences in Lima, Genesee and other places, and continually winning good opinions. A democratic school-master, named Loomis, however, became profoundly disgusted at the young collegian’s success as an orator, as well as with the trenchant blows he dealt, and the story runs that he once inquired with much asperity “what that little Raymond, with a face no bigger than a snuff-box, meant by coming round there to make political speeches!” At this period, also, Raymond took part in public discussions upon political questions, and acquitted himself honorably. The campaign ended, and Harrison was elected. But for that victory of the Whigs, Horace Greeley would probably not have established the *Tribune*; and had not

the *Tribune* been established, Henry J. Raymond's career might have been different.

At the close of the Presidential canvass, Raymond sought for a select school in which to teach, and he has himself told us that it was only upon the downfall of all such hopes, and in despair of finding anything to do at home, that he determined to try his fortune in the city of New York. Arriving there in December, 1840, knowing but one person in the whole city, — a student in a lawyer's office, — he ventured to make application to Horace Greeley for the place of assistant on the *New-Yorker*, the little weekly journal which was the immediate predecessor of the New York *Tribune*. For five years Raymond had been a subscriber to the *New-Yorker*, and had occasionally sent contributions to its column: and on the strength of this relation he made timorous advances to Mr. Greeley. But the result of the first interview was chilling; the services of another applicant had just been accepted; Greeley was poor, and his paper, like all of its class at that day, was unable to bear the expense of a larger number of assistants. Raymond, however, obtained permission to be in the office whenever he chose, and in return promised to give his help on any occasion when his services should be of value. On this anomalous footing he made his way towards the first round of the ladder of New York journalism.

Again pushing out upon the current, he advertised, through the *National Intelligencer* of Washington, for a school in the South, and while awaiting replies, occupied his leisure hours in reading law in the office of Mr. Edward W. Marsh, a member of the New York Bar. A part of each day for three weeks was passed by Raymond in the office of the *New-Yorker*, where a considerable share of literary work gradually fell into his hands. He writes of his life at this period: "I added up election returns, read the exchanges for news, and discovered a good deal which others had overlooked; made brief notices of new books, read proof, and made myself generally useful. At the end of about three weeks I received the first reply to my advertisement, offering me a school of thirty scholars in North Carolina. I told Mr. Greeley at once that I should leave

the city the next morning. He asked me to walk with him to the post-office, whither he always went in person to get his letters and exchanges, and on the way inquired where I was going. I told him to North Carolina to teach a school. He asked me how much they would pay me. I said, four hundred dollars a year. 'Oh,' said he, 'stay here — I'll give you that.' And this was my first engagement on the Press, and decided the whole course of my life."

Eight dollars a week was meagre pay for the literary labor performed by Raymond in his twenty-first year:—quite as meagre, in comparison with the quality of the work, as the paltry pittance of seventy-five dollars a year paid him in the country store at the age of fifteen; but he did not repine, nor did he refuse the slice because the whole loaf was not at command. It was, however, simply impossible to live comfortably upon his pitiful salary. By extra work, he was enabled to increase his income, and he did not disdain to weight his lean purse by writing daily advertisements of a vegetable pill for a quack doctor, at the rate of fifty cents for each production. Subsequently he obtained the situation of teacher to a Latin class in a young ladies' seminary in New York; and, still later, eked out his means of subsistence by writing correspondence for the *Philadelphia Standard*, edited by R. W. Griswold; the *Cincinnati Chronicle*, edited by E. D. Mansfield, afterwards the "Veteran Observer" of the *New York Times*; the *Bangor Whig*, and the *Buffalo Commercial Advertiser*.

Thus the tide ran, — Raymond always floating with it, never overwhelmed, — until the spring of 1841, when Horace Greeley established the *New York Tribune*. The few months' service which had been rendered by Raymond made him a necessity to Greeley, and with the foundation of the *Tribune* were also laid the foundations of Raymond's future position and prosperity. Less than three months over age when he took the post of first assistant upon the *Tribune*, he at once threw his whole force into the profession which he then definitely determined to follow; and so began a career which culminated a few years later in a new era for Journalism in America.

Twenty-one years of Raymond's life had passed before he

became fast-anchored. Thereafter he was identified with newspaper life; in it he made his reputation; by it he amassed a competency; through its agency he rose to political preferment, — and he died in harness.

To his peculiar experiences in the office of the *Tribune*, a separate chapter must be given.

CHAPTER IV.

ANCHORED.

THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE — HORACE GREELEY'S TRIBUTE TO HENRY J. RAYMOND — A MISTAKE CORRECTED — RAYMOND'S WORK ON THE TRIBUNE — SIGNAL SUCCESSES — DR. DIONYSIUS LARDNER'S LECTURES — SEVERE ILLNESS OF RAYMOND — GREELEY CALLS UPON HIM — RAYMOND'S WRETCHED PAY — RESULTS OF AN INTERVIEW IN A SICK-ROOM — RAYMOND AS A REPORTER — HIS SECESSION FROM THE TRIBUNE.

HORACE GREELEY has written of Henry J. Raymond: * "I had not much for him to do till the *Tribune* was started; then I had enough; and I never found another person, barely of age and just from his studies, who evinced so much and so versatile ability in journalism as he did. Abler and stronger men I may have met; a cleverer, readier, more generally efficient journalist I never saw. He remained with me eight years, if my memory serves, and is the only assistant with whom I ever felt required to remonstrate for doing more work than any human brain and frame could be expected long to endure. His salary was of course gradually increased from time to time; but his services were more valuable in proportion to their cost than those of any one else who ever worked on the *Tribune*."

The praise here bestowed is just — but Mr. Greeley's memory is at fault. Mr. Raymond served upon the *New-Yorker* and the *Tribune* less than three years in all, — from December, 1840 to April, 1841, on the *New-Yorker*; and from 1841 to 1843 on the *Tribune*; the latter year being the date of his secession from the *Tribune* to join General Webb in the *Courier and Enquirer*. But Mr. Greeley is entirely right in the tribute he pays to Mr. Raymond's qualities as an efficient worker.

Raymond set out with a resolute purpose, not only to estab-

* "Recollections of a Busy Life," pp. 138-9.

lish his own reputation as a journalist, but also to gain for the *Tribune* the patronage and the confidence of the reading public. To these ends he bent all his energies, and to his untiring perseverance and his marked capacity the new journal owed a very large share of its early success. He wrote editorial articles, clipped paragraphs from the exchanges, made up the news, prepared reviews of new books, reported the proceedings of public meetings, and did with all his might whatever his hand found to do; receiving, as the reward of all this wearing labor upon a daily newspaper, which required his services half the night, the same salary of eight dollars per week which had been paid him for the lighter and pleasanter day's work of a weekly journal!

Among the signal successes achieved by Raymond, in the early days of his service for the *Tribune*, was the reporting of the scientific lectures delivered in New York by Dr. Dionysius Lardner, — a popular lecturer, very much overrated, who was then at the height of his celebrity. The lectures were delivered in that extraordinary old church in Broadway called the "Tabernacle," long since pulled down, in which Jenny Lind declined to sing because it was "an old tub," — and so it was. Raymond, always swift-handed, had a stenographic system of his own, a kind of long-short-hand, by the use of which he was able to follow an ordinary speaker very closely; and his reports of Lardner's remarks proved to be so accurate that the doctor adopted them, and with slight revision they were afterwards published in two octavo volumes. But on the night when the last lecture of the course was delivered, Raymond fell ill. Coming out from the heated church, he found a tempest raging, and reached the *Tribune* office only after a thorough drenching. Sitting for hours in wet clothes, he finished his report, — a very long and excellent one, — and went to his home in the small hours of the morning, to wake next day in a violent fever. His room was on the upper floor of a boarding-house on the corner of Vesey and Church streets; his means were limited; the attendance was poor; fare was scanty; neither family nor friends were near him; it was altogether an unpleasant predicament. But he pulled through bravely. He had

sickened in the service of the *Tribune*; and, as has too often occurred in Mr. Greeley's establishment, hard service was inadequately rewarded. Some time elapsed before Greeley went to inquire about his assistant, the loss of whose aid was beginning to tell upon the paper. Then a conversation occurred, something like this:—

"When will you be well enough to come back?" said Greeley.

"Never, on the salary you paid me!" replied Raymond.

Greeley inquired how much Raymond wanted. "Twenty dollars a week!" said Raymond. Greeley protested angrily that he could pay no such price; but he finally yielded, and the previous relations were restored.

Mr. Raymond, in conversation with the writer of these pages, ten years later, alluded to this tilt with Mr. Greeley; and in speaking of the *Times*—then on the eve of publication—observed that he desired no man to perform services for his own paper for the inadequate remuneration he had himself received during his connection with the *Tribune*. When Raymond took his stand for pay equivalent to the value of the services rendered, Greeley yielded; but so long as the subordinate did not rebel, the chief did not relent. It is the misfortune of some men to be too patient; of others, to be exacting and ungenerous. The relative positions of Henry J. Raymond and Horace Greeley at this period of their lives furnish striking illustrations of the result of such conditions.

A pleasant reminiscence of Mr. Raymond's connection with the *Tribune* was given by Mr. Thomas McElrath, at a dinner given at Delmonico's, in New York, on the 10th of April, 1866, in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the birth of that journal. Mr. McElrath, alluding to the gentlemen originally engaged upon the *Tribune*, said that Mr. Raymond had contributed greatly towards securing the recognition of the journal as a leading newspaper of the day. He spoke of Mr. Raymond as an able and graphic reporter, who possessed the faculty of presenting to his readers a pen-picture of events as they transpired, in a manner scarcely ever equalled by any journalist. Mr. McElrath "alluded particularly to the reports

made by Mr. Raymond of the celebrated Colt murder case, which at the time occupied the attention of the whole country, and also to the equally celebrated Mackenzie trial. These cases were sketched at length in the columns of the *Tribune* by Mr. Raymond, in an elaborate and attractive manner. Mr. McElrath said that these reports added several thousand subscribers to their list during the pendency of the trials, and that nearly all who were thus induced to become patrons of that paper, continued until the journal became an established institution."

In 1843, however, wearied by long and ill-paid service, — and somewhat disgusted withal, — Mr. Raymond accepted a good offer from the proprietors of the *Courier and Enquirer*, and turned his back forever upon Mr. Greeley and the *Tribune*. A new phase of his life had begun.

Here let us pause, to undertake a passing review of the course of New York Journalism. In order to arrive at a correct understanding of the radical changes which Mr. Raymond was instrumental in introducing into the conduct of great newspapers in New York, it is essential to remember the characteristics of the journals which had existed for many years before his appearance in the field of contest.

CHAPTER V.

PROGRESS OF JOURNALISM IN NEW YORK—1840 TO 1850.

EASY-GOING NEWSPAPERS—THE OLD “BLANKET SHEETS”—EDITORIAL DUELS AND HORSE-WHIPPINGS—MR. W. C. BRYANT’S REMINISCENCES—THE COURIER AND ENQUIRER—THE JOURNAL OF COMMERCE—THE EVENING POST—THE COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER—THE HERALD—HOW BENNETT STARTLED THE CITY OF NEW YORK—THE SUN—THE TRIBUNE AS A CHEAP AND RESPECTABLE PAPER—FIERCE RIVALRIES—OLD METHODS OF GETTING NEWS—SHARP PRACTICE—PONY EXPRESSES—STEALING LOCOMOTIVE ENGINES—CARRIER-PIGEONS²—SETTING TYPE ON BOARD OF STEAMBOATS—HOW RAYMOND REPORTED WEBSTER’S SPEECH—THE VOYAGE OF MONROE F. GALE ACROSS THE ATLANTIC—THE PILOT-BOAT WILLIAM J. ROMER IN THE ICE—PERSONALITIES—JAMES WATSON WEBB’S RIDICULE OF HORACE GREELEY’S PERSONAL APPEARANCE—GREELEY’S REPLY—THE TRIBUNE’S “SLIEVEGAMMON” HOAX—BURNING OF THE TRIBUNE OFFICE—THE TIDE CHANGING.

THE easy style of journalism prevailed in New York prior to 1840. The heavy, old-fashioned, “blanket sheet” newspaper, with which the steady merchant of pure Knickerbocker descent had been accustomed to season his morning cup of coffee, and the equally huge evening sheet which conduced to his post-prandial repose, were the best he or his fathers had known. Those days were serious. No flippant flings disturbed the equable flow of journalistic inanity. When two editors differed, one shot the other, quietly, in a duel; or else there was a lively horsewhipping scene in the public streets, a full description of which appeared, on the following day, in the newspapers owned by the horsewhipped men.* There was no telegraph before the year 1843; there were no fast ocean steamers till a period still later; no Associated Press organization simplified the processes of obtaining news. In fact,—and justice requires it to be said,—it was not until James

* See the *Commercial Advertiser*, the *Courier and Enquirer*, and the *Herald* of the period.

Gordon Bennett set the example, in 1835, that the conductors of public journals cared to publish intelligence too freshly. Like epicures, they waited for the food to age. All the old and heavy-weighted journals, which lazily got themselves before the New York public, day by day, thirty years ago, were undeniably sleepy. Their dulness and inaptness had become traditional by long custom; and a remarkable illustration of this is afforded by a passage in Mr. William C. Bryant's "Reminiscences of the *Evening Post*," — a very readable review of the first half-century of that journal, — which was first published in its columns in November, 1851, and was subsequently reprinted in a shilling pamphlet, now out of print. Mr. Bryant wrote: —

"In the *Evening Post*, during the first twenty years of its existence, there was much less discussion of public questions by the editors than is now common in all classes of newspapers. The editorial articles were mostly brief, with but occasional exceptions; nor does it seem to have been regarded, as it now is, necessary for a daily paper to pronounce a prompt judgment on every question of a public nature the moment it arises. The annual message sent by Mr. Jefferson to Congress, in 1801, was published in the *Evening Post* of the 12th of December, without a word of remark. On the 17th, a writer, who takes the signature of Lucius Cassius, begins to examine it. The examination is continued through the whole winter; and, finally, after having extended to eighteen numbers, is concluded on the 8th of April. The resolutions of General Smith, for the abrogation of discriminating duties, laid before Congress in the same winter, were published without comment; but a few days afterwards they were made the subject of a carefully written animadversion, continued through several numbers of that paper."

The ruthless Bennett shocked the staid propriety of his time by introducing the rivalries and the spirit of enterprise which have ever since been distinguishing characteristics of New York newspaper life. The only cheap papers, in 1840, which pretended, with any show of reason, to publish all the news of the day, were the *Herald*, and Moses Y. Beach's *Sun*; and

although the former of these was low and often scurrilous, and the latter silly, they attracted readers among the younger inhabitants of New York, who had begun to tire of the Dutch phlegm.

It was a shrewd movement of Horace Greeley to take advantage of this change in popular sentiment. He says of the first number of the *Tribune*, issued April 10, 1841: "It was a small sheet, for it was to be retailed for a cent, and not much of a newspaper could be afforded for that price, even in those specie-paying times. I had been incited to this enterprise by several Whig friends, who deemed a cheap daily, addressed more especially to the laboring class, eminently needed in our city, where the only two cheap journals then and still existing — the *Sun* and the *Herald* — were in decided, though unavowed, and therefore more effective, sympathy and affiliation with the Democratic party. Two or three had promised pecuniary aid if it should be needed; only one (Mr. James Coggeshall, long since deceased) ever made good that promise, by loaning me one thousand dollars, which was duly and gratefully repaid, principal and interest."

Cheap papers — three in number — having thus come into existence, the sixpenny mammoths began to gasp. Their day was done. From 1843 to 1850, indeed, Raymond made a strong effort to restore to Webb's *Courier and Enquirer* some measure of its departed glory, and his celebrated discussion with Greeley on the subject of Socialism gave it a temporary revival; but he became discouraged with the effort, and finally established the *Times*. The *Times* lived, and the *Courier and Enquirer* died. In the eternal fitness of things, hoary age thus gave place to lusty youth. The old *Journal of Commerce*, which still exists, lives because the older men died out of it, or left it, and the red blood came in; and it is to-day one of the four papers* in New York which return enormous profits.

Between the extremes of dull respectability and bold indecency, of portentous heaviness and unsubstantial froth, came

* The *Herald*, the *Times*, the *Journal of Commerce*, and the *Evening Post*, — each of which made clear annual profits of from fifty thousand to one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, in 1868-9.

Greeley's *Tribune*. It was the first of a long line of cheap and good newspapers, some of which still live and prosper, but many more long since sank into utter oblivion; even the diligent collector of curiosities has difficulty to-day in discovering stray copies of them.

The next development in order was the fierce rivalry which is always born of opposition. Beach and Bennett, who had been tilting in their private lists, united to bear down Greeley. Horace, however, was a good fighter, and he had Raymond to help him, and McElrath* to manage the business affairs, and so the battle was waged without material injury to either party, for in reality there was room for all. The reading public enjoyed the fun, and bought all the papers engaged in quarrel, in order to see which had won; and this continued and growing demand was fuel to the fire of competitive activity.

On election nights, the rival journals ran pony expresses to convey early intelligence of results; and in times of high political excitement, locomotive engines were raced on rival lines of railroad, in the interest of papers which had paid high prices for the "right of way." The writer has a vivid remembrance of one night in the office of the *Tribune*, when a special messenger, hot and dusty, came in from the east end of Long Island, with important election returns from Patchogue or Quogue, or some other queer place, brought by special engine at the rate of sixty-five miles an hour (on the Long Island Railroad too!). The yell of joy which Greeley uttered when he saw the "returns" might have been heard a quarter of a mile. As goes Quogue, so goes the Union; and the returns in question settled the fate of a district.

Instances of sharp practice, too, were not wanting. On one occasion, a messenger for the *Tribune* quietly gathered up the

* In an unpublished letter, written in 1845, Mr. Greeley paid this striking tribute to Mr. McElrath: "In the fall of 1841, a kind Providence impelled Mr. Thomas McElrath, formerly a bookseller, then a lawyer and master in chancery, to call on me and suggest the idea of a partnership. I gladly closed with him on any terms, and from that day to this not another hair has been worn off my head by the aching puzzle of studying out the means of paying to-morrow's note."

details of some important news, in a distant part of the country, and then ran away with it to New York on an engine which was in waiting, under a full head of steam, for the use of the representative of the *Herald*. Of course, the *Tribune* had the news exclusively; and Bennett, very naturally, uttered blasphemies. Such occurrences gave zest to the pursuit of intelligence, and sometimes provoked acrimonious discussions between the rival sheets.

Nor was the competition confined to enterprises like these. For want of the boundless facilities now afforded by the organized enterprise of the newspaper offices, there were curious experiments in unexpected directions. Type was set on board of North River steamboats by corps of printers, who had a speech ready for the press in New York eight hours after its delivery in Albany.* Carrier-pigeons, carefully trained, flew from Halifax or Boston with the latest news from Europe tucked under their wings, and delivered their charge to their trainer in his room near Wall Street; and an excellent gentleman, Mr. Monroe F. Gale, who has been the foreman of the

* This feat was once performed under Henry J. Raymond's direction, and the story was told after his death, with substantial correctness, in one of the current biographical sketches, from which we copy:—

“Before the days of the telegraph [1843], Raymond was sent to Boston to report a speech of Daniel Webster, then in the height of his popularity. Rival city journals also despatched their reporters, each selecting for the purpose two of their best short-hand writers to work against Mr. Raymond. The speech was delivered, and proved to be one of Mr. Webster's greatest achievements. The several New York reporters took the night-boat to return to New York, and all, save Mr. Raymond, gave themselves up to such enjoyment during the evening as the boat afforded. Mr. Raymond sat quietly in the back cabin, and was observed to be writing furiously. Presently one of the reporters had his suspicions aroused, and setting out on an exploring expedition, found that Mr. Raymond had on board a small printing-office, fully equipped. His manuscript was taken page by page to the compositors, set up immediately, and on the arrival of the boat in New York, at five o'clock in the morning, Mr. Raymond's report, making several columns of the *Tribune*, was all in type. These columns were put into the forms at once, and the readers of that journal were, at six A. M., served with a full report of Daniel Webster's speech delivered in Boston on the previous afternoon. This, at that time, was one of the greatest journalistic feats on record, and so completely astonished and astounded the *Tribune's* rivals that they never published the reports furnished by their short-hand writers, but acknowledged themselves fairly beaten.”

Times' composing-room since the foundation of that paper, was sent sailing over the Atlantic, in a little pilot-boat, in quest of improved methods of news-getting.

The episode of this madcap voyage across the ocean dates back to the year 1846, and is interesting enough to be recorded among the reminiscences of the older journalism of New York.

In the early part of the year 1846 there were no fast steamers; seven-day voyages across the Atlantic were supposed to be wild vagaries, — even, indeed, if the idea of attaining such a degree of reckless speed had ever entered the brain of any sane man. Nevertheless; the spirit had been awakened which was to produce this and all other wonders. The eager quest for fresh news had begun to mark the conduct of the public journals of New York as a distinguishing characteristic; and the adventurous voyage of the pilot-boat William J. Romer was but a natural expression of the prevalent feeling of the day. The immediate purpose of her despatch to Europe was the prompt conveyance of the Oregon Treaty to England; but an incidental point was a test of the speed of light-built boats.

A contemporaneous narrative* gives a full account of the voyage of the Romer, together with a copy of the log kept by her captain, the comments of the press of the day upon the probable purpose of the expedition, and five wood-engravings, illustrating some of the perils through which the little craft safely passed. One of these illustrations we reproduce; it represents the boat in mid-ocean, environed by fields of broken ice.

The William J. Romer belonged to the fleet of New York pilot-boats. Her burden was about fifty tons. The equipment for the long and perilous winter voyage across three thousand miles of sea was made as perfect as the circumstances permitted; but the discomforts endured by her courageous crew, and the passengers she carried, were sufficiently disagreeable. She left New York on Tuesday, February 10, 1846, and on the

* Greeley's revived *New-Yorker*, of Saturday, April 18, 1846, — a weekly paper then issued as an adjunct to the *Tribune*.

7th of March she was anchored in the harbor of Cork, Ireland; having thus occupied nearly twenty-five days in making the trip. She was beaten in the race by the sailing packet Patrick Henry, which had also left New York on the 10th of February. Fast-sailing yachts have since made better time across the ocean; but the voyage of the *Romer* is an important part of the history of early journalism in New York; and if the experiment failed, it was through no want of daring or of skill on the part of those who handled her.*


An incident of this period of New York journalism should here be cited, in illustration of the animosities and personal abuse which too often found public expression. The *Courier and Enquirer*, having been worsted in an argument with the *Tribune*, took its revenge in unmannerly and wholly unjustifiable abuse of Greeley. The blackguardism of which Webb was guilty in 1844 might have been forgotten, but for the dignified and caustic rejoinder it drew forth from Greeley. Greeley was so merciless, and Webb so completely quelled, that the brief controversy attracted general attention. Twenty-six years have since gone by, but the articles are still worth reading.

In the *Courier and Enquirer* of January 27, 1844, appeared the following:—

“The editor of the *Tribune* is an Abolitionist; we precisely the reverse. He is a philosopher; we are a Christian. He is a pupil of Graham, and would have all the world live upon bran-bread and sawdust; we are in favor of living as our fathers did, and of enjoying in moderation the good things which Providence has bestowed upon us. He is the advocate of the Fourierism, Socialism, and all the tomfooleries which have given birth to the debasing and disgusting spectacles of vice and immorality which Fanny Wright, Collins, and others exhibit. . . . He seeks for notoriety by pretending to great eccentricity of character and habits, and by the strangeness of his theories and practices; we, on the contrary, are content with following in the beaten path, and accomplishing the good we can, in the old-fashioned way. He lays claim to greatness by wandering through the streets with a hat double the size of his head, a coat after the fashion of Jacob's of old, with one leg of his pantaloons inside and the other outside of his boot, and with boots all bespattered with mud, or, possibly, a shoe on one foot and a boot on the other, and glorying in an unwashed and unshaven person. We, on the contrary, eschew all such affectation as weak and silly; we think

* For a detailed account of the voyage, see Appendix F.

THE PILOT BOAT WILLIAM J. ROMER IN THE ICE



W. J. ROMER

there is a difference between notoriety and distinction; we recognize the social obligation to act and dress according to our station in life; and we look upon cleanliness of person as inseparable from purity of thought and benevolence of heart. In short, there is not the slightest resemblance between the editor of the *Tribune* and ourself, politically, morally, or socially; and it is only when his affectation and impudence are unbearable, that we condescend to notice him or his press."

In the *Tribune* of the following day appeared this reply:—

"It is true that the Editor of *The Tribune* chooses mainly (not entirely) vegetable food; but he never troubles his readers on the subject; it does not worry them; why should it concern the Colonel? It is hard for philosophy that so humble a man shall be made to stand as its exemplar, while Christianity is personified by the hero of the Sunday duel with Hon. Tom Marshall; but such luck will happen. As to our personal appearance, it does seem time that we should say something. Some donkey, a while ago, apparently anxious to assail or annoy the Editor of this paper, and not well knowing with what, originated the story of his carelessness of personal appearance; and since then, every blockhead of the same disposition, and distressed by a similar lack of ideas, has repeated and exaggerated the foolery, until, from its origin in the *Albany Microscope*, it has sunk down at last to the columns of the *Courier and Enquirer*, growing more absurd at every landing. Yet, all this time, the object of this silly raillery has doubtless worn better clothes than two-thirds of those who thus assailed him,—better than any of them could honestly wear, if they paid their debts otherwise than by bankruptcy; while, if they are indeed more cleanly than he, they must bathe very thoroughly not less than twice each day. The Editor of the *Tribune* is the son of a poor and humble farmer; came to New York a minor, without a friend within two hundred miles, less than ten dollars in his pocket, and precious little besides; he has never had a dollar from a relative, and has, for years, labored under a load of debt. Henceforth he may be able to make a better show, if deemed essential by his friends; for himself he has not much time or thought to bestow on the matter. That he ever affected eccentricity is most untrue; and certainly no costume he ever appeared in, would create such a sensation in Broadway, as that James Watson Webb would have worn, but for the clemency of Gov. Seward. Heaven grant our assailant may never hang with such weight on another whig executive!—We drop him."

Colonel Webb made no reply. Mr. Greeley had flattened him.*

*The personalities of this period were not confined to attacks by newspaper editors upon their rivals. Bennett, who had been for five years the leader in the "personal" department, was very fond of talking about himself; and the columns of the *Herald* were devoted, at intervals, to accounts of his private affairs. The most curious specimen is given below, as an illustrative incident. It is the announcement of the intended marriage of the Editor of

Four years later, Greeley's paper became notorious, through the "Slievegammon" hoax, which in itself is a curious bit of

the *Herald*, and it appeared in the leading column of that journal, on the 1st of June, 1840, under a flaming caption:—

"TO THE READERS OF THE HERALD — DECLARATION OF LOVE — CAUGHT AT LAST — GOING TO BE MARRIED — NEW MOVEMENT IN CIVILIZATION.

"I am going to be married in a few days. The weather is so beautiful; times are getting so good; the prospects of political and moral reform so auspicious, that I cannot resist the divine instinct of honest nature any longer; so I am going to be married to one of the most splendid women in intellect, in heart, in soul, in property, in person, in manner, that I have yet seen in the course of my interesting pilgrimage through human life.

... "I cannot stop in my career. I must fulfil that awful destiny which the Almighty Father has written against my name, in the broad letters of life, against the wall of heaven. I must give the world a pattern of happy wedded life, with all the charities that spring from a nuptial love. In a few days I shall be married according to the holy rites of the most holy Christian church, to one of the most remarkable, accomplished, and beautiful young women of the age. She possesses a fortune. I sought and found a fortune — a large fortune. She has no Stonington shares or Manhattan stock, but in purity and uprightness she is worth half a million of pure coin. Can any swindling bank show as much? In good sense and elegance another half a million; in soul, mind and beauty, millions on millions, equal to the whole specie of all the rotten banks in the world. Happily, the patronage of the public to the *Herald* is nearly twenty-five thousand dollars per annum, almost equal to a President's salary. But property in the world's goods was never my object. Fame, public good, usefulness in my day and generation; the religious associations of female excellence; the progress of true industry, — these have been my dreams by night, and my desires by day.

"In the new and holy condition into which I am about to enter, and to enter with the same reverential feelings as I would heaven itself, I anticipate some signal changes in my feelings, in my views, in my purposes, in my pursuits. What they may be I know not — time alone can tell. My ardent desire has been through life, to reach the highest order of human excellence, by the shortest possible cut. Associated, night and day, in sickness and in health, in war and in peace, with a woman of this highest order of excellence, must produce some curious results in my heart and feelings, and these results the future will develop in due time in the columns of the *Herald*.

"Meantime, I return my heartfelt thanks for the enthusiastic patronage of the public, both of Europe and of America. The holy estate of wedlock will only increase my desire to be still more useful. God Almighty bless you all.

"JAMES GORDON BENNETT."

In the postscript to this announcement, Bennett gives notice that he shall have no time to waste upon the editors who attacked him, "until after marriage and the honeymoon."

On the 8th of June, 1840, the marriage was announced at the head of the editorial columns of the *Herald*, as follows:—

"MARRIED.

"On Saturday afternoon, the 6th instant, by the Rev. Doctor Power, at St. Peter's Catholic Church, in Barclay street, James Gordon Bennett, the proprietor and editor of the New York *Herald*, to Henrietta Agnes Crean. What may be the effect of this event on the great newspaper contest now waging in New York, time alone can show."

newspaper history. The troubled summer of 1848, when thrones went down, and blood flowed like water, and men strove breast to breast with pitiless energy, gave rise to many false rumors of successes and defeats. But none became so notable as the *Tribune's* exclusive intelligence of the Irish battle of Slievenamon. On the morning of March 28, 1848, the readers of the morning journals of New York were startled by a flourish of large type, which announced "The Abdication of Louis Philippe" — "A Republic Proclaimed" — "Assault on the Palais Royal" — "Great Loss of Life." It was a time to stir the blood. Crowns cracked — in two senses; the people came uppermost, and then, not knowing how to stay up, went down again. The general purgation was salutary; but the medicine was the bayonet, and the remedy was cruel, and, in the sequel, ineffective. However, the train had been touched, and the flame of revolt leaped over the Channel, and fell upon the bundle of inflammable tow called Ireland. In August, news came that Ireland was "up." As in the days of the Rapparees, bog and mountain bristled with pike and gun. Some bloody fights occurred, but the disciplined valor of the English bore down the ragged Celt. Then the Irish element in America rushed to the rescue; a "Directory of the Friends of Ireland" was organized in New York, and Horace Greeley accepted a leading position in it. It was natural, therefore, that his journal should become the centre of intelligence for all that related to the Irish struggle.

One day in August the despatches received at the *Tribune* office contained letters from Dublin, dated August 3, announcing the battle of Slievenamon in the following terms: —

"No newspaper here [Dublin] dare tell the truth concerning the battle of Slievenamon; but, from all we can learn, the people have had a great victory. General Macdonald, the commander of the British forces, is killed, and *six thousand troops are killed and wounded*. The road for three miles is covered with the dead. We also have the inspiring intelligence that Kilkenny and Limerick have been taken by the people. The people of Dublin have gone in thousands to assist in the country. Mr. John B. Dillon was wounded in both legs. Mr. Meagher was also wounded in both arms. It is generally expected that Dublin will rise and attack the jails on Sunday night (August 6)."

There was not a word of truth in this. The mountain of Slievenamon remained unstained by blood; General Macdonald and his six thousand veterans still possessed unpunctured skins; Thomas Francis Meagher lived, — to break his parole and then challenge Henry J. Raymond to fight a duel, because he charged him with it; and Horace Greeley was innocent of the hoax, because he was at the time exploring the shores of Lake Superior. But the deception did its work, and money came rapidly into the treasury of the "Directory."

As a matter of course, Bennett pooh-pooh'd the story, and travestied the name of the hard-won battle into "Slievegammon," by which title it has since been generally known. Had the *Herald* received the news exclusively, instead of the *Tribune*, the complexion of the affair would have been changed, and that sheet would have preserved a decorous silence as soon as the hoax became apparent.

And this was the end of the battle of Slievenamon.

The dingy building, in which the early years of the *Tribune* were passed, was burned in February, 1845, and the reappearance of the paper on the following morning, although at the time the proprietors did not know but they were irretrievably ruined, was regarded by its admirers and opponents alike as an example of enterprise deserving the warmest praise. It was a profitable fire for the *Tribune*. Mr. Greeley and Mr. McElrath stood musing upon the ruins only for a brief period, and then turned to their work as naturally as if nothing had happened. The paper appeared on the following morning, only an hour behind its usual time; and its patrons vied with the conductors of the opposition journals, in extending a helping hand.*

* Mr. Greeley's "Reflections over the Fire," which appeared in the columns of the *Tribune* on the morning after the catastrophe, deserve to be recorded. He wrote in this good-humored strain: —

"We would not indulge in unnecessary sentiment, but even the old desk at which we sat, the ponderous inkstand, the familiar faces of files of correspondence, the choice collection of pamphlets, the unfinished essay, the charts by which we steered, — can they all have vanished, never more to be seen? Truly, your fire makes clean work, and is, of all executive officers, super-

Upon the site of the old building rose the present one, — Slamm's *Plebeian* disappearing from the little gore of land upon the corner which it had occupied, — and in the ensuing autumn, the *Tribune* was fully reinstated, having added strength to its editorial force, and improved its facilities for conducting business. A year or two later it passed from the sole proprietorship of Greeley & McElrath, into the management of a joint-stock company, which has since controlled its fortunes.

In the period of ten years from 1840 to 1850, therefore, four important events in New York journalism had occurred. First, the heavy old papers had been startled, and their power shaken, by the advent of the *Herald*; secondly, a spirit of eager rivalry had been awakened, which ensured the prompt collection of the news of the day; thirdly, the *Tribune* had become the established organ of the respectable part of the community, appealing directly to, and receiving ample support from, a large class which had long forsaken Bennett, on account of his indecency; and, fourthly, it had been proved that a cheap paper could exist in New York without pandering to the criminal, or attempting to please the vulgar. To Bennett must be given the credit of effecting a revolution in the meth-

eminent. Perhaps that last choice batch of letters may be somewhere on file; we are almost tempted to cry, 'Devil! find it up!' Poh! it is a mere cinder now; some

" ' Fathoms deep my letter lies;
Of its lines is tinder made.'

"No Arabian tale can cradle a wilder fiction, or show better how altogether illusory life is. Those solid walls of brick; those five decent stories; those steep and difficult stairs; the swing doors; the sanctum, scene of many a deep political drama, of many a pathetic tale, — utterly whiffed out, as one summarily snuffs out a spermaceti on retiring for the night. And all perfectly true.

"One always has some private satisfaction in his own particular misery. Consider what a night it was that burnt us out, that we were conquered by the elements, went up in flames heroically on the wildest, windiest, stormiest night these dozen years, not by any fault of human enterprise, but fairly conquered by stress of weather; there was a great flourish of trumpets, at all events.

"And consider, above all, that salamander safe; how, after all, the fire, assisted by the elements, only came off second best, not being able to reduce that safe into ashes. That is the streak of sunshine through the dun wreaths of smoke; the combat of human ingenuity against the desperate encounter of the seething heat. But those boots, and Webster's Dictionary — well! we were handsomely whipped there, we acknowledge."

ods of news-getting; but to Greeley the higher praise of improving upon Bennett's invention. James Gordon Bennett and Horace Greeley were, in fact, the John Fitch and Robert Fulton of New York journalism.

When the tide began to change, the stream of journalistic life began to broaden, and from this point onward the record covers a larger field.

CHAPTER VI.

PROGRESS OF JOURNALISM IN NEW YORK.—CONTINUED.

PERIODS IN JOURNALISM — THE EXPANSION OF THE PRESS AND THE PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION — THE PIONEER FOLLOWED BY THE PRINTER — USELESS PAPERS DEAD — CONDITION OF THE NEW YORK PRESS TWENTY YEARS AGO — HOW THE HERALD AND THE TRIBUNE FELL INTO DISREPUTE — HENRY J. RAYMOND CREATING A NEW ERA IN JOURNALISM — THE GERM OF HIS FUTURE SUCCESS.

THERE are periods in Journalism, as in art, science, trade, commerce, and the whole range of literature. The rapid growth of knowledge, and the continual increase of the facilities of travel and intercommunication, are followed in regular order by the expansion of the Press and by the enlargement of its legitimate power. Two centuries ago the world's pace was moderate, and its wants were few; ships spread their canvas only to favoring winds; stage-coaches rumbled slowly over ill-made roads; mail-bags conveyed to distant places tidings of events which had occurred three months, six months, or a year before; kings were acknowledged to rule by a right called divine; discoveries were rare, inventions rarer, and the great mass of the population of the world sodden. Newspapers especially were stupid, for the excellent reason that there were few readers who cared to receive them; or, receiving, were able to understand them. Macaulay has written of the English Press at the close of the seventeenth century, — and the English Press then was the best in the world, — that the leading papers were wretchedly printed, and that "what is now called a leading article seldom appeared, except when there was a scarcity of intelligence, when the Dutch mails were detained by the west wind, when the Rapparees were quiet in the Bog of Allen, when no stage-coach had been stopped by highwaymen,

when no non-juring congregation had been dispersed by constables, when no ambassador had made his entry with a long train of coaches and six, when no lord or poet had been buried in the Abbey, and when consequently it was difficult to fill up four scanty pages." The progress of civilization, however, producing gradual changes in all the relations of life, has given greater breadth to the world's Diary, which we call the Newspaper; and so marked is this effect that Mr. Buckle records it among the proofs of human development. In a meddling spirit, and with mistaken notions of protection, "great Christian governments," he observes, "have made strenuous and repeated efforts to destroy the liberty of the press, and prevent men from expressing their sentiments on the most important questions in politics and religion." * Such efforts always fail.

The history of the American Press, properly arranged and conscientiously elaborated, is yet to be written. The whole period to be covered by such a record would scarcely exceed a century; for the newspapers printed in colonial times were chiefly weak and indigent, and it is not extravagant to aver that seven decades include all the days in which our Press has been recognized as a power. The history of the rise and growth of this power would be an important contribution to the history of the United States; for but a moment's thought is required, to trace the steps by which the general progress of our Press has kept pace with the development of the nation. The Pioneer has been closely followed by the Printer; the influential editor, who began to be recognized as a political leader when the present century came in, has become the peer of statesmen and scholars in the higher stages of civilization; the public journal is the object of daily consideration in the councils of government.

Free Americans read continually; and in regard to newspapers they are omnivorous. There is a clientage for every class of journal; and while our population undergoes its annual changes by natural accretion, or through the agencies of immigration, the supply keeps pace with the growing demand.

* History of Civilization, i., 206.

Every calling has its mouth-piece, every political party its organ, every sect its weekly journal or its monthly magazine. The numbers multiply in the ratio of the growth of the interests represented; and each publication finds a support more or less ample, according to the wealth, position, or influence of the class upon whose patronage it depends. As each class increases in numbers, weight, or power, a demand arises for a journal to represent it. And thus new papers continually appear, devoted to specialties, or baited to please the taste prevalent at the moment.

The American newspapers which failed to interpret obvious signs died, as they should have died, when they became unrepresentative, useless, dull, and bankrupt; and out of the long list of newspapers familiar to our grandfathers, barely half a dozen still survive, — so transformed that only the old names suggest what they were half a century ago.* But the new are constantly springing up, for the American habit of establishing newspapers is wholly ineradicable. The uneasy American mind must find expression in type. When our soldiers went to Mexico to fight, they started a paper. When our army captured a southern city, in the recent war, a corporal's guard of printers stepped out of the ranks to edit and print a journal. If a quack desire notoriety, he buys a newspaper and has it all to himself; and one man in New England finds relief for a surcharged mind in writing out a weekly sheet, four inches by six, every letter in which he prints by hand, and every word of which is his own composition. This latter is the only instance on record of a man being his own editor, printer, publisher, and reader. He is happy in his conceit, and as the copies cannot conveniently be multiplied, the public are happy in their release from at least one paper which uselessly insists upon living.

A thousand miles of new country on the Great Plains now

*The *Journal of Commerce*, established in New York by Arthur Tappan, in the year 1827, is the only survivor of the morning papers then in existence in the city. The oldest existing evening paper in New York is the *Commercial Advertiser*, which was founded in 1794, and the next in chronological order is the *Evening Post*, which dates from 1801.

lie open to travel, and trade, and civilization, by the completion of the Pacific Railway. Has it occurred to the reader how many thousands of newspapers that region will produce? The prospect would be appalling, but for the consoling reflection that the habit of shooting newspaper editors at sight still prevails to a considerable extent in the far West!

So long as the world moves, however, human interest in human affairs will remain a human sentiment, and as this interest crystallizes in the solid substance we call the Press, we must be content to take all that comes, bearing patiently with bushels of wretched and innutritious chaff, in the hope of discovering plump and comely kernels.

But this is a digression from the subject in hand.

Twenty years ago the reading public of New York began to hunger. Their daily newspapers had become insufficient and unsatisfactory. The *Courier and Enquirer*, despite the magnetism of Raymond and his assistants, who did their best to galvanize it, was dull. The *Journal of Commerce* was eminently respectable, but its contents consisted of market reports, the news of the Stock Board, and personal quarrels with James Watson Webb. The *Express* was a morning paper, quite behind the times. The *Sun* — not then, as now, sancy, brilliant, fully alive to the wants of the day — was read chiefly by domestics in quest of employment, and by cartmen dozing at street-corners in waiting for a job. The *Evening Post* published one edition only, — at half-past two in the afternoon, — and was notable chiefly for its vigorous espousal of the doctrine of Free Trade and its high literary tone. The *Commercial Advertiser* was the bitter rival of the *Evening Post*, — a condition which long since ceased, for the latter has gone to the head-rank of the afternoon journals of New York. The *Herald* was filled, day by day, with printed filth. The *Tribune* had got into bad ways, — mainly through its editor's enthusiastic advocacy of the theories of Charles Fourier. The day for a new paper had arrived; and as the vacuum had been gradually created, so, too, natural forces had been in operation to produce the means of filling it.

The choice left to newspaper readers in New York, in

1850, was Hobson's: either the sixpenny journals of Wall street, with meagre supplies of news, — or the cheaper *Tribune* and *Herald*, with all the intelligence of the day overlaid and almost extinguished by the Socialistic heresies of the one and the abominable nastiness of the other. Heads of families feared to take the *Tribune* to their homes, because its teachings were the apotheosis of vice. They could get their tidings of the news of the world through Bennett's *Herald* only at the cost of wading through heaps of rubbish. The predicament was unpleasant; and the man who saw it clearly, and determined to apply the remedy, was Henry Jarvis Raymond. His remedy was the *Times*. It was effective; and the history of its operation is the history of a new era in the Journalism of New York, — an era of decency, of grace, of enterprise, and of success.

Mr. Raymond was mainly the instrument of effecting the radical change of which he was swift to take advantage. His early and merciless attacks upon the doctrines of Socialism were the direct cause of bringing the *Tribune* into disrepute, and putting into the field a rival to the *Herald*; and in his celebrated discussion with Mr. Greeley, in the columns of the *Courier and Enquirer*, lay the germ of his own subsequent victory as a journalist. Although the period upon which he was to leave the impress of his hand was virtually of his own creation, he was himself really unconscious of the vigor of the blows he struck; yet the effects of his fierce encounter with the enemy of Virtue and Religion were visible long after the tournament had ended.

— It is now time to trace the rise and progress of the Socialistic element in New York Journalism.

CHAPTER VII.

AN OLD TAINT.

THE SOCIALISTS TWENTY-TWO YEARS AGO — HORACE GREELEY AND ALBERT BRISBANE — THE TRIBUNE, THE FUTURE, AND THE HARBINGER — ZEALOUS ICONOCLASTS — THE FALSE PRETENCES OF FOURIERISM — SOCIALISTIC FAILURES — THE TRIBUNE IN DISREPUTE — RAYMOND'S ATTACKS UPON SOCIALISM — THE CELEBRATED DISCUSSION BETWEEN GREELEY AND RAYMOND — THE MERITS AND DEMERITS OF SOCIALISM.

"THE propagation in this country of Fourier's ideas of Industrial Association" — observes Horace Greeley, in his volume of autobiography * — "was wholly pioneered by Mr. A. Brisbane, who presented them in a series of articles in the *Tribune*, beginning in 1841, and running through two or three years. The *Future* — a weekly entirely devoted to the subject — was issued for a few weeks, but received no considerable support, and was therefore discontinued. The *Harbinger*, a smaller weekly, was afterwards issued from the Brook Farm Association, and sustained — not without loss — for two or three years. Meantime, several treatises, explaining and commending the system, were published, — the best of them being "Democracy, Pacific and Constructive," by Mr. Parke Godwin, of the *Evening Post*. The problem was further discussed in a series of controversial letters between Mr. Henry J. Raymond and myself. Thus, by persevering effort, the subject was thrust, as it were, on public attention."

Mr. Greeley further tells us that his own observations of extreme destitution, in the wretched corners of the sixth ward in the city of New York, had inspired him with a desire to solve the problems of labor; and that accordingly he published a series of articles in the *New-Yorker* in 1839-40, under the

* "Recollections of a Busy Life," p. 151.

title, "What shall be done for the Laborer?" — in which the social question was discussed. These papers attracted the attention of Mr. Brisbane, who was at that time a resident of Batavia, in the State of New York, having just returned from Paris. In the course of widely extended travels abroad, Mr. Brisbane had made the acquaintance of the social reformers known as the St. Simonians, after their leader, and had become a disciple of Charles Fourier. In 1840, Mr. Brisbane published in the United States the first of his long series of writings in defence of Socialism: — it was an exposition of Fourier's industrial system. Mr. Greeley's outburst of philanthropy in the *New-Yorker*, at the same period, drew the two men together in a bond of sympathy; and for many years thereafter they labored in unison, with a degree of zeal which might have produced tangible results had it been accompanied by discretion. The zealous man who shows himself to be nothing but an iconoclast usually fails, — and this was what befell Greeley. The whole Socialist heresy, which created a tempest twenty-five years ago, and which struggled along a very thorny path until the year 1855, when it died a natural death, and passed into a tradition, after having crazed some, ruined others, and disorganized whole communities, was kept alive in its earlier days by the influence, the arguments, the persistency of the *Tribune*. The truth of history requires this record, and the proof is at hand.

Fourierism means license. Under the guise of philanthropy, of the reform of social abuses, of a desire for the elevation of labor, of a demand for equal and exact justice to all men, its advocates seek to disrupt the ties which make the family relation sacred, and communities happy and prosperous. The reformers who assume the lofty title of "social architects" too often forget in their own lives to establish their theory of an exalted moral sense; for

. . . "the difference is too nice
Where ends the virtue or begins the vice;"

and the conspicuous failures of the Socialistic companies, which have from time to time associated themselves together for prac-

tical experiment, point unerringly to inherent causes of weakness and decay. The Brook Farm Community, in Massachusetts, — one of the earliest and certainly the best of all these curious experiments in social life, for it counted in the membership brilliant men and women who have since become famous in literature, — lived five years, struggling fitfully in its later days, and dying bankrupt. The North American Phalanx, in New Jersey, which endured for thirteen years many vicissitudes of fortune, has degenerated into a market-garden, and its hundred members have become scattered, or have died. The Oneida Community, which has its principal farm to-day in Central New York, with a branch establishment in Wallingford, Connecticut, is the most prosperous experiment of this kind that has yet existed; but its prosperity is chiefly derived from the co-operative system of well-directed industry, and in no appreciable degree from its practice of the Socialistic theories.*

* An unpublished work, by a Socialist named A. J. McDonald, contains a list of the Communistic experiments tried at various times in the United States. This list is here appended. It shows that the duration of the Communities was for very limited periods, and that there was a prevalent tendency to get into debt: —

EXPERIMENTS OF THE OWEN EPOCH.

Blue Spring Community; Indiana; no particulars, except that it lasted "but a short time."

Co-operative Society; Pennsylvania; no particulars.

Coxsackie Community; New York; capital "small;" "very much in debt;" lasted between one and two years.

Forestville Community; Indiana; "over sixty members;" three hundred and twenty-five acres of land, duration, more than a year.

Franklin Community; New York; no particulars.

Haverstraw Community; New York; about eighty members; one hundred and twenty acres; debt, twelve thousand dollars; lasted five months.

Kendall Community; Ohio; two hundred members; two hundred acres; duration, about two years.

Macluria; Indiana; one thousand two hundred acres; duration, about two years.

New Harmony; Indiana; nine hundred members; thirty thousand acres, worth one hundred and ninety thousand dollars; duration, nearly three years.

Nashoba; Tennessee; fifteen members; two thousand acres: duration, about three years.

Yellow Springs Community; Ohio; seventy-five to one hundred and ninety families; lasted three months.

EXPERIMENTS OF THE FOURIER EPOCH.

Alphadelphia Phalaux; Michigan; four or five hundred members; five or six hundred acres; lasted one or two years.

This, however, is not the place to discuss the question of Socialism, nor to describe in detail the sorry failures which the disciples of the "New Philosophy" have suffered. The point

Brook Farm; Massachusetts; one hundred and fifteen members; two hundred acres; duration, five years.

Brookes' Experiment; Ohio; few members; no further particulars.

Bureau Co. Phalanx; Illinois; small; no particulars.

Clarkson Industrial Association; New York; four hundred and twenty members; two thousand acres; lasted from six to nine months.

Columbian Phalanx; Ohio; no particulars.

Garden Grove; Ohio; no particulars.

Goose Pond Community; Pennsylvania; sixty members; lasted a few months.

Grand Prairie Community; Ohio; no particulars.

Hopedale; Massachusetts; two hundred members; six hundred acres; duration, not stated, but commonly reported to be seventeen or eighteen years.

Integral Phalanx; Illinois; fourteen families; five hundred and eight acres; lasted seventeen months.

Jefferson County Industrial Association; New York; four hundred members; three hundred or four hundred acres of land (which was heavily mortgaged and finally sold to pay debts); lasted a few months.

Lagrange Phalanx; Indiana; one thousand acres; no further particulars.

Leraysville Phalanx; Pennsylvania; forty members; three hundred acres; lasted eight months.

Marlboro Association; Ohio; twenty-four members; had "a load of debts;" lasted nearly four years.

McKean County Association; Pennsylvania; thirty thousand acres; no further particulars.

Moorhouse Union; New York; one hundred and twenty acres; lasted "a few months."

North American Phalanx; New Jersey; one hundred and twelve members; six hundred and seventy-three acres; debt, seventeen thousand dollars; duration, thirteen years.

Northampton Association; Massachusetts; one hundred and thirty members; five hundred acres; debt, forty thousand dollars; duration, four years.

Ohio Phalanx; one hundred members; two thousand two hundred acres; deeply in debt; lasted two months.

Clermont Phalanx; Ohio; eighty members; nine hundred acres; debt, nineteen thousand dollars; lasted two years or more.

One-mention (meaning probably one mind) Community; Pennsylvania; eight hundred acres; lasted one year.

Ontario Phalanx; New York; brief duration.

Prairie Home Community; Ohio; five hundred acres; debt broke it up; lasted one year.

Raritan Bay Union; New Jersey; few members; two hundred and sixty-eight acres.

Sangamon Phalanx; Illinois; no particulars.

Skaneateles Community; New York; one hundred and fifty members; three hundred and fifty-four acres; debt, ten thousand dollars; duration, three or four years.

Social Reform Unity; Pennsylvania; twenty members; two thousand acres; debt, one thousand dollars; lasted about ten months.

Sodus Bay Phalanx; New York; three hundred members; one thousand four hundred acres; lasted a "short time."

Spring Farm Association; Wisconsin; ten families; lasted three years.

Sylvania Association; Pennsylvania; one hundred and forty-five members;

to be considered here is the effect of the bold advocacy of the Fourierite doctrines by the *Tribune*, the *Harbinger*, and other journals in the United States, a quarter of a century ago. This alone has relation to the history of Journalism, which it is the main purpose of this volume to exhibit.

But for Mr. Greeley's favoritism to Mr. Brisbane, the *Tribune* would not have fallen into the disrepute which threw it into the background in the year 1851. The Socialist tendencies of that journal, leading it into excesses, produced a natural result in awakening a feeling of repulsion among a very large proportion of its early readers and old friends; and when, swift to see the drift of the popular current, Henry J. Raymond attacked Horace Greeley in the memorable discussion of 1846-7, he attracted attention to himself, made a new reputation for the *Courier and Enquirer*, and threw out the first shovelfuls of earth for the track upon which the *New York Times*, in later years, was to run smoothly and safely.

"Association Discussed; or, The Socialism of the *Tribune* Examined," was the title given by Mr. Raymond to the pamphlet edition* of the controversial articles which appeared in the columns of the *Courier and Enquirer* and the *Tribune*, in the winter of 1846-7. The discussion originated in a letter from Mr. Albert Brisbane, — published in the *Tribune* on the

three thousand acres; debt, seven thousand nine hundred dollars; lasted nearly two years.

Trumbull Phalanx; Ohio; four hundred acres; lasted eighteen months.

Washtenaw Phalanx; Michigan; no partienlars.

Wisconsin Phalanx; twenty families; one thousand eight hundred acres; duration, six years.

RECAPITULATION.

The Owen group were distributed among the States as follows: in Indiana, four; in New York, three; in Ohio, two; in Pennsylvania, one; in Tennessee, one.

The Fourier group were located as follows: in Ohio, nine; in New York, six; in Pennsylvania, six; in Massachusetts, three; in Illinois, three; in New Jersey, two; in Michigan, two; in Wisconsin, two; in Indiana, one.

Indiana had the greatest number in the first group, and the least in the second.

New England was not represented in the Owen group; and only by three associations in the Fourier group, and these three were all in Massachusetts.

* Published in New York, by Harper and Brothers, in 1847, and long since out of print.

19th of August, 1846, and addressed to the editor of the *Courier and Enquirer*, — proposing sundry inquiries, to which specific answers were requested, concerning the scheme of social reform of which Brisbane was the acknowledged advocate. On the 25th of August, Mr. Raymond answered these inquiries, through the columns of the *Courier and Enquirer*. On the following day, the *Tribune* published an editorial rejoinder, to which Mr. Raymond replied on the 28th. On the 1st of September, the *Tribune* responded editorially; and this was followed on the 5th by a rejoinder from the *Courier and Enquirer*. On the 7th of September, the *Courier and Enquirer* announced the receipt of a long reply from Mr. Brisbane; but, while disavowing any obligation to publish it, offered to do so if the *Tribune* would give place to the *Courier and Enquirer's* reply. On the 8th, Mr. Greeley met this offer with a formal proposition to open a discussion on the whole subject involved; the *Tribune* and the *Courier and Enquirer* each to publish twelve articles in defence of its own position, and each contestant to republish the articles written by his antagonist. The *Courier and Enquirer* accepted the challenge; and at the close of the State political canvass the discussion was begun.

The *Tribune* led off, on the 20th of November, with a statement of rudimental propositions, intended to show that justice to the poor and wretched demands of the more fortunate classes a radical social reform. The article, bearing the signature of "H. G.," began with a quotation from the Bible, — "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," — from which was deduced the proposition that earth, air, water, and sunshine, with their natural products, were divinely intended and appointed for the use and sustenance of the whole human family — not for a part only; hence, that the civilized society of our day, in divesting the larger portion of mankind of the unimpeded enjoyment of these natural rights, has assumed a power detrimental to the public good, and contrary to divine law. Mr. Greeley further contended that the landless have an inherent right to their due share of land, and that all men have the right to labor, and to the rewards of labor; but that

under existing conditions these rights are denied. "The right to constant employment, with a just and full recompense," he said, "cannot be guaranteed to all without a radical change in our Social Economy." "We must devise a remedy," he added. His remedy was Association.

Mr. Raymond replied in the *Courier and Enquirer* of November 23. After reciting the points of Mr. Greeley's essay, he met the first issue squarely, by charging the *Tribune* with agrarianism. "The position that those who own no land are wronged and robbed of what is justly theirs," said Mr. Raymond, "is equivalent to a denial of the right of property in land. . . . Inclusively, this is a denial of the right of property in anything whatever." Raymond then assailed Greeley's proposition that society creates property; showing that in reality society is the creature of property. "Property is the root of the tree of which society is the trunk; and society, in turn, as it is the product, becomes guardian of the right of individual property. Property has always originated everything like order, civilization and refinement in the world. It has always been the mainspring of energy, enterprise, and all the refinements of life. Evils are of course developed in connection with it; but they are accidental, and comparatively trifling. Without it, civilization, would be unknown—the face of the earth would be a desert." Raymond enlarged upon this point, said a passing word of contempt about the notorious Fanny Wright, whose adherents had become noisy, and ended with a rebuke of the *Tribune* for espousing theories whose tendency was to undermine, and gradually to destroy, sound and important doctrines, of which that journal itself had hitherto been the advocate.

Mr. Greeley's second essay appeared in the *Tribune* of November 26. He denied the charge of agrarianism point-blank, and accused Mr. Raymond of misrepresenting his position. What he had contended for was the right of all men to an opportunity to labor, and to a just recompense of such labor; not a general distribution of lands, but "a limitation of the area thereof which any man may hereafter acquire and hold, whether directly or at second-hand." He gave an indignant

fling at Raymond for coupling the names of Horace Greeley and Fanny Wright; and then passed to a consideration of the wants of the laboring class, and defined the operation of such a "Phalanx or Social Structure" as would, in his judgment, provide cheap and good homes for the poor. In short, Greeley set forth an outline of the system of co-operation.

Mr. Raymond's second reply (November 30) denied any misstatement of Mr. Greeley's position on the land question. "The charge of misstatement is so absurd," said Raymond, "that it becomes simply ludicrous. We copied the very language of the *Tribune* itself. We gave to it precisely the meaning which common sense required. We drew from it simply the deductions which were unavoidable." . . . We said in our first article that the *Tribune* would undoubtedly disavow any denial of the right of property in land, or in anything else; and so it attempts to do. But how can it do so in the face of its fundamental principle? While it persists in urging that the landless have a claim upon the owners of land for a recompense; while it insists that society is bound to guarantee to them an equivalent for the land of which they have been deprived, how can it possibly disown the fundamental principle upon which this claim is founded? The two must stand or fall together." Raymond dwelt upon this point, and in reply to Greeley's personalities concerning Fanny Wright, and the disciples of her school, sent this hot shot into the *Tribune*:—"We think it not at all unlikely that we shall insist, in the course of this discussion, that the *Tribune* is an 'exceedingly mischievous and dangerous paper;' but it will be only by way of inference from the principles which it promulgates; and for those principles, as well as for all just inferences from them, the *Tribune*, and not we, must be held responsible."

Mr. Greeley's third number (December 1) resumed the labor question, repeating the argument concerning opportunity and recompense, and again denying the charge of agrarianism. Mr. Greeley also complained that Mr. Raymond had exceeded the space originally agreed upon as the limit of the articles on either side, and added: "If you think this fair play, go on!"

Then he began to unfold his plan of Association; setting forth substantially the theory of Fourier in regard to common property, remuneration of labor, inducements to workers, and the punishment of moral offences.

Mr. Raymond responded, December 8, within the limits of a column. He again insisted upon the charge of agrarianism, — and proved it by citations from Mr. Greeley's articles. He then advanced to an inquiry into the practical organization of Socialism, and showed that the men of capital must necessarily become the owners of the land in the proposed "Associations;" and, therefore, that Communism was simply a new phase of the relation of landlord and tenant, despite all the reasoning to the contrary. Raymond pressed this point with great logical force.

Mr. Greeley denied it roundly, in letter No. IV. — published immediately after the appearance of Mr. Raymond's reply. "Let me say, once for all," observed Mr. Greeley, "that Association proposes to divest no man of any property which the law says is his. Its grand aim is to effect a reconciliation of the interests of capital and labor, by restoring the natural rights of the latter without trenching on the acquired rights or interests of the other." Then, by way of illustration, he drew a contrast between the ordinary method of settling a new township, and that which would be followed by the believers in Association. In the first, the early settlers would be rudely housed and rudely served; in the latter, all the appliances of civilization, by means of combined effort, would be at hand immediately.

Mr. Raymond admitted (December 14) the imperfection of the existing social system; but contended that Association would only increase and perpetuate its worst features. Its inevitable tendency would be to render the relation of landlord and tenant universal and perpetual.

From this point the discussion broadened, until the essays on either side became long and wearisome, embracing questions of social life, the relations of the sexes, political economy, and religion. After the lapse of twenty-two years, it is unprofitable to recall all the details of controversy concerning a theory

which was so soon to be rejected as impracticable and mischievous; neither would any useful purpose be served by analyzing the arguments put forth by the skilful antagonists. Mr. Greeley was thoroughly honest, exceedingly personal, and somewhat illogical in the conduct of his side of the controversy; Mr. Raymond was cool, sarcastic, earnest, sometimes sophistical. The discussion fairly exhibited the characteristics of the men; and, from this point of view, it is alike valuable and interesting.

The arguments for and against Socialism were compactly summed up in the concluding papers of the series. To this part of the discussion we give place:—

MR. GREELEY'S CONVICTIONS.

“Let me barely restate, in order, the positions which I have endeavored to maintain, and I will calmly await the judgment to be pronounced upon the whole matter. I know well that nineteen-twentieths of those whose utterances create and mould public opinion, had prejudged the case before reading a page with regard to it; that they had promptly decided that no social reconstruction is necessary or desirable, since they do not perceive that any is likely to promote the ends for which they live and strive. Of these, very few will have read our articles,—they felt no need of your arguments, no appetite for mine. Yet there is a class, even in this modern Babel of selfishness and envious striving, still more in our broad land, who are earnestly seeking, inquiring for, the means whereby error and evil may be diminished, the realm of justice and of happiness extended. These will have generally followed us with more or less interest throughout; their collective judgment will award the palm of manly dealing and of beneficent endeavor to one or the other. For their consideration, I reiterate the positions I have endeavored to maintain in this discussion, and cheerfully abide their verdict that I have sustained, or you have overthrown, them. I have endeavored to show, then,—

“1. That man has a natural, God-given right to labor for his own subsistence and the good of others, and to a needful por-

tion of the earth from which his physical sustenance is to be drawn. If this be a natural, essential right, it cannot be justly suspended, as to any, upon the interest or caprice of others; and that society in which a part of mankind are permitted or forbidden to labor, according to the need felt or fancied by others for their labor, is unjustly constituted, and ought to be reformed.

"2. That, in a true social state, the right of every individual to such labor as he is able to perform, and to the fair and equal recompense of his labor, will be guaranteed and provided for; and the thorough education of each child, physical, moral, and intellectual, be regarded as the dictate of universal interest and imperative duty.

"3. That such education for all, such opportunity to labor, such security to each of a just and fair recompense, are manifestly practicable only through the association of some two or three hundred families on the basis of united interests and efforts (after the similitude of a bank, railroad, or whale-ship, though with far more perfect arrangements for securing to each what is justly his); inhabiting a common edifice, though with distinct and exclusive as well as common apartments, cultivating one common domain, and pursuing thereon various branches of mechanical and manufacturing as well as agricultural industry, and uniting in the support of education, in defraying the cost of chemical and philosophical apparatus, of frequent lectures, etc., etc.

"4. That among the advantages of this organization would be immense economies in land, food, cooking, fuel, buildings, teams, implements, merchandise, litigation, account-keeping, etc., etc.; while, on the other hand, a vastly increased efficiency would be given to the labor of each by concentration of effort, and the devotion to productive industry of the great numbers now employed in unproductive avocations, or who are deemed too young, too unskilled, or too inefficient, to be set at work under our present industrial mechanism.

"5. That, thus associated and blended in interests, in daily intercourse, in early impressions, in cares, joys, and aspirations, the rich and poor would become the brethren and mutual

helpers for which their Creator designed them, — that labor would be rendered attractive by well-planned, lighted, warmed, and ventilated work-shops, by frequent alternations from the field to the shop, as urgency, convenience, weariness or weather should suggest; and that all being workers, all sharers in the same cares and recreations, none doomed to endure existence in a cellar or hovel, the antagonism and envious discontent now prevalent would be banished, and general content, good will, and happiness prevail, while famine, homelessness, unwilling idleness, the horrors of bankruptcy, etc., would be unkuown.

“These, hastily and imperfectly condensed, are my positions, my convictions. I believe that Christianity, social justice, intellectual and moral progress, universal well-being, imperatively require the adoption of such a reform as is here roughly sketched. I do not expect that it will be immediately effected, nor that the approaches to it will not be signalized by failures, mistakes, disappointments. But the PRINCIPLE of Association is one which has already done much for the improvement of the condition of our race; we see it now actively making its way into general adoption, through odd-fellowship, protective unions, mutual fire, marine, and life insurance, and other forms of guaranteeism. Already commodious edifices for the poor of cities are planned by benevolence, unsuspecting of the end to which it points; already the removal of the paupers from localities where they are a grievous burden to those where they can substantially support themselves, is the theme of general discussion. In all these and many like them, I see the portents of, ‘a good time coming,’ not for the destitute and hopeless only, but for the great mass of our fellow-men. In this faith I labor and live: share it or scout it as you will.

“Adieu!

“H. G.”

MR. RAYMOND'S POSITION.

“We are not aware of a single position taken by the *Tribune* upon this subject that we have left unnoticed. We have given to every argument it has urged in defence of the system all the attention it seemed to merit. We began by discussing its

fundamental theory of natural rights,—its primary denial of the right of property in land; and we have followed, throughout, the line of argument which it adopted. The *Tribune* ascribed all existing evil to the false arrangements of society; we contended that even those false arrangements grow out of the selfishness of the human heart. The *Tribune* demanded a new social form which should abolish the *cause* of existing evil; we insisted that, as evil did not spring from social forms, so no change of those forms could destroy it. The *Tribune* condemned the present system of isolated households and individual effort, and demanded the substitution for them of a community of interests and of life; we sought to prove that such a community would be impossible so long as human nature remains unchanged. The *Tribune* urged Association as the means of effecting that change in human character which alone would render Association possible; we proved that this confounded cause and effect, and that the personal reform of individual men must *precede* such a social reform as the *Tribune* seeks. The *Tribune* contended that, in Association, labor would receive, as its reward, a fixed proportion of its product, and that this would be greater than under the present system; we proved that the reward of labor is regulated by certain principles of permanent force, which Association could not change, and that then, as now, when labor was abundant and laborers scarce, the wages of labor would be high; and that, when laborers increased more rapidly than the work to be done, their reward would diminish. And so we proceeded step by step, meeting every claim urged by the *Tribune* in defence of the system; refuting its pretensions to exclusive philanthropy; pointing out obstacles for which it made no adequate provision; and discussing fully and fairly the whole system, in all its details, as presented in its columns. We met the *Tribune*, throughout, upon its own ground; yet, in nearly every instance, our objections were denounced as '*cavils*;' our arguments remained untouched; and now, in its closing article, the *Tribune* repeats all its original positions, and charges us with having failed to meet them. We are quite content to submit this point to the judgment of our readers.

“ . . . We have proved, in preceding articles of this discussion, that the whole SYSTEM OF ASSOCIATION is founded upon, and grows out of, the fundamental principle known as the law of PASSIONAL ATTRACTION. The argument by which this position is established remains untouched; and we shall not therefore repeat it. In our last article we proved that, in this system, the *law of man's nature* is made the supreme rule of his conduct and character; that it recognizes no higher law than that of inclination, no authority above that of passion, and of course no essential distinction between right and wrong, — no standard of duty except that of impulse. Of course the idea of human responsibility is utterly destroyed; and all the sanctions of moral and religious truth, as derived from the Word of God, are abrogated and cast aside. These deductions flow inevitably from the law of passional attraction; and that law we have proved to be fundamental in Association.

“ . . . We have still to advert to one point of great practical importance, which has hitherto been but slightly touched; we mean the INFLUENCE UPON SOCIETY OF THE PRINCIPLES OF ASSOCIATION, as they are presented and urged in the columns of the *Tribune*. Its advocacy of this social system is regarded by many as wholly unaccountable, — as the result of some strange whim, for which no reason can be found in its general tone and teaching. This, in our judgment, is a mistaken notion. The fundamental principles of Association — its essential doctrines, as we have set them forth in this discussion — are far more earnestly cherished by the editor of that paper, than any of the party measures, or temporary expedients, which he advocates. The principles which lie at the bottom of this new social system, in our view, shape the entire policy of the *Tribune*. They dictate all its sentiments; prompt all its comments upon men and measures; pervade its most trifling notices of the most common events; govern its estimate of all schemes of public concern; and create the very atmosphere in which it has its being.

“ . . . Here we close the discussion of Association, to which we were challenged by the *Tribune*. We have not given the system that methodical and complete examination, which can

alone do justice to its principles and pretensions. Our remarks have been desultory and discursive, because the form of controversy compelled us to follow in the path which our opponent chose to take. Very many points of more or less interest we are thus enforced to leave untouched. The provisions of the system for civil government; its 'sacred legion' for the performance of the 'filthy functions' of society; its asserted power to reclaim deserts, to redeem alike the torrid and the frigid zones from their excessive heat and cold, — these claims, like many others which the system presents, must remain unnoticed. Its practical aspects and essential principles have formed the only topic of this discussion; and with regard to them, we think the following leading positions have been established by evidence and argument which the *Tribune* has failed to shake: —

"I. Association ascribes all existing evil to what it terms the 'FALSE ORGANIZATION of society,' and it seeks to cure it, therefore, by giving to society a *new* and widely different organization from that which now prevails.

"II. This reorganization of society is to be universal, and embrace all departments of social life. All social forms and institutions, it is alleged, are radically wrong; all, therefore, must be radically and completely changed.

"III. LABOR is the first thing to be reformed. Existing society authorizes the 'monopoly of land,' and thus excludes a part of its members from sharing this God-given element, and from working upon it, and enjoying the fruits of their labor. Association proposes, therefore, to *abolish* private property in land; to make the soil the *joint* property of masses of men, all of whom can work upon it and share its fruits, but none of whom can have in it any private and exclusive ownership; and by this means to *increase* and render *fixed* the reward of mere labor, without making it, in any degree, dependent upon capital. We have proved (1.) that capitalists never can be induced to enter into this arrangement: (2.) that the denial of the right of private property *in land* involves the denial of the right to own anything: (3.) that the very root and foundation of all civilization and progress are thus destroyed: (4.) that such a

community of property and labor, if it were feasible, would beget discontent and strife, and so involve the elements of its own destruction: (5.) that the reward of labor cannot be made *fixed*, because it must always, *ex necessitate rei*, depend upon the fluctuating ratio of the supply to the demand: and (6.) that the effect of this system of owning the soil, if carried out, would render *capitalists* the sole owners of all the land, and laborers everywhere their tenants and serfs. Its only effect would be, therefore, vastly to *increase* the evils which it seeks to remedy.

"IV. The ISOLATED HOUSEHOLD is the next false institution of the present society to be reformed. As a general thing, each family now inhabits a separate house. Association proposes that this shall be abandoned, as expensive, selfish, and inconvenient; and that all shall live in one *common house*, having their cooking, washing, and all other domestic service performed in common; eating, as a general rule, at a common table, and leading in all essential respects a common life. Such an arrangement, we have contended: (1.) would destroy that most potent spur to human effort, the desire of creating and enjoying an independent and separate *home*: (2.) that it would bring together persons of habits, tastes, convictions, prejudices, motives, and general characters utterly incompatible with each other: (3.) that it would fail to bring such discordant materials into the harmony of feeling, faith, and conduct essential to success: and (4.) that it would, so far as it should prove successful, destroy all individuality of character, and bring all men to a dead level of uniformity. It would be, therefore, in the first place, *impossible*; and, if not so, injurious to the best interests of all concerned.

"V. The EDUCATION OF CHILDREN is the next thing to be reformed. Now, infants are taken care of by their parents, or by hired nurses: they are subjected to their absolute control; they inherit their tastes and dispositions; there is no uniformity in their education, and therefore none in their belief or characters, — and thus are perpetuated, from one generation to another, all the evils of the existing social state. Association proposes to commit all the infants to common nurses; to educate young chil-

dren upon a common plan, and under the direction of an elective council; to release them from all constraint, leaving them to obey *none* but 'superiors of their *own choice*;' relieving the parents from all care of them, and the children from all obligation to obey their parents; and so forming their characters, and guiding their conduct, in a way precisely opposite to that which now prevails. This system we have shown, (1.) neglects entirely to take into account the strong instincts of parental and filial affection: (2.) that it, therefore, would prove impracticable: (3.) that it aims, avowedly, to *annul the DUTY* of filial obedience: (4.) that it *denies* explicitly the **RIGHT** of parental authority: and (5.) that it thus strikes a deadly blow at the very heart of the **PARENTAL RELATION**, as its nature is set forth, and its duties defined in the Word of God.

"VI. The relation of **HUSBAND** and **WIFE** is now a fixed and permanent one: yet it often unites parties who have for each other no mutual love, and keeps asunder those whom mutual passion impels to union. Public sentiment, legal enactments, the pecuniary dependence of woman, the embarrassing care of children, and all existing social usages combine to perpetuate and enforce this unnatural and unjust constraint. Association proposes to reorganize the marriage relation; to remove all the obstacles to the free sway of natural impulse; and to commit the intercourse of the sexes to the laws of human nature and individual passion, freed from all the restraints and checks they now encounter. In order to effect this, it imposes on society the care of the children; repeals all legal disabilities; confers upon women perfect liberty in person, property, and affection; enlightens public sentiment; and so renders easy and unobstructed the full and free gratification of inconstant, as well as of constant, passions. We have demonstrated, (1.) that this is the aim and final purpose of this system of social reform: (2.) that, in not regarding marriage as a permanent institution of divine origin and sanctions, it rejects the teachings of Christ: and (3.) that its result would be the complete destruction of the **MARRIAGE RELATION**, and the substitution for it of a systematized polygamy, less regulated, less restrained, and therefore

far worse than has ever been witnessed in any nation or in any age of the world.

"VII. The FAMILY, under the present social system, is an institution narrow in its scope, selfish in its spirit, and injurious to social and human progress. It rests upon, and is sustained by, the isolated household, the parental relation, and the relation of husband and wife. So long as these exist, it will exist also. But Association proposes, as we have already seen, to *reorganize*, and, in effect, *destroy* all these relations. When that has been accomplished, the FAMILY RELATION must, of course, fall to the ground, and the family *spirit* will be *absorbed* by the spirit of the Association. In all this we have insisted, (1.) that the system seeks the destruction of an institution of divine origin; one that lies at the basis of all human improvement, that nourishes and develops all the best affections and sympathies of the human heart, and that does more for the preservation of order, of purity, and of civilization than all human institutions put together: (2.) that its purposes are therefore hostile to the well-being of society: and (3.) that, if carried out, they would sweep away the best and surest safeguards of the public good, and break down one of the strongest barriers ever erected against the destructive torrent of vice and misery.

"VIII. Under the existing system, the RESTRAINT OF HUMAN PASSIONS is made the great end of all social institutions. Education, law, the church, the family, all formal provisions for the public good, enforce the duty and necessity of *repressing* the passions and impulses of human nature. Association denounces this as a false and fruitless method. The natural impulses of man, it asserts, are *good*: evil results only from their repression. A true society, therefore, should provide for their perfect and complete development. This is accordingly proposed as the great and controlling object of the new society which the system seeks to introduce. *The impulses of every human being, in the language of Association, point out exactly his real functions and his true position in society.* This law, therefore, is to CONTROL, in every respect, *the proposed reorganization of all social forms.* Labor, education, the family, all modes of life and of work, are

to be brought under its complete command. (1.) In labor, men are to work, not under the guidance of necessity, but according to their likings; not separately, as their personal interests may dictate, but in *groups* and *series*, according to the law of passional attraction. (2.) In education, children are to learn, not what they are directed, but what they like; they are to obey, not their parents, but only 'superiors of their own choice;' and in all things, their path is to be indicated, not by the judgment of older and wiser persons, but by their own 'passional attractions.' (3.) In the conjugal relation, according to this fundamental law, those persons are to be united whose impulses prompt a union; if those impulses are constant, the union may be constant also; if they die, the union may be dissolved; if they change to other objects, they may still be gratified; and all the obstacles which public sentiment, the care of children, and the fear of consequences now oppose to such an arrangement will be removed; and, in the language of Fourier himself, the author of the system: —

“ ‘A wife may have *at the same time a husband* of whom she may have two children: (2.) a *genitor* of whom she has but one child: (3.) a *favorite*, who has lived with her and preserved the title; and further, simple *possessors*, who are nothing before the law. This gradation of the title establishes a great courtousness and great fidelity to the engagement. *Men do the same to their divers wives*. This method prevents completely the hypocrisy of which marriage is the source. Misses would by no means be degraded for having had “gallants,” because they had waited before they took them to the age of eighteen. They would be married without scruple. . . . *Our ideas of the honor and virtue of women are but prejudices which vary with our legislation.*” *

“* It has been repeatedly asserted, by some of the advocates of Association, that in after life Fourier *changed* his views upon this subject, and *disclaimed* the opinions set forth in this extract, the authenticity of which is conceded. They were challenged to produce any evidence of this assertion. The only paragraph which has ever been cited in its support is the following, — which we give at length, in order to preclude any charge of partial or unfair dealing: —

“ ‘In 1807, my progress in the theory of harmony extended only to the relations of material love, which, being the *easiest to calculate*, became naturally the object of the first studies.

“ ‘It was only in 1817 that I discovered the theory of spiritual love, in its simpler and higher degrees.’

“ ‘No one ought to be astonished, if in a statement written only eight years

"(4.) All the forms, and all the relations of society, are to be adapted to the wants of human nature; to be shaped in exact accordance with the requirements of the law of passional attraction; so that, instead of RESTRAINT, the complete SATISFACTION of all the passions shall be the controlling object of all social forms. It has been our aim, in this discussion, to prove that these *results* are actually involved in the principles, and contemplated in the practice, of the SYSTEM. It has not been necessary to do more than this; as the *Tribune* has not seen fit to follow the inquiry into this branch of the subject.

"IX. In all its principles and all its arrangements, the SYSTEM of Association recognizes no higher rule of human conduct, no other standard of right and wrong, than that of the LAWS OF HUMAN NATURE. These laws, in its whole reorganization of society, are final and imperative. In this respect, we contend, it is essentially, and at bottom, a system of INFIDELITY, inasmuch as it discards the vital and absolute distinction between right and wrong; recognizes no such thing as conscience; involves a denial of God as a moral being, — the governor of the universe; and is directly hostile, in its essence, to the most vital doctrines of the Christian faith.

"That this is the true outline and character of the SYSTEM

after the first discovery, I considered love only in its material relations, the theory of which was still exceedingly *incomplete*.

"A new science can attain its free development only by degrees, and for a long time is subjected to the influence of the tendencies prevailing around it. Situated as I was in the midst of civilizers, who are all sensualists, or nearly so, it was almost inevitable that in my first studies of love, as it will exist in the combined order, I should stop at the material part of the subject, which alone opens a vast field for scientific calculations. Afterwards, I came to the spiritual part of the theory, which is much more difficult to unfold; I could not carry on both these branches together, and was obliged in 1807 to treat the relations of material love *into the system of which I had at that time an insight*."

"It will be seen here, that Fourier, instead of *disclaiming* his former views, and asserting that he had *changed* them, simply remarks that his scheme was then '*incomplete*,' and explicitly declares that in 1807 he had 'an insight' into the scientific principles of the 'system of material love.' Nor have the American Associations ever repudiated, so far as we are aware, or disavowed these opinions. So far as they go, they are held to be just: the only complaint is that of Fourier, that the system is incomplete."

OF ASSOCIATION, first promulgated by Fourier, and now urged upon the adoption of the American people by the *Tribune*, we claim to have proved in the foregoing articles of this discussion. We do not assert, nor do we believe, that the editor of the *Tribune* aims at these results. On the contrary, if he believed that they were involved in the system, we have no doubt he would promptly discard it. But in our judgment, *they flow necessarily from the fundamental principle of the system*; and every step taken towards *its* supremacy, is a step towards *their* establishment. The *Tribune*, whether consciously or not, advocates THE SYSTEM in which they are involved; and it is justly, therefore, held responsible for its principles and their inevitable results. The system of Association, if fully carried out, would effect the most complete *overthrow* of existing institutions the world has ever seen. A universal deluge would not more thoroughly change the face of the earth, than would this social revolution change the face of human society. Law, labor, education, social forms, religion, domestic life, *everything* in the world as it now exists, the best institutions as well as the worst, would be swept into a common vortex, and all society would be thrown back into a worse than primeval chaos. Churches, courts of law, halls of legislation, the homes of men, all private rights, and all the forms of social life, would be banished from the earth, and the whole work of social creation must be performed anew. So momentous a change as this the world has never seen, — one so radical, so sweeping in its nature, so overwhelming in its results. And the principles which, if *fully* carried out, would involve these tremendous consequences, when *partially* carried out, produce, of course, corresponding injury. They are subtle, plausible, and to many minds attractive; and, in our judgment, by adroitly and zealously pressing them upon public favor, the *Tribune* is weakening the foundations and pillars of the social fabric; is silently poisoning the public mind with false notions of natural rights and of personal obligation; and is sowing broadcast the seeds of discontent and hate, of which future generations will reap the fruits, if not in the bloody field of carnage and terror, in

the anarchy and social disorder which are equally fatal to all human advancement and all social good.

“Throughout this discussion the *Tribune* has charged us with being hostile to all reform, and especially to every attempt to meliorate the hard lot of the degraded poor. The charge is as unfounded as it is ungenerous. We labor willingly and zealously, as our columns will testify, within our sphere, in aid of everything which seems to us TRUE REFORM, — founded upon just principles, seeking worthy ends by worthy means, and promising actual and good results. We regard it as our duty to do all in our power to benefit our fellow-men; but we are not of those who ‘feel personally responsible for the turning of the earth upon its axis,’ nor do we deem it our special ‘mission’ to reorganize society. We believe much good may be done by improving the circumstances which surround the vicious and the wretched; but the essential evil lies behind that, and must be reached by other means. We should not differ from the *Tribune* as to the Christian duty of the rich towards the poor; but we cannot denounce them as the tyrants and robbers of those who have been less industrious and less fortunate. We would gladly see society free from suffering, and all its members virtuous and happy; but we believe social equality to be as undesirable, as it is impossible, — holding, rather, with Plato and Aristotle, that a true society requires a *union* of unequal interests, mutually sustaining and aiding each other, and not an aggregation of identical elements, which could give nothing like coherence or strength to the fabric. We believe in human improvement, but not in a progress which will have nothing *fixed*; which consists in leaving behind it everything like established principles, and which measures its rate by the extent of its departure from all the pillars which wisdom and experience have erected. We cannot regard with favor any principle or any scheme, no matter how plausible its pretensions, which involves the destruction of the FAMILY RELATION, or subjects the MARRIAGE union to the caprice of individual passion; for not only the dictates of wisdom and experience, but the explicit injunctions of God himself, are thus rejected and disavowed. We would not venture upon the tremendous experi-

ment of taking off from human passions all the restraints which society, law, and religion have hitherto imposed, however plausible the plea that the law of passional attraction will again bring them into more complete harmony, and with ' pacific and constructive ' power, build up, as by enchantment, a new and more perfect social form. As soon would we unchain and turn loose upon unprotected women and children a thousand untamed tigers, or lead mankind, in search of its lost paradise, into the very heart of hell, — in the hope that some Orphean lute might charm wild beasts from their nature, and convert even the furies of the infernal world into angels and ministers of grace. The walls of Thebes may have risen to the sound of Amphion's harp ; but he himself was a son of the Highest, and received his lyre and acquired his skill in such creative melody, from the direct teachings of its Sovereign God. So, in these latter days, must the principles of all true REFORM come down from heaven. We have no faith in any system that does not aim at the extirpation of MORAL EVIL from the heart of man ; or that sets aside, in this endeavor, the teachings of Revelation ; the eternal principles of spiritual truth therein proclaimed ; and the method of redemption therein set forth. The CHRISTIAN RELIGION, in its spiritual, life-giving, heart-redeeming principles, is the only power that can reform society ; and it can accomplish this work only by first reforming the individuals of whom society is composed. Without GOD, and the plan of redemption which he has revealed, the world is also without HOPE."



PRESENT CONDITION OF THE RAYMOND HOMESTEAD IN LIMA, N. Y.

James Smith, Lima, 1869.

CHAPTER VIII.

RAYMOND AT TWENTY-EIGHT.

HIS FILIAL DEVOTION — BURNING OF THE HOMESTEAD IN LIMA — MR. RAYMOND'S LETTERS TO HIS PARENTS AND HIS BROTHER SAMUEL — HIS VISIT TO LIMA — HIS SOLICITUDE FOR HIS FATHER AND MOTHER — A TOUCHING TRIBUTE.

ON the last day of September, 1848, while Mr. Raymond was diligently performing the onerous duties which fell to his lot in the office of the *Courier and Enquirer*, the house which had been the shelter of his early years was destroyed by fire, and his father and mother were suddenly thrown upon the world without a home, and with but small means of support. By this time, fortune had smiled graciously upon the son; and the disaster to the old homestead gave him the opportunity of repaying a part of the debt of gratitude he owed to loving and self-denying parents.

A telegraphic despatch announced to Mr. Raymond the fact of the destruction of the homestead, but gave no particulars. He immediately sent to his father the following letter of condolence, written very hastily in the pressure of business: —

“NEW YORK, Saturday P. M.
[Sept. 30, 1848.]

“MY DEAR FATHER:— I have just heard by telegraph from Samuel of your misfortune. So the old house has gone!— Well, I little thought when we were all there so snugly this summer that it would be for the last time, from such a cause. I trust and suppose that it was insured, so that the actual loss will be but little, if anything. And if this is so, although it will put you to a great deal of inconvenience, still it will not be without its advantages, — as you can now build one more to your liking.

“I suppose I could be of no service even if I was there, so that I regret less than I should do otherwise the impossibility of my going. If you want any assistance that I can give, you have only to let me know what it is. I hope mother will not let it trouble her much. It's bad, to be sure — but it can't

be helped. I presume the old house made a fine blaze. I shall expect to hear very soon, from some of you, all the particulars. . . .

“Your affectionate son,

“HENRY.”

Two days later, he wrote a longer letter, addressed to his “dear parents,” in which he said many cheery words of comfort, and gave them a pressing invitation to make their home at his house in New York; at the same time offering pecuniary assistance to enable them to retrieve the misfortune which had overtaken them. This letter, filled with expressions of tender filial devotion, is here given entire: —

“NEW YORK, Oct. 2, 1848.

“MY DEAR PARENTS: — I wrote a very short and hasty letter on Saturday, as soon as I heard of your misfortune. I hope to hear to-day or to-morrow more particulars of the matter, as we are still entirely in the dark as to the amount of loss, etc., etc. We have speculated about it till we are tired, — wondering how the fire caught, whether this thing was saved, or that one burned, etc., etc. But it’s all useless, and we must wait patiently until we hear something direct and explicit. I hope you are not much dejected or discouraged about it, — and indeed I am not at all afraid that it has so far depressed your spirits as to prevent your considering what’s to be done. I’m most anxious to know whether it was insured, and whether you saved any considerable portion of the furniture, your papers, etc., etc. If, when you get this, you shall not already have fully written upon all these points, I hope you will do so without delay.

“And now let’s see what’s to be done. I suppose of course you will not think of building again this fall. Why not, then, as soon as you put things straight, pick up the pieces, etc., etc., and come down here and stay with us? At all events, we have made up our minds that you *must come*, — to stay a while at any rate. We have plenty of room, and will do everything we can to make it pleasant.

“What do you intend to do about rebuilding? Why would it not be well to buy the east part of Hopkins’ farm, and live in his house, — not building again upon the old spot? I think it very likely this would be the cheapest way, and would be best for the farm in the long run. It wouldn’t seem so much like home for a few years; but it would after a while, and then it would make a splendid farm. If you conclude to build again, I suppose it would not be worth while to do more than clear away the rubbish and get material ready before spring. You can undoubtedly build a much more convenient and in every way a better house than the old one was, and that probably at no very great expense.

“It makes me sad to think that the old homestead has gone; but it can’t be helped, — so there’s no use in feeling bad about it. I wish I could go out there, to see how things stand, and to help you, if I could be of any service. But it is impossible for me to leave just now. If you want anything of me,

let me know it. I can let you have some money, if you have need of it. You may rely upon me for everything you want that it is in my power to give or do. I hope to see you here before long, so that we may talk the whole thing over. Of course it will cause you a great deal of trouble and confusion, but even that will prevent you from getting dull and having nothing to engage your attention; and beyond that I hope it will cause you no serious inconvenience. Come down and stay with us, and we'll try and make you glad the old house was burned. . . . Little Henry is well, — though the mosquitoes have almost eaten him up.

"Hoping to hear from you very soon, and writing myself in great haste, I am as ever

"Your affectionate son,

"HENRY."

Not content with words, Mr. Raymond, a week later, proceeded to deeds. Difficult as it was for him to leave the responsible place he occupied, even for a few days, he went to Lima, to supervise the task of gathering up the shattered household gods, and to assume the responsibilities which rightly belonged to him as the eldest son of the family. Arriving in Lima on Sunday, he occupied that day and Monday in making temporary arrangements for the comfort of his parents, and in rescuing, from the wreck of the old homestead,* all that was worth preserving; and on Monday afternoon was on his way back to New York, having first despatched from Lima the following letter to his brother Samuel: —

"LIMA, Monday P. M.
[October 9, 1848.]

"MY DEAR BROTHER:—I have been a good deal disappointed in not seeing you here, though, come to think it over, I suppose it would have been difficult for you to get away. I sent you word by telegraph on Friday afternoon that I should be here on Sunday morning. We were detained first by a fog on the river, and then by running off the track, so that I did not get to Canandaigua until nine o'clock Sunday morning; and it was after twelve when I got home, though the 'home' I found then was very different from the old one I used to come to. The folks had all gone to church, and were astounded enough when they found me on their return. It was with a good deal of difficulty that I got away from New York even for a few days, but I thought our folks would be glad to see me, even if it were but for a little while. I go back to-night, — and shall start in an hour or two, — father going to Canan-

* The Raymond farm was subsequently sold, and is now in the occupation of Mr. Longyear. The present house occupies the site of the one in which Henry J. Raymond was born; and the locust-grove shown in the illustration is the same that existed fifty years ago.

daigua with me. I thought they would probably be a good deal discouraged by their misfortunes, and that I might perhaps help them some. I'm glad to find them less disheartened than I feared they would be.

. . . "How desolate the old place looks! It seems scarcely possible that the blackened ruin we see now can be all that is left of our old and happy home; and indeed it is not; for the *memory* of the old place, and of the many happy hours we have spent there, — of the kind care of parents that has made it so blessed a place for us, — still lives, and fire cannot destroy it. I cannot conceive how the fire could have taken; it seems perfectly unaccountable. How fortunate it was that James came home that night! And how admirably everything seems to have been managed, after the fire was discovered! If the house was to burn, it could scarcely have burned under better auspices. Most of the most valuable things seem to have been saved; and the kindness of friends has in good part made up for the rest. I have been talking matters over with father, and told him I wanted him to decide on doing just what would *suit him and mother best*, and not be deterred by any consideration of expense, for I would pay all deficiencies. He has about concluded to use his insurance money to pay off all his debts the first thing, — except the State loan, — and then take the rest to build a house in the spring; and whatever is lacking I will supply. This will give him a snug house, his farm, and all clear of debt; and he can snap his fingers at all the world. Mother will come to New York, by and by, and stay I hope some time. Father will probably come with her, though he may not be able to stay till she returns. On the whole, I think they have a prospect of having things comfortable again, though they cannot have a house of their own this winter. It would not be easy to build properly this fall.

"But it is time for me to be getting ready to be off. I have been well repaid for coming, by the feeling that my visit has made them happier. And nothing gives me more pleasure than the thought that I can now be of some service to them, in return for the inestimable services they have rendered me. I hope to hear from you soon. Good-by.

"Your affectionate brother,

"HENRY."

Such glimpses of the inner lives of men are useful and interesting. To casual observers, Mr. Raymond appeared impassive, perhaps selfish. But those who knew him best, and especially the parents and brothers who had known him longest, knew how deep and warm were his natural feelings of affection, and how generous his hand. The closing passage of the last letter quoted above is a well-deserved tribute to his parents; and the sentiment expressed throughout is noble, tender, and touching.

CHAPTER IX.

RAYMOND'S ENTRANCE INTO POLITICAL LIFE.

ELECTION TO THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE IN 1849—A GOOD BEGINNING—RETURN TO THE COURIER AND ENQUIRER—RE-ELECTION TO THE LEGISLATURE IN 1850—REMARKS ON ASSUMING THE SPEAKERSHIP OF THE ASSEMBLY—SUDDEN END OF THE SESSION—AN INCIDENT IN RAYMOND'S LIFE—QUARREL BETWEEN WEBB AND RAYMOND—DEPARTURE OF RAYMOND FOR EUROPE—HIS FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF THE OLD WORLD—LETTER FROM LONDON.

THE political life of Henry J. Raymond began in 1849. In the autumn of that year, as the candidate of the Whig party, he was elected to the State Legislature, as the representative in the Assembly of the Ninth Ward district of the city of New York; obtaining a large majority over his Democratic competitor, Mr. Potter. As a parliamentarian, and a political leader, Mr. Raymond immediately took a commanding position. His ability as a debater, his thorough knowledge of the rules of legislative action, and his sympathy with the Free Soil movement of the day, at once elevated him to a prominent place in the ranks of the opponents of slavery extension. In the general business of the session he was also active and efficient. Having been appointed Chairman of the Committee on the petition for the improvement of Rackett River, he made an elaborate report upon the history and the undeveloped capacities of that comparatively unknown part of the State, which brought him into notice as a careful investigator in a new field of research.

This was Mr. Raymond's first experience in the political arena. He intended it should be his last; for, on returning, at the close of the session, to his duties in the office of the *Courier and Enquirer*, he again became engrossed in journalism, and long resisted the efforts made by his constituents and

friends, to induce him to continue in public life. Moreover, the whole responsibility of conducting the *Courier and Enquirer* had fallen upon him, on the departure of General Webb for Europe; and the gradual accumulation of his means had enabled him to purchase a share in that journal. Prudent regard for his own welfare, therefore, required absolute devotion to the demands of his profession. It was only when the Whigs beset him with solicitations, that he yielded his own desires to those of his party, and again consented to become a candidate for the Assembly. For the second time he was triumphantly elected (November, 1850), and at the opening of the session in January, 1851, he was chosen Speaker. His Whig competitor for that position was Mr. J. B. Varnum of New York. The Democratic candidate was Mr. N. S. Elderkin; but in that Legislature the Democrats were in the minority.

Messrs. Varnum and Elderkin conducted Mr. Raymond to the Speaker's chair, and he opened the session with a wise little speech, in which he gave good counsel in pithy words, thus:—

“GENTLEMEN OF THE ASSEMBLY:—I tender you my thanks for the honor you have been pleased to confer on me. I shall endeavor to discharge the duties, and to meet the responsibilities which that honor brings with it, by a careful attention to the progress of public business, and under a due sense of the importance of the trust which you have devolved upon me.

“You will soon adopt rules for your guidance and government in the deliberations of the present session. I shall seek to give such vigorous, practical effect to such rules as shall best attain the design they are intended to secure. I shall often need, gentlemen, and I do not doubt I shall always have, your most charitable indulgence in this endeavor.

“Nothing, permit me to remind you, can more effectually promote the easy and beneficial discharge of public duty than a pervading sense of the magnitude of the interests committed to your care. Let us bear always in mind that we are making laws for the greatest, the richest, the most powerful, of the American States; that the topics which will demand our attention are those which touch most nearly the dearest interests of those millions of people; and that in regard to our sister States, and the Federal Union, we have rights, relations, and duties, which demand our care; and that our action here may shape the character, guide the growth, and control the destinies of this great State long after we shall have ceased to take any part in its affairs. Under such a sense of the greatness and importance of our task, and with proper dependence upon the wisdom that cometh from above, let us address ourselves to the duties that lie before us.”

Mr. Raymond filled the place of Speaker with much honor to himself and with satisfaction to both parties. His selection of committees — always a delicate and difficult task — was accomplished without offence. His thorough knowledge of parliamentary rules made his decisions prompt and accurate. His self-possession was unconquerable; his manners urbane; his treatment of the minority just and considerate.

In the course of the winter he frequently left the chair to take part in the debates. The session was stormy. The election of a United States Senator in place of Daniel S. Dickinson — the question of Slavery — the Canal Policy of the State — the Common School System, were the topics which excited bitter party feeling, and gave rise to acrimonious discussions. Mr. Raymond was committed to the policy of enlarging the canals; he was an ardent advocate of free schools; he advised the adoption of the resolutions, which were finally passed by the Legislature, in regard to the Compromise measures; and he produced a marked impression by a written decision in reference to the Sodus Bay question.

The session came to an untimely end, through the conduct of a refractory Senate. Thirteen members of that body, opposed to the canal enlargement, resigned their seats in order to prevent the passage of the measure, and the session was terminated by the lack of a quorum.* The Appropriation and Supply bills had not yet been passed, and an extra session of the Legislature became an imperative necessity.

The history of these disturbing events, and the reasons for calling an extra session, were set forth in an "Address to the People of the State," which was drawn up by Mr. Raymond, at the request of the Whig members, and published in their

* The Assembly had passed an act known as the "Nine Million bill," authorizing a State loan of nine million dollars, for the enlargement of the canals. The constitutionality of the measure was doubted; but Daniel Webster and Rufus Choate both gave opinions in its favor, and Mr. Raymond and his friends carried it through the Assembly. The Democratic senators, finding that it was sure to pass the Senate, resigned their seats, so that a quorum could not be obtained. A special election was called by Governor Hunt, and a Whig preponderance was obtained. The bill was passed, and afterward declared unconstitutional by the Court of Appeals by a party vote.

name. The whole body was then dissolved, and the members returned to their homes. The extra session had been called for the following June; but before that time arrived, Mr. Raymond was on his way to Europe, for the benefit of his health.

A comical incident, which occurred in the course of this session of the Legislature, has hitherto been known only to a few of Mr. Raymond's friends. It furnished a good illustration of the character of the Albany lobby, and of the peculiarities of some of the lower class of Democratic politicians, who found their way to the Capitol; and it affected Mr. Raymond in a manner more ludicrous than agreeable. An eye-witness of the scene, — Mr. Alden J. Spooner, of Brooklyn, — who was fortunately able to rescue Mr. Raymond from an unpleasant predicament, has kindly acceded to a request by the writer of these pages, in sending him the racy letter which is here subjoined: —

BROOKLYN, November, 1869.

In the winter of 1851, when, after a great struggle, the Whig party had succeeded in electing a Senator, that peculiar hand which always hovers around the Legislature, ready to join in any triumph which offers a chance for a high carouse, were approaching Congress Hall, after a circuit of all the drinking-places in Albany. As fate would have it, in their boisterous march up State Street, they encountered and surrounded Mr. Raymond, who then filled the place of Speaker of the House. He was quite out of health, but had been delivering an address before the Normal School.

Him they took in their midst, and hurried into Congress Hall, in spite of his protestations; and, having fixed him in a corner, proceeded to compel him to libations of wine, which, under the circumstances, seemed neither to admit of limit nor respite. Bottle after bottle was called for, and glass after glass was pushed up to the Speaker, who was compelled to drink "*supernaculum*," under the fearful penalties of refusal which gleamed from the fiery eyes around him.

The Speaker did his best, but that was nothing. He endeavored to remonstrate with his persecutors, on the score of his ill health; but this only added fuel to their ferocity. They insisted that the wine would do him good, and continued to ply him *ad nauseam*.

Happening to be at Congress Hall, in an upper room, and hearing the shouts of laughter, I imprudently proceeded to the scene of merriment, all unconscious of its features or character. The Speaker, with those drinking daggers constantly placed at his throat, was the perfect image of despair. His persecutors were inexorable, and he could only gain occasional delay by a little by-play, or some attempted joke; but it ended in his being compelled to drink it down, with the sharpest inspection to see that not a single drop was lost.

As I put my unlucky head within the room, my hat was forthwith snatched away. It was tossed about from one to another, till ultimately some person gave it a violent kick, sending it through the door into the reading-room, where some attendant minister upon these infernal orgies seized it, and placed it upon the glowing anthracite fire, where it was at once consumed.

"Who is that fellow?" cried a voice.

"That," replied another, "is Senator Schoonmaker," — whom perhaps I resembled to the extent of the pair of gold spectacles which bridged my nose.

"No!" said the Hon. Mike Walsh, by whom I was very slightly known: "he is a fellow who has a bill to pass; but by G—d it shall not pass!"

This diversion was lucky for Mr. Raymond, who made the best of it by turning all the attention upon me, and being a fresh comer in the drinking game, I had largely the advantage.

I met the banter of the Hon. Mike, by admitting that I had a little bill of my own, and insisting that it would pass, and I could prove it.

"I'll bet it won't!" said Mike; and bets were made, — to what amount I will not say.

I immediately handed over a bank bill to "the Commodore," who kept the bar, for wine for the company, declaring it was the only bill I had to pass, asking him loudly if it would not pass, and receiving his loud affirmative response.

The Hon. Mike, with considerable objurgation, admitted that he was "sold;" and forthwith the attention of the whole company was concentrated upon me.

The Speaker took advantage of the opportunity, and, crouching behind us, made good his retreat.

It was then made manifest by certain of the rollicking crowd, that a new party had been instituted, denominated the "hat-burning party," wherein the burning of a hat was the token of membership. Of this I was already a member. In the course of the evening, as numerous others came in, they were added to the new-born party, through a like burnt-offering, till a start was made with highly respectable numbers.

So long as the fun was fast and furious, the Speaker was forgotten. He had been rapidly admonished not to go to his own room, but to that then occupied by the Hon. Willis Hall, Elijah Ward, and a large party of friends. To this he proceeded, and the door was barricaded.

The precaution was timely. A cry was raised: "Where is the Speaker?" and the wolves became aware that he had eluded them. Forthwith a rush was made to his bedroom, and, in common parlance, it was gutted. A rapid search was then made for him in other rooms. Through all the corridors the uproar went on, and reached at last the chamber where he was ensconced; but, without opening it, the pack was driven off by diplomatic lies. At length, worn down by its orgies, and persuaded by the remonstrances of the Commodore and other friends to leave the house, the pack passed again into the streets, and left the Speaker to a troubled and apprehensive sleep.

It is not probable that, in all his experience, he ever passed through a crisis more dangerous than this; when, from every pore of his skin, and in the pallor of his face, he was evidently saying, with Stephano, "I would fain die a dry death!"

While General Webb remained abroad, Mr. Raymond had infused life into the *Courier and Enquirer*, making it an attractive and trustworthy sheet, and devoting to its columns a large share of his time, even when most actively engaged in the excitements of a political canvass and in official duties at Albany. But the stand he took in reference to the Slavery question — particularly in its connection with the choice of a new United States Senator from this State — failed to meet the approval of his superior. General Webb had a strong desire to occupy the seat then held in the Senate by Mr. Dickinson; the Whigs declined, with many thanks, to accept him as a candidate. Then Webb appealed to Raymond, but Raymond flatly refused to use his political influence in behalf of one whom his party had peremptorily rejected. General Webb was politely bowed out. Personal difficulties ensued between Raymond and Webb; and when the former, broken in health by excitement and overwork, announced his intention of going to Europe, he was warned that his departure would be considered by Webb as a formal withdrawal from the paper.*

This was in the spring of 1851. New events were about to occur. A fresh field was opening for the display of Mr. Raymond's ability, energy and ambition. His days with General Webb were already numbered; his long struggle for a place in the world had been crowned with success; thenceforth he was to occupy an independent, influential and honorable position.

More than two-thirds of the span of life allotted to him had passed, before Mr. Raymond was able to break away from the routine of daily duty and labor, for a brief run through the Old World. His temporary release from care gave him the most intense enjoyment; and although his sojourn abroad was necessarily limited, he derived from it the measure of health and the enlargement of observation and experience which subsequently contributed to the success of the *Times*. A private

*It is pleasant to know that these differences became healed before the death of Mr. Raymond. After several brisk wars of words, at different periods, friendly relations were restored. Yet no account of Mr. Raymond's life would be complete without an accurate record of his conflicts as well as his friendships.

letter, written upon his arrival in London, in June, 1851, gives us a glimpse of the impressions conveyed to his mind by the scenes which were novel to him, and also conveys the earliest information of the impending change in his business relations. The subjoined copy of this interesting letter is furnished by his brother, Mr. Samuel B. Raymond.*

“LONDON, June, 1851.

“MY DEAR BROTHER:— I suppose you will have heard of my departure for the Old World, and probably also from father of my safe arrival. We had a long voyage, so that, although I have been away from home since the 8th of May, I have only been in England a fortnight. I spent a week on the way from Liverpool to London, visiting the most interesting places on the way, I went to the famous Tubular Bridge over the Menai Straits, — the largest bridge in the world, — and visited the Duke of Devonshire's magnificent country-seat at Chatsworth. He has a house as large as the Seminary in Lima, in the midst of a park containing two thousand acres, and presenting the most beautiful variety of surface you ever saw. The Duke is *well off*, having a yearly income from his estates of one million five hundred thousand dollars.

“Here in London I have visited all the principal places; but any description of them which I could give in a letter would amount to little. I went up to the Crystal Palace this morning. It is an immense affair, — one of which descriptions can give no idea. The building itself is enormous, and the articles exhibited surpass, in elegance and splendor, anything I ever dreamed of. I like my visit here tolerably well, though it is not always pleasant to think that I am three thousand miles from home, in this vast city, and with scarcely an acquaintance in it. I have fallen in with three or four Americans, and have travelled with them. My health is better than it was last winter, but I do not gain strength as rapidly as I hoped. I presume I shall never be as celebrated as Samson was for strength! . . . I have nearly finished my visit here, and intend to leave for Paris early next week. How long I shall stay I am not yet determined, but I hope to be at home early in August, and shall then try to make a short visit at least to Lima and Rochester.

“You will probably have seen that I am no longer in the *Courier and Enquirer*. Two gentlemen in Albany propose to start a new paper in New York early in September, and I shall probably edit it. †

“This is the mail day for to-morrow's steamer, and I have had just time to write this, — intending not to give you any description of my travels, but simply to let you know where and how I am. . . .

“Your affectionate brother,

“HENRY.”

* To whom the writer is indebted for many courtesies and much assistance, — especially for free access to family records and correspondence, which appear in print for the first time in these pages.

† This passage conveyed the first hint of the intended establishment of the *Times*. The circumstances which led to the birth of that paper are set forth in the ensuing chapter.

CHAPTER X.

FOUNDATION OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

ORIGIN OF THE TIMES — THURLOW WEED'S OFFER OF THE ALBANY EVENING JOURNAL TO RAYMOND AND JONES — FAILURE OF A NEGOTIATION — PROJECT OF A NEW WHIG PAPER IN NEW YORK — THE WINTER OF 1850-51 — A WALK UPON THE ICE ON THE HUDSON RIVER — A BANKING LAW WHICH PRODUCED A NEWSPAPER — GEORGE JONES, E. B. WESLEY, AND HENRY J. RAYMOND — THE TIMES' COPARTNERSHIP — EIGHT STOCKHOLDERS — RAYMOND'S SHARES PRESENTED TO HIM — THE TIMES ANNOUNCED — COMMOTION AMONG NEW YORK NEWSPAPERS — RAYMOND'S VISIT TO EUROPE — HIS RETURN TO NEW YORK — THE PROSPECTUS OF THE TIMES — A BUILDING SELECTED — HOW THE FIRST NUMBER OF THE PAPER WAS MADE UP — MR. RAYMOND'S SALUTATORY ADDRESS — "ONLY SIXPENCE A WEEK" — THE MONEY SUNK IN THE FIRST YEAR — MR. RAYMOND'S STATEMENT OF RESULTS.

AN interesting history is connected with the origin of the *New York Times*, — a history hitherto unwritten, but in many particulars interesting and significant.

A peculiar combination of political events in the year 1848 led Mr. Thurlow Weed to contemplate a final retirement from the *Albany Evening Journal*, which paper he had elevated to the rank of a controlling power in the State of New York. The *Journal* was offered to Henry J. Raymond, who was then engaged upon the *Courier and Enquirer* in New York, and who had not yet begun his political career. Raymond was but twenty-eight years old; Weed was already a veteran in politics and journalism, and had established his reputation, and built up a prosperous business. But Weed had enemies, who began to scheme against him. He was willing to rest upon his laurels, and give place to younger men; and his first choice was Mr. Raymond. The offer to transfer the proprietorship of the *Journal* was formally made to Raymond, in 1848, through Mr. George Jones, a banker in Albany, who afterwards became the partner of Mr. Raymond in the *Times*,

and is now the chief proprietor of that paper. Mr. Weed revealed his purpose to Mr. Jones without reserve; declared his determination to retire from editorial life, and expressed an earnest desire that Raymond and Jones should assume the control of the *Evening Journal*. A letter from Mr. Jones apprised Mr. Raymond of this proposition; and the latter immediately went to Albany to consult with Jones and Weed. The negotiation fell through, in consequence of the refusal of one of Mr. Weed's partners (William White) to sell his own interest in the paper. Another partner, Andrew White, was willing to sell; but his own desire and that of Mr. Weed were alike unavailing. William White remained inexorable, and after long parley, the *Journal* was left as before, and Raymond returned to New York to resume his duties in the office of the *Courier and Enquirer*.

But this was not to be the end. The project of establishing a new Whig paper in New York was soon broached in a correspondence between Jones and Raymond, and out of innumerable letters on this subject gradually grew the plan of starting the *Times*. In 1849, the year after the fruitless negotiation at Albany, Raymond took his seat in the Legislature for the first time, and the inchoate newspaper plan became the topic of frequent conversations with his future partner. Still another year passed, but no definite result was reached. At the beginning of 1850, however, Raymond had again been elected to the State Assembly, and the choice for the Speakership had fallen upon him. Events were at last hurrying to a conclusion; and a walk upon the ice of the Hudson River was destined to be the turning-point of Raymond's career.

The winter of 1850-51 was severe. The Hudson was completely frozen over at Albany, and the only method of access to the railroad station, on the opposite shore, was by the natural bridge of ice. Mr. Raymond's father was on his way to Albany, on one of the sharpest days of the winter, and the young Speaker, going to meet the incoming train at Greenbush, stopped at Jones' banking-house to solicit the favor of his company. They set out together to cross the river; and when half way over, Mr. Jones casually observed that he had heard

"the *Tribune* had made a profit of sixty thousand dollars the past year." This remark at once revived the topic which had already been the burden of long correspondence between the two friends; and the question of newspaper enterprises, and risks, and rewards, was again discussed with animation. The information concerning the *Tribune* seems to have been regarded with a feeling akin to awe, — for a clear profit of sixty thousand dollars for a single newspaper in one year was considered an immense success nineteen years ago. In these later days it is not an occurrence so unusual that the announcement takes one's breath away.

After further conversation, Mr. Raymond expressed his decided conviction that a new paper could be started in New York, which would make as much money as the *Tribune*; and, declaring his willingness to share the risks of such an enterprise, urged Mr. Jones to revive the project which had already given rise to negotiation and correspondence.

Mr. Jones hesitated, but explained that his own business as a banker was at that time prosperous, and was likely to continue so, unless the Legislature should pass an act then pending, the practical operation of which would inflict serious loss upon all the bankers in the State. This act provided for a reduction of the rate of redemption of country money; and, in common with those who then conducted the banking business under the Free Banking Law of the State, Mr. Jones was naturally apprehensive of its damaging effect.

Mr. Raymond replied, laughing, that he should himself make a strong effort to procure the passage of the objectionable act, having now a strong personal motive; but added, more gravely, an expression of his opinion that it would be passed. He was right. The act became a law; and its effect justified the apprehension. The bankers began to close up a business which had become perilous instead of profitable; and among the earliest to retire were Mr. Jones and his partner, Mr. E. B. Wesley.

At this moment the *Times* became, in fact, an established institution, for the money and the men were ready. Before the session of the Legislature was broken up that winter, through causes described in the preceding chapter, the plan of the

forthcoming daily journal had been substantially agreed upon. Raymond's health had failed; he was to go to Europe for the summer, and to return in the fall to assume the editorship. Jones was to remain at home, to prepare the details of the organization. Seven gentlemen contributed the capital; and all were confident of the ultimate success of the venture.

The nominal capital of the *Times* was one hundred thousand dollars; but all this sum was not required at the start. The subscribers to the stock, and the proportions held by each, were as follows:—

Henry J. Raymond,	20 shares.
George Jones,	25 "
E. B. Wesley,	25 "
J. B. Plumb, Albany,	5 "
Daniel B. St. John, Albany,	5 "
Francis B. Ruggles, Albany,	5 "
E. B. Morgan, Aurora,	2 "
Christopher Morgan, Auburn,	2 "
Total number of owners,	8
Total number of shares, first subscription,	89

Mr. Raymond selected for the new paper the name of *The New York Daily Times*; and the name of the business firm was Raymond, Jones & Co. It was unanimously agreed that Mr. Jones should become the publisher and the responsible financial manager. It is due to Mr. Jones, and to the gentlemen who were associated with him at the outset, to record the fact that the twenty shares of stock assigned to Mr. Raymond were presented to him, all paid up. This was a practical and generous recognition of Raymond's abilities and of the value of his services.

The preliminaries having been thus satisfactorily adjusted, the formal announcement of the forthcoming sheet was the next step in order. Then came a tempest.

The first intimation of the intended appearance of a rival to the *Tribune* and the *Herald* produced a flutter in the offices of those journals.* The flutter increased to a tremor; the tremor

* It was characteristic of the management of the *Tribune* that as soon as Mr. Raymond made public announcement of his intention to start the *Times*,

to a spasm. Efforts were made in insidious ways to create a prejudice against Raymond. He was an Abolitionist; he was a Radical; he was a man reckless of constitutions, of laws, and of the public good; he was a tool for the furtherance of party schemes. All this, and more, found expression in the newspapers, in letters from correspondents, in political clubs, and in the current gossip of the day. But the subject of this animadversion was all the time enjoying a quiet rest, three thousand miles away, recruiting, among the scenes of the Old World, the wasted health which needed thorough restoration before he could turn to give battle. The whole summer of 1851 he gave to this work of recuperation; but for the whole of the same summer he and his newspaper were, at intervals, the subjects of the town talk and of curious speculation.

The *Times*, therefore, was very well advertised without much expenditure of money; but when Raymond returned in August, and called about him the assistants who had been engaged in the service of the *Times*,* the time had arrived to offer the challenge and begin the fight. In an earlier chapter of this volume, certain reasons have been given, to account for the immediate and continued success of the *Times*. The harvest was ready. The tares had long grown together with the wheat in New York journalism, and the day for the reaping had come. The *Tribune* and the *Herald* were to lose, and

a bitter feeling found official expression in the following entry upon the carriers' book:—

“NOTICE TO THE CARRIERS.

“A new daily paper is to be issued in a few days, and any carrier of the *Tribune* who interests himself in said paper, in getting up routes, etc., prejudicial to the interests of the *Tribune*, will forfeit his right of property in the *Tribune* route. We give this notice now, that all who do so may know that they do it at the peril of losing their route on the *Tribune*.”

This was not exactly fraternal, but it was the *Tribune's* way. Of course the mandate fell flat, for the carriers did help the *Times*, and, moreover, presently carried more copies of the *Times* than of the *Tribune*, and continue to do so to this day. Nor was this all; for Raymond's baner, unknown to himself, became the standard of revolt in the *Tribune* ranks. Three editors, a dozen good printers, the assistant foreman of the composing-room, and the assistant foreman of the press-room of the *Tribune* establishment resigned their positions to accept better places under Raymond.

* But who had kept their own counsel for six months.

the *Times* was to gain; for thousands of newspaper readers in New York had been for years prepared to welcome a journal which should be pure in tone, reasonable in price, and prompt in the collection of news. These conditions Raymond sought to fulfil; and he succeeded.

Printer's ink was freely impressed into the service of the *Times*, in the months of August and September; and the subjoined Prospectus, which had already been largely circulated through various channels, was advertised simultaneously in all the leading journals of the city—none of which journals, it might be added, gave it gratuitous publicity:—

“NEW YORK DAILY TIMES;
“A NEW MORNING AND EVENING DAILY NEWSPAPER,
“EDITED BY HENRY J. RAYMOND.
“PRICE ONE CENT.

“On Tuesday, the 16th of September next,* the subscribers will commence the publication, in the city of New York, of a Daily Morning and Evening Newspaper, to be called *The New York Daily Times*, printed upon a folio sheet of twenty-four columns, and sold at ONE CENT per copy, served in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Williamsburgh, at SIX AND A QUARTER CENTS per week; sold by agents in all the principal cities of the United States, and mailed to subscribers in the country at FOUR DOLLARS per annum. *The Times* will present, daily:—

“The news of the day, in all departments and from all quarters, special attention being given to reports of legal, criminal, commercial, and financial transactions in the city of New York, to political and personal movements in all parts of the United States, and to the early publication of reliable intelligence from both continents.

“Correspondence from all parts of Europe, from California, Mexico, and South America, and from all sections of the United States, written expressly for the *Times* by intelligent gentlemen, permanently enlisted in its support:—

“Full reports of Congressional and Legislative proceedings; of public meetings, political and religious; transactions of agricultural, scientific, and mechanical associations; and generally of whatever may have interest or importance for any considerable portion of the community:—

“Literary reviews and intelligence, prepared by competent persons, and giving a clear, impartial, and satisfactory view of the current literature of the day:—

“Criticisms of music, the drama, painting, and of whatever in any department of art may merit or engage attention:—

“Editorial articles upon everything of interest or importance that may occur in any department,—political, social, religious, literary, scientific, or per-

* The day of actual publication was the 18th of September.

sonal, written with all the ability, care, and knowledge which the abundant means at the disposal of the subscribers will enable them to command.


“For the principles which the *Times* will advocate, and for the manner in which it will discuss them, the subscribers would refer to its columns, rather than to any preliminary professions which they might make. It is sufficient to say that, as it is not established for the advancement of any party, sect, or person, — it will discuss all questions of interest and importance, political, social, and religious, to which the stirring events of the time may give rise. It will canvass freely the character and pretensions of public men, the merits and demerits of all administrations of government, national, State, and municipal, and the worth of all institutions, principles, habits, and professions. It will be under the editorial management and control of HENRY J. RAYMOND; and while it will maintain firmly and zealously those principles which he may deem essential to the public good, and which are held by the great Whig party of the United States more nearly than by any other political organization, its columns will be free from bigoted devotion to narrow interests, and will be open, within necessary limitations, to communications upon every subject of public importance.

“In its political and social discussions, the *Times* will seek to be CONSERVATIVE, in such a way as shall best promote needful REFORM. It will endeavor to perpetuate the good, and to avoid the evil, which the past has developed. While it will strive to check all rash innovation, and to defeat all schemes for destroying established and beneficent institutions, its best sympathies and co-operation will be given to every just effort to reform society, to infuse higher elements of well-being into our political and social organizations, and to improve the condition and the character of our fellow-men. Its main reliance for all improvement, personal, social, and political, will be upon Christianity and Republicanism; it will seek, therefore, at all times, the advancement of the one and the preservation of the other. It will inculcate devotion to the Union and the Constitution, obedience to law, and a jealous love of that personal and civil liberty which constitutions and laws are made to preserve. While it will assert and exercise the right freely to discuss every subject of public interest, it will not countenance any improper interference, on the part of the people of one locality with the institutions, or even the prejudices of any other. It will seek to allay, rather than excite, agitation, — to extend industry, temperance, and virtue, — to encourage and advance education; to promote economy, concord, and justice in every section of our country; to elevate and enlighten public sentiment; and to substitute reason for prejudice, a cool and intelligent judgment for passion, in all public action and in all discussions of public affairs.

“The subscribers intend to make the *Times at once the best and the cheapest daily family newspaper in the United States*. They have abundant means at their command, and are disposed to use them for the attainment of that end. The degree of success which may attend their efforts will be left to the public judgment.

“Voluntary correspondence, communicating news, is respectfully solicited from all parts of the world; all letters, so received, being accompanied by the writers' real names, if used, will be liberally paid for.

“Advertisements will be conspicuously published at favorable rates. Ad-



FIRST OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK TIMES, 113 NASSAU STREET, — 1851.

Rockwood, Photo.

vertisements for servants and others wanting employment, and notices of all meetings, political and religious, will be inserted at half the regular price. No advertisement will be charged for less than five lines.

“All payments for subscription or advertising must be made in advance; and postage on all letters must be prepaid.

“Communications for the editorial department must be addressed to HENRY J. RAYMOND, editor of the *New York Times*; letters upon business or enclosing money, to RAYMOND, JONES & Co., publishers.

“THE WEEKLY FAMILY TIMES”

will be issued from the same office, and mailed to subscribers on Thursday of each week. It will be printed upon a large quarto sheet, and will contain tales, poetry, biography, the news of the day, editorials upon all subjects of interest, and a variety of interesting and valuable matter. No effort will be spared to make it superior, as a family newspaper, to any published hitherto. It will be mailed to subscribers in any part of the United States and Europe, at the following prices:—

Single copies,	\$2 per annum.
Ten copies	15 “
Twenty copies,	20 “

“Subscriptions and advertisements, left at the office, No. 118 Nassau Street, or sent by mail, are respectfully solicited.

“RAYMOND, JONES & CO.

“NEW YORK, August 30, 1851.”

The proprietors of the *Times* found difficulty in procuring a suitable building, in a central situation, but finally selected the brown stone house No. 113 Nassau Street, between Ann and Beekman Streets, which was then in process of construction. The owner of this building intended it for a store; but his means had suddenly become exhausted, and work upon it had nearly ceased, when Raymond, Jones & Co. made him a favorable offer, and took possession. In great haste, the upper floors were roughly finished, fonts of type were “laid;” and one of Hoe’s steam cylinder presses — purchased at a cost of twenty thousand dollars — was set up in the basement of the building, with no more than the usual delay; but on the 18th of the month the ground floor was still unfit for occupancy. The publication office of the *Times* was opened in temporary quarters in a little shop on the opposite side of the street (No. 118), whence it was transferred to its proper place after the lapse of a few weeks.

On the night of the 17th of September, the first number of the *Times* was "made up," in open lofts, destitute of windows, gas, speaking-tubes, dumb-waiters, and general conveniences. All was raw and dismal. The writer remembers sitting by the open window at midnight, looking through the dim distance at Raymond's first lieutenant, who was diligently writing "brevier" at a rickety table at the end of the barren garret; his only light a flaring candle, held upright by three nails in a block of wood; at the city editor, and the news-men, and the reporters, all eagerly scratching pens over paper, their countenances half-lighted, half-shaded by other guttering candles; at Raymond, writing rapidly and calmly, as he always wrote, but under similar disadvantages; and all the night the soft summery air blew where it listed, and sometimes blew out the feeble lights; and grimy little "devils" came down at intervals from the printing-room, and cried for "copy;" and every man in the company, from the chief to the police reporter, gave his whole mind to the preparation of the initial sheet. The price of the paper, which, on the next day, promptly redeemed its promise of appearance, was only one cent; but it contained all the news of the day, and it was good, lively, and sensible.

Mr. Raymond's salutatory address to the readers of the *Times* was a characteristic production, — clearly cut, manly, and temperate. We reproduce it here entire: —

"A WORD ABOUT OURSELVES.

"We publish to-day the first number of the *New York Daily Times*, and we intend to issue it every morning (Sundays excepted) for an indefinite number of years to come.

"We have not entered upon the task of establishing a new daily paper in this city, without due consideration of its difficulties as well as its encouragements. We understand perfectly that great capital, great industry, great patience are indispensable to its success, and that even with all these, failure is not impossible. But we know, also, that within the last five years the reading population of this city has nearly doubled, while the number of daily newspapers is no greater now than it was then; that many of those now published are really *class* journals, made up for particular classes of readers; that others are objectionable upon grounds of morality; and that no newspaper, which was really *fit* to live, ever yet expired for lack of readers.

"As a *Newspaper*, presenting all the news of the day from all parts of the world, we intend to make the *Times* as good as the best of those now issued

in the city of New York; and in all the higher utilities of the press, — as a public instructor in all departments of action and of thought, we hope to make it decidedly superior to existing journals of the same class. Of course, all this cannot be done at once; some little time is necessary to get the machinery in easy working order — to arrange for correspondence, to receive exchanges for various quarters of the world, and to enable assistants to find just the places in which they can work most efficiently. We hope, however, at the very outset, to show that we are *disposed*, and in course of time that we are *able*, to make as good a newspaper in all respects, and in many a much better one, than those hitherto offered to the New York public.

“ We have fixed the price of the *Times* at *one cent* each copy, or six and a quarter cents a week, delivered to subscribers. Carriers, of course, make their profit upon this; so that the amount which we receive barely covers the cost of the paper upon which it is printed, the deficiency being made up by advertisements. We have chosen this price, however, deliberately, and for the sake of obtaining for the paper a large circulation and corresponding influence. That influence shall always be upon the side of Morality, of Industry, of Education and Religion. We shall seek, in all our discussions and inculcations, to promote the best interests of the society in which we live — to aid the advancement of all beneficent undertakings, and to promote, in every way, and to the utmost of our ability, the welfare of our fellow-men.

“ During the past summer, the public press throughout the country has speculated and predicted, to a very considerable extent, and in all possible ways, upon the character and purposes of this journal. It has been praised and denounced in advance, for principles to which it was supposed to be devoted, and for purposes which it was said to entertain. Some have said it was to be an *abolitionist* paper — a *free-soil* paper — devoted to the work of anti-slavery agitation — radical in everything, reckless of constitutions, laws, and the public good. Others have ascribed its establishment to a design to push individual interests or party schemes; one announces that it is to sustain Mr. Webster, another General Scott, and another Mr. Clay for the presidency. In fact, almost every possible variety of sentiment and of purpose has been ascribed to it in one quarter or another.

“ We have not the least fault to find with all this. Some of it proceeded from a malicious desire to prejudice the public mind against it, while much of it sprung doubtless from that propensity to *gossip* which governs tea-tables and newspapers, and which readers of all classes are suspected of not disliking overmuch. None of it is likely in the long run to prove injurious; on the contrary, it has contributed greatly towards making our project known, and has stimulated public curiosity concerning it, to a degree which our own exertions might have striven for much longer in vain. We are, therefore, rather thankful for it than otherwise; while to those numerous journals throughout the country, whose love of fair play as well as personal kindness has led them to interpose on our behalf, any expression we might make would fall far short of the gratitude we feel.

“ Upon all topics, — Political, Social, Moral, and Religious, — we intend that the paper shall speak for itself; and we only ask that it may be judged accordingly. We shall be *Conservative*, in all cases where we think Conservatism essential to the public good; and we shall be *Radical* in everything

which may seem to us to require radical treatment, and radical reform. We do not believe that *everything* in society is either exactly right, or exactly wrong; what is good we desire to preserve and improve; what is evil, to exterminate, or reform.

“We shall endeavor so to conduct all our discussions of public affairs, as to leave no one in doubt as to the principles we espouse, or the measures we advocate. And while we design to be decided and explicit in all our positions, we shall at the same time seek to be temperate and measured in all our language. We do not mean to write as if we were in a passion, unless that shall really be the case; and we shall make it a point to get into a passion as rarely as possible. There are very few things in this world which it is worth while to get angry about; and they are just the things that anger will not improve. In controversies with other journals, with individuals, or with parties, we shall engage only when, in our opinion, some important public interest can be promoted thereby: — and even then, we shall endeavor to rely more upon fair argument than upon misrepresentation or abusive language.

“We hope to make the *DAILY TIMES* acceptable to the great mass of our people, and shall spare no effort to do so. We have an abundance of means, — plenty of able and experienced assistance, and every facility for making at once the *best* and the *cheapest* newspaper in the United States. We know how much easier it is to say this than it is to do it; but we hope to show, in due course of time, that we have not failed in our promise, or disappointed any just expectation.

“We shall seldom trouble our readers with our personal affairs; but these few words, at the outset, seemed to be required.”

The opening declaration in this address, announcing the intention of the proprietors of the *Times* to publish it “for an indefinite number of years to come,” was like the crack of a whip. It sounded dismally to the opposition journals, but it pleased the readers of the new paper, for it showed confidence and vigor; and the promise to make the *Times* a good newspaper, as well as a cheap one, was redeemed at the beginning, and has ever since been kept. Subscriptions came in rapidly after the appearance of the first number, and advertisements followed. The *Times* was a success; and in the new adjustment which occurred in the field of New York journalism it was found there was room enough for all. It was true that Raymond attracted to the *Times* readers who had become discontented with the *Tribune* and the *Herald*; but the partisans of Greeley and of Bennett still clung to their favorites, for whom the *Times* was apparently unsuited. In short, the display of ill-temper which was elicited by the venture of Raymond, Jones & Co., proved to have been wholly unnecessary.

One of the leading editorial articles in the first number of the *Times* discussed the affairs of Cuba. Then, as now, the question of the independence of that island was a topic of the day; and, in view of the passing events of 1869, it is interesting to remember what was said by the *Times* in 1851. The following is the material part of the article in question:—

“Whether it be right or wrong; whether it be in accordance with, or against, the principles of international law; whether it be any of their business or not, — *the Americans will always sympathize with any people struggling, or supposed to be struggling, against oppression.* There may be some among us who can look coolly upon such contests, and regulate their sentiments concerning them by their intellectual notions of law and national duty; but the great mass of the people of the United States, acting solely from the impulses of free hearts and quick sympathies, will always sympathize with, and stand ready to aid, so far as they can, every nation, or colony, which may desire and endeavor to throw off hurtful and injurious restraint, and to secure for themselves the same proud position and the same independence of political action which we enjoy. It would be strange, indeed, if it were otherwise, — prizing freedom, as we do, and believing as we profess to believe that freedom is the natural right of every people, brought into national existence, as we were, under the influence of this belief, and through the aid of sympathizing allies, — *it would be strange, indeed, if we could look with cold indifference upon the efforts of others to throw off unjust oppression, and to regulate their political conduct by laws of their own enactment.*”

Encouraged by their success, the proprietors of the *Times* were prompt to seize every advantage, and the new sheet was pushed in all directions. Simultaneously with the appearance of its fourth number, a little handbill, nine inches long and six inches wide, was thrust under the doors of thousands of dwellings in New York. It set forth in short compass the low price and the peculiar character of the *Times*. The paper was “only sixpence a week,” and it contained “an immense amount of reading matter for that price,” and more to the same effect. As a curiosity, the following exact copy of this production is appended:—

“A CARD.

“The carrier of the *New York Daily Times* proposes to leave it at this house every morning for a week, for the perusal of the family, and to enable them, if they desire it, to receive it regularly.

“The *Times* is a very cheap paper, costing the subscriber only SIXPENCE a week, and contains an immense amount of reading matter for that price.

The proprietors have abundant capital, able assistants, and every facility for making it as good a paper as there is in the city of New York. It will contain regularly all the news of the day, full telegraphic reports from all quarters of the country, full city news, correspondence, editorials, etc., etc.

"At the end of the week the carrier will call for his pay; and a continuance of subscription is very respectfully solicited.

"NEW YORK, Sept. 21st, 1851."

Through legitimate channels, the *Times* was thus brought to the notice of all classes of readers, and while those engaged in its service were adequately rewarded for heavy labor, money was also freely spent in procuring early news, and in providing correspondence and contributions. In the first twelve months, thirteen thousand dollars were paid to the editors of the paper, — a sum considered enormous in those days, although a mere trifle now, — twenty-five thousand dollars were expended in the mechanical department; forty thousand dollars were paid for the white paper upon which the *Times* was printed. The Hoe press and the general outfit of the office cost nearly fifty thousand dollars. In all, one hundred thousand dollars were sunk before a profit was made. The gradual increase of advertising patronage of course helped to pay expenses; but the outlay was for a long time heavy and constant. The capitalists in the firm drew no money out, having courage to wait, and sufficient means for their own support while they waited. Mr. Raymond, embarrassed in the adjustment of his affairs with General Webb, was content to draw a salary of fifty dollars a week, upon which he lived.

The general results of the first year were described by Mr. Raymond in an article entitled "The Year One," which appeared in the leading column of the *Times* on the 17th of September, 1852. This article is an important part of the history of the *Times*, and we reproduce it entire: —

"THE YEAR ONE.

"This day's issue closes the first volume of the *New York Daily Times*. The year's experience has disappointed alike the expectations of its friends, and the predictions of its foes. At the outset, owing mainly to personal causes, it was compelled to encounter as fierce hostility as any new enterprise ever met. Advantage was taken, by men whose personal resentments uniformly overbear all considerations of justice and fair play, of the absence

from the country of the principal editor, to defame his character, belie his motives, misrepresent in the most shameful manner the objects and scope of the enterprise, and to prejudice, by all the arts of unscrupulous cunning, the public mind against the *Daily Times*. These efforts were continued, with relentless and unrebuked mendacity, for some months previous to the commencement of the paper; and were seconded in various quarters by those who became innocently their dupes, as well as by those whom selfish fear of rivalry prompted to a similar course.

“Our readers will bear us witness that we have troubled them but little hitherto with reference to matters of this kind. We have allowed this tide of interested hostility to take its own course, feeling quite certain that it must in the end exhaust itself, or be turned back by public justice and the sober judgment of the reading community. We have reached a point now at which we are entirely willing to abide by the verdict of the tribunal to which our only appeal was made. We have left the *Times* to speak for itself, day by day; and we have left its habitual readers to judge for themselves of its character, of the justice of the hostility it has encountered, and of the truth or falsehood of the widespread rumors by which it has been assailed. The favorite shape in which the interested enemies of the paper and its editor have clothed their hostility has been the charge of *Abolitionism*. Day after day, week after week, and month after month, — from a period antecedent by some months to its publication, down to the present time, — a certain portion of the public press, both in this city and out of it, has denounced the *Times* as an abolitionist organ, — as devoted to the interests of the anti-slavery crusade, — as animated by this sentiment and controlled by this leading and predominant purpose. We have never stopped to contradict or correct this calumny, partly because we are never disposed to ‘give reasons upon compulsion,’ but mainly because we felt sure the public would not credit it unless the contents of the *Times* should show it to be true. And now, at the close of its first volume, after one year’s trial, with *three hundred and twelve* daily issues from which to select the evidence, we are quite willing to allow its twenty-five thousand subscribers, and its hundred thousand readers, in every section of the Union, and comprising all shades of opinion, to say for themselves whether the allegation is true or false. We do not suppose that, upon that or upon any other subject, the *Times* has always expressed opinions to which everybody would at once assent; but we do assert that its leading aim, — the guiding purpose traceable throughout its whole career, — the principles it has maintained, the tone it has preserved, and the spirit and scope of all its discussions, have been in the most direct and palpable hostility to the slanderous allegations by which it has been assailed.

“The strongest possible proof that the public confidence in the *Times* has not been in the least degree touched by these assaults, is found in the *success* by which it has been crowned. It has been immeasurably more successful, in all respects, than any new paper of a similar character ever before published in the United States. There is not one of the established and powerful journals by which it is now surrounded, in this or in any other city, which closed the first year of its existence with an experience at all comparable to that of the *Daily Times*. In circulation, in income, in influence, in everything which goes to make up the aggregate of a successful journal, it chal-

lenges a comparison with any other paper ever published. We have printed during the year, as shown by the self-adjusting register upon our Mammoth Press, seven million five hundred and fifty thousand copies; which gives an average daily circulation of twenty-four thousand one hundred and ninety-eight, from the very day it started. That circulation has fluctuated, more or less, of course, as does that of all cheap papers, with the season, the demands of business, etc., etc.; but commencing with no subscribers at all it has steadily advanced, and is now increasing as rapidly as at any time since it was three mouths old. Its readers are among the best portion of our citizens, — those who read it because they like it, and not because it panders to any special taste, and least of all to any low or degrading appetite. It is made up for all classes, and it is designed to cover all departments. Whatever has interest or importance for any considerable portion of the community has found a place, according to its limits, within its columns. We feel that we can safely appeal to our readers for proof of the fact, that we have neither spared labor nor expense in the endeavor to make the *Times* in all respects as good a newspaper, as interesting and useful for family perusal, as complete in its summary of news, as reliable in its statements, as able and candid in its discussions, and as perfect in every way, as any newspaper in the city, without regard to its price. We have expended during the year not less than one hundred thousand dollars upon its various departments. Of this amount over thirteen thousand dollars have been paid to editors, correspondents, and contributors; about twenty-five thousand dollars have been paid to compositors, pressmen, and others employed in the mechanical departments of the paper; we have paid very nearly forty thousand dollars for the white paper alone upon which it has been printed; and upon every other department, whether in obtaining news, correspondence from distant points, articles of ability, and written with care, upon engrossing topics, or in improving the typographical and general appearance of the paper, the same liberal, and even lavish, expenditure has been bestowed.

“We commenced the publication of the *Times* with the determination to make it the best family daily newspaper in the city of New York. After one year’s experience, encouraged by the abundant support of the public we have received, we are resolved to go forward with all possible speed to the full attainment of that object. We have thus far had obstacles to encounter — some of which the lapse of time has removed, while others will be made to yield to the energy and resources we shall bring to the task. We have suffered most of all from *lack of room*; as, owing to the limited size of the sheet, we could neither give as much reading matter daily as we desired, nor afford to take advertisements at so low a price as other papers. We shall endeavor, during the coming year, to obviate these difficulties, so far as possible.

“So much for the year that is past. To-morrow we shall enter upon our *Second year* and the *Second Volume* of the *Daily Times*; and we will then hold some further conference with our readers upon these matters of direct interest to them, as well as to ourselves.”

CHAPTER XI.

THE FIRST WORKERS ON THE TIMES—A RETROSPECT.

THE JOURNALISTS WHO JOINED RAYMOND—ALEXANDER C. WILSON—JAMES W. SIMONTON—THE TIMES AND ITS CHARGES OF CORRUPTION IN CONGRESS—A PAGE OF HISTORY—THE TIMES TRIUMPHANT—NEHEMIAH C. PALMER—CALEB C. NORVELL—MICHAEL HENNESSEY.

WHEN Raymond announced his purpose of establishing the *Times*, he had no difficulty in securing competent assistants. Known as a trained journalist, an accomplished scholar, a polished gentleman, and an indefatigable worker, he attracted to his paper men who had previously slaved for pittances, under masters who were neither courteous nor noble. Numberless applications were made for places in the service of the new paper; and from the whole number he chose half a dozen. The gentlemen engaged were experienced journalists, who, from humble beginnings, had steadily worked their way upwards, until they had achieved reputations for talent, skill, industry, and trustworthiness. Many years later, Mr. Raymond frankly attributed to this early company of his assistants a great measure of the success which had attended his independent venture.

The first assistant in the *Times*, on the 18th of September, 1851, and for several years afterwards, was Mr. Alexander C. Wilson, a native of New Jersey, whose previous experience as the conductor of a local journal in that State had made him familiar with the general requirements of journalism. Aside from this professional qualification, Mr. Wilson's services to the new paper were extremely valuable in another direction. His mind, encyclopædic and precise, had been carefully trained by a long course of reading and study. His early years had

been passed under the care of a father* whose culture was large, whose associations were with the foremost men of his time, and whose tenderest care was always bestowed upon his children. The son, storing in a retentive memory the treasures he had amassed, was able, in later life, to turn them to useful account. Mr. Wilson finally left the *Times* to assume the Presidency of a Bank Note Engraving Company in New York; was afterwards editor of the New York *Commercial Advertiser* for a few months; and in the winter of 1866 accepted the position of Agent of the New York Associated Press in London, in which city he is now living.

Mr. James W. Simonton, who left the *Courier and Enquirer*, in 1851, to join the editorial staff of the *Times*, is now the General Agent of the Associated Press in New York. His personal history is interesting. For twenty-five years he has been actively engaged in newspaper life, and is widely known as one of the most successful men in the ranks of American journalism. Beginning at the age of twenty-one, as a law-court reporter for the *American Republican*, — a "Native American" paper then published in New York by Leavitt & Trow, — he was content, like Raymond, to work for small pay, in order to learn the routine of the profession he had determined to follow. His salary was five dollars a week; and the proprietors of the *American Republican* declared themselves "well satisfied" with his services! Through the kindly aid of Mr. Charles Burdett, — of whom there are many cheery recollections among the older newspaper men in New York, — Mr. Simonton soon made material additions to his income by extra work for other papers; and within a year he went to Washington as a member of the staff of Senate reporters, — the semi-official corps who reported the debates for Ritchie's *Union* under Mr. Polk's administration. Later, he wrote sketches of the proceedings and debates in both Houses of Congress, for the New York *Courier and Enquirer*. In November, 1850, he went to California to start a Whig paper at the seat of government; but while he was on the way thither another person

* The late General Wilson, U. S. Senator from New Jersey.

stepped into the field. Mr. Simonton then entered into an engagement with the proprietors of the *San Francisco Courier*, the leading Whig paper of the State; but after conducting that journal for three months, he returned to New York to take service in the *Courier and Enquirer*, as night editor under Mr. Raymond. He continued to hold this place under Mr. Spaulding after Mr. Raymond's departure for Europe in the spring of 1851; but in the fall of that year resigned, to assume a similar position on the *Times*. His experience in Washington, however, soon made his presence in that city essential to the *Times*, and for several years he was in constant attendance upon the sessions of Congress as the correspondent of the paper. In this service he displayed great energy and sagacity; and he often procured for the *Times* important intelligence in advance of other correspondents. He is naturally quick, and he has always cherished a profound conviction that it is the first duty of a good newspaper man to "beat" all his rivals in the collection of early news.

One incident in the life of Mr. Simonton possesses historical interest. In January, 1857, while he occupied the position of Washington correspondent of the *Times*, he wrote a letter to that paper, exposing a scheme of land robbery which had been devised by the Congressional lobby. Under the guise of granting to the Territory of Minnesota certain public lands for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, a bill had been prepared which gave away nearly the whole domain of that territory. It was, in fact, what the *Times* of January 6th called it, — "a magnificent land-stealing scheme." Mr. Simonton fearlessly exposed the corruption of the lobby, and of the members of Congress who were notoriously the tools of the lobby; and, while acquitting the House Committee on Public Lands of any complicity in the fraud, insisted that the members of that committee had been "overborne by outside influences." He added: "If the committee will take the pains to inquire, they will find the baser strata of the lobby awaiting the advent of this bill with greedy hands, ready to shame all decency in the influences to be used for its success when once before the House. As a guide to their investigations let me

tell them, to begin with, that this bill is the special pet of that corrupt organization of insiders and outsiders whose evil influence upon the legislation of the present Congress has become almost as notorious as the Congress itself. The proportion of honest men who have anything to do with it would have been scarcely sufficient to save Sodom and Gomorrah from destruction, while there is hardly an individual hanging about the capital, living upon ill-gotten gains, and whose hands reek with the slime of congressional corruption, who does not look to this Minnesota land-bill as the present Mecca of his hopes, — *the* scheme through which especially he expects to secure the chief reward of his winter's humiliation and non-indictable crime." When the *Times* containing this letter reached Washington, there was a stir in Congress, — besides great rage in the lobby. The House of Representatives ordered a Committee of Investigation. Before this committee Mr. Simonton was summoned, and named witnesses who established the fact of corruption in the House; but he declined to give the names of certain other members, in regard to whom his suspicions had been aroused in the course of confidential conversations with them in his professional capacity. He had been satisfied corruption existed; it was his duty to expose it. He had done so, and had acted with a pure motive. More, he would not say. For this contumacy, he was summoned to the bar of the House, and there, in his own defence, delivered a temperate and logical address, adhering to his first declarations, and arguing the whole question upon its merits. The result was, that on the 19th of February, the committee made its report to the House, declaring the charges of corruption proved, and recommending the summary expulsion from the House of four members of the body. The *Times* and its correspondent were, therefore, fully vindicated; and once more a Free Press had performed useful service for the public good.

In the spring of 1857, when a Mormon war was expected, Mr. Simonton went to Utah as the representative of the *Times*; but neither correspondents nor troops had anything to do, for the Mormons refused to fight. Mr. Simonton then went to California, where he bought one-half of the San Francisco *Bulletin*; varying his journey by a trip to the newly discovered gold

mines on Fraser River, full accounts of which he sent to the *Times*. In 1858, he took up his residence in San Francisco, to edit the *Bulletin*, and remained in that city until the winter of 1859-60, when he again went to Washington, and subsequently resumed his connection with the *Times*. For several years past, he has held stock in the *Times*, and he is still a partner in the San Francisco *Bulletin* Company; but the duties of the Associated Press Agency now occupy the greater part of his time.

Mr. Nehemiah C. Palmer, City Editor of the *Times*, joined the editorial force of that paper early in 1852, and died in the service on the 7th of June, 1853. He was a man of exceeding modesty, but very earnest, conscientious, and painstaking, — a facile, agreeable, and forcible writer, and a genial and amiable companion. His first experience in journalism was as an editor and publisher of the *Buffalonian*, at Buffalo, New York, when he was only eighteen years of age. He was afterwards engaged upon the *Herald* in New York. His predecessor in the City Editorship of the *Times*, for a few months, was Mr. James B. Swain, afterwards the Albany correspondent of that paper.

Mr. Caleb C. Norvell, long and favorably known as the commercial editor of the *Times*, was one of the earliest and most valuable accessions to its staff. His service has been faithful and unremitting for eighteen years; and he is now the veteran of the editorial department of the *Times*. He is a native of Tennessee; but the greater part of his life has been passed in the North, chiefly in the conduct of monetary affairs. His experience is large, and his knowledge of the principles and laws of trade and finance exceptionally profound.

Mr. Michael Hennessey, a brother of the artist William J. Hennessey, was also an early worker on the *Times*, acting as assistant to Mr. Norvell.

The whole number of printers required to put into type the first number of the *Times* was only eighteen. The number of printers employed in the same office to-day is sixty!

In its second year, the *Times* gave employment to a larger number of editors, contributors, and reporters; for the size and

the price of the paper had both been doubled, and more space was afforded for the display of its resources. But before this period of its history is traced, it is proper to pause, for the purpose of considering two notable events which conduced largely to the popularity and the influence of its Editor.

CHAPTER XII.

KOSSUTH — RAYMOND — WEBB.

ARRIVAL OF LOUIS KOSSUTH IN NEW YORK IN 1851 — ENTHUSIASTIC RECEPTION — MUNICIPAL BANQUET IN THE IRVING HOUSE — RAYMOND AND JAMES WATSON WEBB — A LIVELY ALTERCATION — WEBB DEFIANT — POLICE RESTORING ORDER — WEBB'S SUPPRESSED SPEECH SUBSEQUENTLY PRINTED — THE PRESS BANQUET TO KOSSUTH IN THE ASTOR HOUSE — ADMIRABLE SPEECH BY MR. RAYMOND — HIS ADVOCACY OF THE CAUSE OF HUNGARY.

LOUIS KOSSUTH arrived in the United States in 1851, landing first at Staten Island, in the harbor of New York, on Friday, the 5th of December.* He came with the flavor of a hero. At the head of the race of the Magyars, he had made a gallant stand against the tyranny of a despotic ruler. The representative of liberal ideas, he had been sustained by the moral sympathy of the enlightened, both in Europe and America; but, defeated in the field, powerless in councils which had been suddenly undermined by treachery or cowardice, he fled. The sympathy evoked by his bravery, and the admiration excited by the brilliancy of his genius, had been but unsubstantial rewards for his efforts, as well as insufficient props for the edifice of Liberty he had endeavored to erect. He came to the United States, by his own admission, in search of the sinews of war, which he designated by the phrase "material

* The steamer Humboldt, from Havre and Cowes, arrived off Staten Island at two o'clock in the morning, having on board Governor Kossuth and his family. In expectation of his coming, Dr. A. Sidney Doane, Health Officer of the port, had kept ceaseless vigil; and when the steamer was first descried, at midnight, a discharge of rockets announced the event. A large tent had been erected on the shore of Staten Island, to which, early on the following morning, Kossuth was conveyed, to undergo the ceremonies of a formal reception, and Richard Adams Locke was the orator of the occasion. Kossuth was then permitted to go on to New York, where he became the subject of continued attentions.

aid."—a phrase which soon passed into a proverb. His reception was gushingly enthusiastic. The period was long anterior to the War, and the hospitable, excitable population of New York had not yet become wearied with shoutings and dinner-giving, and the other accompaniments of a grand welcome to a distinguished guest. Moreover, Kossuth was a representative man, and he had undertaken a work which appealed directly to the heart of the American citizen. True, he had failed, but not, at that time, irremediably; and his very misfortunes served the double purpose of intensifying the popular demonstrations in his favor, and of replenishing his exhausted treasury with the voluntary contributions of his admirers.

Mr. Raymond, whose sympathy always went freely out towards the oppressed, had warmly espoused the cause of Hungary, from the outbreak of the insurrection; and he was one of the earliest to welcome the Magyar chief. It was shrewdly suspected, however, that the exceedingly conspicuous part taken by the *Times*, in recording the movements of the guest of the day, was due, in part, to the desire of its conductor to eclipse his contemporaries in the fulness and accuracy of its detail. Mr. Raymond was unquestionably sincere in the sentiments he expressed in relation to the struggle led by Kossuth: but the newspaper instinct was strong within him; and the *Times* was less than three months old when Kossuth landed. His arrival was the first notable event of the kind which had occurred since the foundation of the new journal; the opportunity was favorable for the display of enterprise. Mr. Raymond was quick to see his advantage, — the part he took was that of a skilful editor, a polished orator, and a pugnacious controversialist, all in one. For himself he obtained reputation; for his paper he earned credit. The Kossuth fever was an excellent advertisement for the *Times*.

The municipal banquet to Kossuth was given at the Irving House, then situated at the corner of Broadway and Chambers streets, on Thursday evening, December 11, 1851. Mayor Kingsland presided. The banqueting hall was elaborately decorated, and among the guests were Robert Rantoul, of Massa-

chusetts ; Chauncey Cleveland, Governor of Connecticut ; Hugh Maxwell, Collector of the Port of New York ; William V. Brady, Postmaster of the city ; Recorder F. A. Tallmadge ; John Young, United States Treasurer ; the members of the Common Council, the Commissioners of Emigration ; United States District Attorney J. Prescott Hall ; John Van Buren ; Ogden Hoffman ; General James Watson Webb ; Major-General Sandford and the members of his Staff ; Colonel Gardner, of the regular army ; C. V. Anderson, Registrar ; Alexander W. Bradford, Surrogate ; Simeon Draper ; Moses H. Grinnell ; James S. Thayer, Public Administrator ; Charles O'Connor ; E. K. Collins ; Marshall O. Roberts, and many others distinguished in political, commercial, and literary life.

Letters of regret were received from Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Lewis Cass, William H. Seward, Hamilton Fish, Robert C. Winthrop, Governor Washington Hunt, Christopher Morgan, and J. H. Hobart Haws. After a brief introductory speech by Mayor Kingsland, Kossuth was introduced and spoke for upwards of an hour. Then occurred a curious scene, in which Raymond figured conspicuously.

The Mayor announced the sixth regular toast, as follows : —

“ *The Press* — The organized Voice of Freedom — It whispers hope to the oppressed, and thunders defiance at the tyrant.”

Mr. Raymond rose to respond to this toast, and General James Watson Webb, of the *Courier and Enquirer*, also rose to perform the same office. This circumstance gave rise to much confusion. Then were loud cries for “ Raymond ” and other cries for “ Webb,” from different parts of the house ; and considerable time elapsed before order could be restored. Mr. Raymond then proceeded to say that he had risen simply to perform a duty assigned to him by the managers of the banquet. He was interrupted at this point by Gen. Webb, when the cries were renewed, and great confusion followed. After a protracted altercation, in the course of which the police came forward and interposed, General Webb sat down, and Mr. Raymond resumed. Repeating that he had risen simply to perform a duty which had been assigned to him, he added that he had persisted

in its performance from *a habit he had of finishing whatever he undertook!* He had merely, on behalf of the profession to which he had the honor to belong, — he continued, — to return thanks for the compliment which had just been paid it. He continued at some length, frequently interrupted by applause, closing with this sentiment:—

“*The First Minister Plenipotentiary from the Independent Republic of Hungary*— May he hasten to receive the welcome which awaits him on these shores.”

This toast was received with applause; and then General Webb again took the floor. He was greeted with loud cries: “Sit down!” “Hear him!” “No, no!” “Order!” “Order!” Silence having finally been restored, the Mayor said it was the desire of the distinguished guest of the evening that the gentleman should be heard. The confusion continuing, Mr. Raymond obtained the attention of the assembly, and said it was *his* wish, and he believed the wish of all the members of the Press at least who were present, that the gentleman, against whom such signs of disapprobation had been expressed, should be allowed to speak. This was magnanimous.

General Webb again rose, and read some remarks from a printed slip, in which he declared it to be the frequent duty of the Press to resist public opinion, etc.; but, after he had been once or twice interrupted, he was at last forced to desist by the cries, hisses, and noises of all kinds, that were made around him.

The *Times*' report of this dinner, on the following day, after describing this scene, said, “We intended to publish the remarks of General Webb, in full, this morning, but their great length and the pressure upon our columns forbid.” On the following day, the *Times* surrendered several columns of space to descriptions of the movements of Kossuth and his suite, as well as to reports of speeches made at the banquet, which had been crowded out of its report on the previous day, including that of General Webb. Webb's speech was copied from the *Courier and Enquirer*, and made two columns of solid minion type in the *Times*. The following are one or two passages from it:—

“SPEECH OF JAMES WATSON WEBB, PREPARED FOR, BUT NOT MADE AT, THE DINNER TO KOSSUTH, AT THE IRVING HOUSE, LAST EVENING.

“For twenty-four years, Mr. President, — nearly a quarter of a century, — I have been the sole responsible editor of the *Courier and Enquirer*. And this long period embraces so much of the time usually allotted to man here on earth, that I feel it my right to speak of the Press as one who is looking back upon the past; and who may, therefore, speak in its praise without being liable to the charge of self-laudation.

. . . . “Sir, when the *abolitionism* which has so recently shaken to its centre the whole fabric of our government first determined to make itself felt in our political contests, it selected this city for the arena wherein to plant itself, and from whence to disseminate its pestiferous sentiments. Then, as now, sir, the conservative Press proclaimed abolition doctrines treasonable to the union, and aided in driving their advocates from our city. For this act it was burned by the infatuated fanatics, and its editor complimented with *groans!* More recently, *anti-rentism* raised its hideous head in this State; and putting at defiance the law and the very basis of social order upon which society rests, has not hesitated to resort to *murder* itself, in support of its deliberate robberies. Controlling many thousand voters, political demagogues have been base enough to tamper with the many-headed monster, baptized, as it is, in the blood of the officers of the law. But the Press generally, mindful of its duties to the country and to itself, boldly denounced, as they merited, this band of robbers and murderers; and, for so doing, one of its editors was burnt in effigy, with his own paper as a winding-sheet, amid the fiendish groans of men far more reckless in their character than the savages they disgraced and dishonored by assuming their garb as a cloak to their lawlessness. And only three months ago, some exiles from the land of Cuba, claiming to be republicans and martyrs to liberty, demanded of the people of America intervention in the affairs of a nation with which we are at peace, and asked of our people ‘MATERIAL AID’ in addition to our ‘friendly sympathy.’ The Press of this city, and of the United States generally, pointed to our laws of neutrality and to the great fundamental principles of our government which regulate our intercourse with foreign nations, as an insuperable objection to a compliance with the demand. We quoted the Farewell Address of the immortal Washington as a barrier to any change in our foreign policy; while we freely expressed our sympathy with the cause of freedom throughout the world. But this did not suit the fugitive and exile from Cuba, — the self-styled martyr in the cause of Republican Liberty, who was so utterly ignorant of its first principles, that he would have controlled the liberty of the press, as he controlled his own down-trodden slaves; and he appealed from the doctrines of Washington, the laws of the land, and the government itself, to the ‘SOVEREIGN PEOPLE!’ And in yonder park, under your own eyes, Mr. Mayor and President, while your two houses were in session, gentlemen of the Common Council, he then and there asked for and received *three groans* for the Conservative Press from the excited populace whom his eloquence had roused to frenzy, and who were persuaded to look upon him as the Apostle of Liberty.”

If General Webb's conduct and observations were regarded with disfavor by the guests assembled to do honor to Louis Kossuth, what wonder?

A few days later, Mr. Raymond appeared in a stronger light. As the speaker assigned to represent the Press in another demonstration in honor of Kossuth, he spoke very eloquently, and encountered no opposition. The services of the police were not again called into requisition; and the ill-mannered rivalry which had covered Webb with disgrace at the previous dinner had slunk, abashed, into the background.

On Monday evening, December 15, 1851, the Press of New York gave a banquet to Kossuth at the Astor House. It was a splendid affair, and was attended by hundreds of persons distinguished in literary and journalistic life. William Cullen Bryant presided, assisted by Horace Greeley, George B. Butler, and Julius Froebel. Among the guests were George Bancroft, Governor Anthony, of Rhode Island, Mayor Kingsland, Moses H. Grinnell, Charles King, President of Columbia College; Simeon Draper, President of the Board of Ten Governors; Parke Godwin, Charles L. Brace, James Harper, John A. King, and Rev. E. H. Chapin. Among those who sent letters of regret were Daniel Webster, Alexander H. H. Stuart, John I. Crittenden, Washington Hunt, Geneval Avezana, and others. Speeches were made by Mr. Bryant, Mr. Bancroft, Kossuth, Charles King, Parke Godwin, Henry Ward Beecher, and Charles L. Brace.

Mr. Raymond made the principal speech of the evening, in response to the fourth toast:—

“*National Independence*—Secured by international love, and not left to the mercy of the strongest.”

Mr. Raymond said:—

“MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN:—While I am ready at all times to discharge any duty that may be laid upon me, I must ask permission of you, sir, and of the honorable Committee of Arrangements, to say that, after the full, the luxurious, and the satisfactory banquet at which and under which we have just sat down, the toast you have assigned me is altogether *dry*. [Laughter.] The principle which it asserts seems better fitted for Senatorial discussion, or for Executive enforcement, than for this occasion. But

yet, sir, it should be remembered that this is not simply a convivial occasion. We are not met here merely for enjoyment or for hospitality. We come here for a practical business purpose. We are assembled here to-night for the purpose of extending practical sympathy and effective aid to the cause of Hungarian independence. [Applause.] Moreover, sir, the Press in this age, and especially in this country, claims and exercises jurisdiction over every possible subject of interest or importance to the world. Therefore it is that even so grave a topic as this should receive consideration even here.

“But certainly, sir, the principle asserted cannot need debate. The very idea of national existence implies the idea of national sovereignty. It cannot for a moment be doubted that a crime is committed against public law, when the constitution or liberty of any nation shall be trodden under foot by despotic power. Every one will admit this as an abstract principle. It is only when we come to a practical application of it that doubts arise and hesitation is feigned. To apply it to this very practical case, — this case which gives it the only practical importance which it has for us to-night, — does anybody doubt that Russia committed a crime against public law when she trod the independence of Hungary to the earth beneath her feet?” [Responses of “No!” “No!”] “Why, sir, consider what Hungary was. No nation on the face of the earth ever held an independent existence by higher and holier sanctions than those which guaranteed her rights to Hungary. The Constitution of the United States does not stand upon a firmer basis, so far as right and justice are concerned, than did the Constitution and the rights of Hungary. She held them against Austria, not only by immemorial usage — not only by the solemn compact of treatise — not only by all the sanctions which eight hundred years of acquiescence could give them; but she held them by what we Republicans must regard as a still higher sanction, — that of the will of the people, up to the time when Austria claimed the absolute subjugation of Hungary, with the right of the people of Hungary to exercise over their own dominions exclusive and sovereign legislation, they had gone on exercising the sovereign power which they had thus enjoyed; they made laws for their own domestic concerns; they emancipated the great mass of the people from the burdens put upon them; and though the nobles held the supreme control of the diet, they admitted the serfs to an absolute equality of political power. That, I venture to say, is an act which stands alone in the history of nations. It was this very act of extending the political power, which belonged to them by sovereign right, to the great mass of the people, — it was this very act of making their Constitution and legislation *democratic* in all its essential features, that brought Austria down upon Hungary, with all the force of her myriad troops. But that force was not sufficient. The free spirit of a free people, determined to maintain and assert their rights, was then, as it always will be, too powerful for the hired minions of an imperial despot. Hungary had asserted her independent rights against Austria. She maintained that assertion. She drove the Austrian armies from her border. She crushed the Bon Jellachich like a flower beneath her feet; and she would have stood to-day a republic by the side of the United States but for the gigantic crime against which this toast, to which I stand here to answer, is meant to protest. Russia, a foreign power having no connection with Hungary, having no claim upon her, having nothing more to do

with her, so far as right is concerned, than we have with the Khan of Tartary, — Russia sent her troops into Hungary, and, by mere brute force, trod her liberties in the dust. And is that no crime? Is there a heart here to-night that has one breath to utter in vindication of that act of the Russian despot? If there is, then I will argue with him; if there is not, I shall proceed to speak of the practical point, — the most important point which can come up before the people of the United States." ["Hear! Hear!"]

"Is it any part of the duty of the United States to take any concern in the matter?" [Cries of "Yes!" "Yes!"] "Well, sir, that depends entirely upon the position of the United States, and upon her relations to international law, and to human rights. If the United States were a despotic power, if they were thousands of leagues away, and beyond all reach of intelligence from the scene where these transactions are going on, then they might claim exemption from the common duty which falls upon them. America is one of the nations of the earth. To her, as to all other nations, is the guardianship of international law committed. She cannot suffer that law to be violated, and to be trampled in the dust, any more than any other nation on the face of the earth, without weakening her position and her power. She is bound to protest, as a nation can protest, and with all the power of the nation at the back of that protest, against this violation of international law, — this violation of international law in Hungary, which may at some time be extended to France, which has already been extended to Rome, which may be extended to Cuba, and which, for aught we know, may be extended to the United States. She is bound to protest, because she has set the examples to Europe, of freedom and independence. A nation is responsible for its example as well as its acts; because that example is among its acts. And now that the down-trodden people of Europe are taking an example and drawing confidence from our success, when they are looking to the heights of political power to which we have attained, and are sighing for some share of the political freedom and prosperity which we enjoy, is it for us to say, 'We have nothing to do with you; no sympathy with you; fight your own battles; we cannot even think of you; we are busy with our own concerns?'" [Cries of "No!" "No!"] "Sir, if selfishness or cowardice to that extent has usurped the fountains of our life, then we are doomed to lose all self-respect, if not to lose all the more material, but not more important, qualities of national greatness and glory.

"Mr. President, although the occasion invites it, it cannot be necessary, and I am not sure it will be tolerated for me to enter into an examination of the reasons which have been offered against obeying this instinctive dictate of the republican heart of the American people. 'We are bound to neutrality, it is said; it is our duty to be neutral. We have nothing to do with the movements of Europe!' Do we never hear of Europe? Have we no connection with that continent? Has Europe no influence upon us, nor we upon it? Then why this movement among the people of Europe? Why do they struggle to attain the same heights of freedom which we have for years enjoyed? Sir, our neutrality enjoins no such indifference to the fate of Europe, nor to the fate of any other people on the face of the earth. I have been accustomed, as have many here to-night, to look to the present Secretary of State as an exponent of constitutional rights and the privileges of the American people." [Here some dissent was manifested, and some one said: — "He

is no expounder.”] “It is very likely many of you may differ from me in that opinion, and yet even you will confess that he is good authority when his decision jumps with your own. Now, sir, Mr. Webster, in his great speech upon the Panama mission in 1825, when this great question of interference with foreign powers with the rights of the people struggling for independence arose, then defined what our neutrality meant. ‘What do we mean by our neutral policy?’ said he. ‘Not a blind and stupid indifference to whatever is passing around us, — not a total disregard of approaching events or approaching evils. Our neutral policy not only justifies, but requires, our anxious attention to the political events which take place in the world, a skilful perception of their relations to our own concerns, our relations to their consequences, and a firm, timely assertion of what we hold to be our own rights and our interests.’ [Tremendous applause.] That is a definition of neutrality which I, for one, am perfectly willing to accept and to apply to the present occasion. I say our neutrality does not require us to be indifferent to the struggles of the European people for independence. On the contrary, it not only justifies, but *requires*, us to watch their movements with the closest attention, and to assert what we believe to be our rights and our interests in connection with their own.

“But it is said we shall have *war*, if we say anything about Russia; that war is inevitable, and that it will be ruinous. Sir, I have only this answer to make to that. It is the answer which our commissioners made when the Holy Alliance was threatening war against us, if we interfered with the revolted colonies of Spain: ‘It is the interest and prerogative of the United States to take counsel of their *rights* and their duties rather than their fears.’ [Great applause.] Any nation that conducts its foreign policy under the predominating influence of fear of war, or fear of any sort, does not deserve to have foreign relations at all. [Applause.] Let us take courage, if we need courage; let us follow the example, if we need an example, from the conduct of the Turkish monarch. [Applause.] When Russia and Austria, lying upon his borders, with their millions of armies hovering upon his frontiers, and with their cannon pointed at his capital, demanded that the Sultan should surrender to them that man who graced that chair to-night, — the champion of Hungary, the star of our admiration as well as that of his own people, — what was the reply of that Mahomedan monarch? ‘I respect your power, but I respect the rights of humanity more! Do your worst; I shall do my duty, and trust in God.’ [Great cheering.] And the mighty Republic of the West takes counsel of its fears. It prognosticates war in the assertion of its principles, and in protesting against a crime, against which humanity from every quarter of the earth protests in the most indignant language which humanity can ever use!

“Sir, this case does not need argument; least of all in this present hour, when every heart beats with sympathy for every sentiment in favor of Hungary. It needs no argument before the American people. Never was a cause presented to them which so thoroughly enlisted the sympathy of the Americans here as that of Hungary. And there are abundant reasons for this, — reasons which short-sighted, prejudiced, biased observers cannot perceive; reasons which men used to foreign courts, and accustomed to take their view of such matters from their own whims or their own prejudices,

cannot appreciate. They are reasons which touch the heart of the American people, and prompt them to warm, earnest, and effective sympathy with this great cause of independence and liberty. And one cause of that sympathy is the similarity which exists between the commencement of the Hungarian struggle for independence and ours; in its continuance, its progress, and its victories, though not, I am sorry to say, in its result. Hungary commenced her struggle for independence, not of Austria, but of the despotism of Austria. She wanted her rights in connection with Austria. We wanted ours in connection with Great Britain, and, as late as 1774, George Washington disclaimed, in the most earnest manner, all intention to have a separation from Great Britain. Yet the fact that Hungary did not strike at once for independence; that she did not say, at the very outset, that she would not be connected with Austria, has been urged as an objection to her conduct and her struggle. That is a parallel to our own history, and that very parallel strikes a chord of sympathetic feeling in every heart. We sympathized with her victories; we sympathized with her defeat; we sympathized with her noble heroes. And greater heroes never trod the earth, or fought the battles of down-trodden humanity, than those who fought upon Hungarian fields. [Applause.] Our sympathies went with her victorious commanders when they drove the Austrian out of their borders, and purged their country of Austrian despotism. We not only sympathized with Hungary in her late struggle, but *we shall aid Hungary* in that struggle which is yet to come. [Great applause.] Does any man doubt it? Let him take counsel of his faith in the American people; of his faith in the principles of humanity, and in the great foundations of our own government. Let him feel that here the government must obey the voice of our people [Applause], and that that voice will be obeyed. I, for one, do not for a moment doubt. I do not doubt that the government of the United States — the Executive government — will do what Great Britain did for us in 1823. Then *she invited us* when the Holy Alliance called upon her to unite with them against the revolted colonies of Spain to establish upon the South American shores the supremacy of legitimacy as the only ground of rightful government; then she invited *us* to unite in protesting against it, and in protecting the colonies of Spain from the conspiracy against them. Great Britain then made the loudest protest any nation can ever make against this contemplated violation of international law. Let us now ask Great Britain to unite *with us* in protesting against similar violations of international law still nearer to her own shores. [Applause.] I do not doubt our government will ask it, because the voice of the people will demand it, and the government must obey it. [Applause.] I do not doubt Great Britain will assert it. And, although I know perfectly well that in 1815, and before that, Great Britain intervened in France for the express purpose of restoring legitimate authority, yet I feel perfectly assured that the great majority of the people of that country would sanction such an intervention no longer. I know it from the English debates and from the English press, and from expressed opinions in every corner of the English realm.

“ Now I hope our government will make that proposition to Great Britain; and instruct our commanders in the Mediterranean to follow up whatever course Great Britain, in connection with us, may see fit to take. • This will

preserve the peace of Europe rather than break it. And I find reason for this belief in the instance of South American experience. Then the nation of Great Britain and the United States prevented the alliance from interfering in the colonies of Spain, and thus prevented war in Europe. That is a fact which any man acquainted with history knows full well. Spain, Germany, Russia, Prussia, and all the allied powers were making ready their fleets, — everything was in preparation to commence war upon the revolted colonies of Spain. We protested, and Great Britain and the United States prevented that war. [Applause.] And, sir, such a protest from us now must have a similar effect, unless the power of those despots is greater, or their disposition for war more eager, than then! And how stands that fact? Any of you who know the weakness of those powers and the troubles to which they are subjected, — every one of them contriving all the while how to sit on his throne for a fortnight longer [Laughter] — knows that they are not anxious for a war. [Applause.]

“Now, sir, I have but very few words more to speak.” [Cries of “Go on! Go on!”] “The power of public opinion is sadly underrated by the American people. I cannot find words to express my opinion of the weight of such a protest, half as strongly as words that were used by our great Secretary of State at the New Hampshire festival some years ago. He was then speaking of this very subject, and of the meditated design of the Emperor of Russia to seize upon Kossuth and his companions in Turkey; and in denouncing it he said: ‘The lightning has its power, and the whirlwind its power, and the earthquake its power; but there is something among men more capable of shaking despotic themes than lightning, or whirlwind, or earthquake, — and that is *the excited and aroused indignation of the whole civilized world.*’ [Applause.] I conclude, Mr. President, by giving you a toast, begging pardon of the assembly, most humbly and earnestly, for the length of time I have consumed. The sentiment is drawn from our duty to neutrality, and it rests, too, upon the authority of the same great man from whom I have already quoted: —

“*Our Neutral Policy, as defined by Daniel Webster — A policy that protects neutrality, that defends neutrality, that takes up arms, if need be, for neutrality.*”

Mr. Raymond resumed his seat amid a storm of applause, and the assembly rose in a body, and gave him three cheers.

During the remainder of Kossuth’s sojourn in the United States, Mr. Raymond was unwearied in the advocacy of the Hungarian cause; and his old antagonist of the *Courier and Enquirer* received some heavy blows. The *Times* finally fixed upon Webb’s paper the title of “The Austrian organ in Wall Street.” It was not inappropriate.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BALTIMORE CONVENTION.

MR. RAYMOND THE CENTRAL FIGURE OF AN EXCITING SCENE — A REMARKABLE EPISODE IN HIS LIFE — HOW HE BECAME A MEMBER OF THE CONVENTION — NORTHERN SUBSERVIENCY AND SOUTHERN ARROGANCE — ATTEMPT TO EXPEL MR. RAYMOND FROM THE CONVENTION — A DESPATCH TO JAMES WATSON WEBB, AND WHAT CAME OF IT — A FIERCE DEBATE — MR. RAYMOND'S DEFENCE — HIS FINAL TRIUMPH.

THE Whig National Convention, which nominated Winfield Scott for the Presidency of the United States, assembled in the city of Baltimore on the 16th of June, 1852. Peculiar circumstances caused Henry J. Raymond to figure prominently in the proceedings of the body; and he came out of a fierce ordeal with great increase of reputation. The incisive part of his nature had had full play, — and he could cut deeply when he chose to wield a blade. He had been put upon his mettle; and on occasion he could be brave. The Baltimore Convention gave him his first public opportunity to display these qualities; and those who had known him best were surprised the least when he emerged from the conflict with honor and renown.

The history of this episode in the life of Mr. Raymond is, in part, the history of the sectional strife which culminated in war in 1861. We shall, therefore, give space to a complete account of it, both as the revelation of some strong points in the character of Mr. Raymond, and as an illustration of the feeling which then divided North from South.

The convention was composed of full delegations from every State in the Union. The number of members was nearly three hundred; and Gen. John G. Chapman, of Maryland, was the presiding officer. The candidates for the Presidential office

were General Scott, Daniel Webster, and Millard Fillmore; and so vigorously were the conflicting claims insisted upon by the delegations committed to each respectively, that it was not until the convention had been in session for six days, and on the fifty-third ballot, that General Scott obtained the requisite number of votes, through defections from the ranks of the Fillmore men. Webster's friends stood steadily by him, — their votes numbering thirty-two at the highest, and never falling below twenty-one. Fillmore fell gradually from one hundred and thirty-three to one hundred and twelve; and on the final ballot the vote was: For Scott 159; for Fillmore 112; for Webster 21. The number necessary to a choice was 147. One day of the session was wasted on the wrangle over the case of the Editor of the "Times;" and in the course of that wrangle, the southern element in the convention displayed its arbitrary temper, and received, in return, first, a signal rebuke, and then a signal defeat.

Mr. Raymond went to Baltimore, to attend the convention, not as a delegate, but as the correspondent of his own paper. On the second day of the session, he was requested by the chairman of the New York delegation to take the place of Benjamin F. Bruce, one of the two representatives of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of New York, who had been compelled by sudden illness to return home. It subsequently appeared that when Mr. Bruce, departed, he had left, in the hands of the chairman of the New York delegation, a blank proxy, which had been twice filled with the names of gentlemen * who declined to act. The chairman then applied to Mr. Raymond, who gave his consent only after consultation with the entire New York delegation, and also with the chairman of the Committee on Credentials, — Mr Watts, of Virginia. There was no dissenting voice, and Mr. Raymond then took his seat as a delegate, with the full consent of the convention. His colleague was Mr. Richardson.

The immediate cause of the whirlwind of wrath which Mr. Raymond was fated to encounter, was a telegraphic despatch,

* Ogden Hoffman and George W. Blunt.

sent by him to the *Times* on Friday night, June 18th, and published with displayed head-lines in that journal on the morning of the 19th. In this despatch, he intimated that a bargain had been made by the Northern Whigs, to relinquish a part of the platform of principles, in order to secure Southern votes for Scott. The charge was true, for it was the day of Northern cowardice,* and the South cracked the whip continually. But Raymond's old enemy, James Watson Webb, was also in attendance upon the convention, and he had an assistant in the office of the *Courier and Enquirer* in New York, who took much pains to send the following despatch to his chief:—

“GENERAL J. WATSON WEBB,
“*Care of Moses H. Grinnell.*

“Raymond has telegraphed to, and published in, his paper, that the New York delegation is indignant at the rejection of their claimants, and that, if Scott is defeated, they will protest against the action of the convention, and disavow its binding force.

“These are the exact words. Also, that the Northern Whigs gave way on the platform, with the understanding that Southern Whigs were to give way on Scott.

“GEO. H. ANDREWS.”

The despatch sent to the *Times* by Mr. Raymond, and mentioned in the foregoing message from Andrews, was as follows:—

“BALTIMORE, Friday, June 18.

“Six ballots show an average strength of Webster, twenty-nine; Fillmore, one hundred and thirty; Scott one hundred and thirty-three. To-morrow, it is believed Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and one or two others will give Scott the nomination on the third or fourth ballot. The Northern Whigs gave way on the platform, with this understanding. If Scott is not nominated, they will charge breach of faith on the South. The Webster men count on an accession of all the Fillmore votes, and *vice versa*. Both will probably be disappointed.

* In the light of subsequent events, it is curious to read, in the Platform adopted by this convention, such words as these: “The series of acts of the thirty-second Congress, the Act known as the Fugitive Slave Law included, are received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States, as a settlement in principle and substance of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace; and, so far as they are concerned, we will maintain them, and insist upon their strict enforcement,” etc., etc. Nine years later came the shock of civil war, rebellion, and the end of the Fugitive Slave Law, to which Millard Fillmore was weak enough to put his signature.

“A very hot discussion was had between Messrs. Choate, Botts, Governor Jones, and Cabell, mainly personal, and upon Scott's position. Scott was triumphantly defended by Botts against Choate and Cabell.

“The New York delegation are very indignant at the summary ejection of the New York Scott men, and if Scott is defeated by it, they will protest against the action of the convention, and disavow its binding force.

“In the Oswego district, Mr. Bruce, one of the two delegates, having gone home, appointed H. J. Raymond, of New York, in his place. Mr. Richardson, his colleague, denied his right to vote; but the Committee on Credentials and the convention sustained Raymond's right to act for Bruce, and offset Richardson's vote, except when they agree, which is not likely too often.

“The weather is cool, and good for active electioneering.

“The Webster men are very active and lavish in canvassing. They will do their best. Scott's chances are still good.”

General Webb — actuated, as Raymond distinctly charged on the following Monday, partly by motives of personal malignity — immediately placed the message from Andrews in the hands of a Southern delegate, and then the long and bitter fight began.

Mr. Duncan, of Louisiana, rose to a question of personal privilege and honor. He said: “I have just had placed in my hands, by a distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Dawson], because he is a little more hoarse than I am — the paper which I hold in my hand. If he had not been so enfeebled he would have felt it to be his duty to present the same thing to the house and the country. Among other things, it is stated that the New York delegation are indignant at the rejection of their claimants, and that, if Scott is defeated by it, they will protest against the action of the convention, and disavow its binding force.”

Applause and hisses here interrupted the speaker, and also cries of “Hear him!” “Order!” etc.

Mr. Duncan continued, “When my honor is touched, hear me, and you shall!” He then read, amid a tremendous uproar, the despatch from Andrews.

When Mr. Duncan read the signature, various voices asked, “Who is he?”

Mr. Duncan — “I appeal to every member of the committee on the Platform, whether there was such an infamous understanding as this?”

Cries — “ No ! ” “ No ! ” “ No ! ”

Mr. Draper said — “ Nobody believes it ! ”

Great confusion ensued ; many delegates talking, and several rising to their feet. Several voices cried — “ Raymond wrote it ! ”

Mr. Duncan — “ I don't know who wrote the statement. It is infamously false ; and, if I knew the author, I would throw it in his face ! ”

Governor Johnston, of Pennsylvania, said — “ I am well satisfied that there is no person in this convention who is more deeply sensible of the infliction of an injury on the feelings of the honorable gentleman from Louisiana than myself. I can say I was a member of the Committee on the Platform, and that it is entirely untrue that any proposition was made by southern or northern gentlemen, or Scott, or Fillmore men, in the form of a compromise in relation to either of the candidates. I do not say this because I am a friend of General Scott's, but the friend of the Whig party.” [Applause, and cries of “ Good ! ”]

“ I will say further, there was not in the committee the slightest exhibition of unkind feeling, — none that could be called unpleasant. I appeal to every gentleman on the committee, to say whether we did not meet as a band of brothers, to compare our views on various subjects, and construct a platform which the great national Whig party could stand upon ; and I say now, as I did not wish to trouble the convention, because in some quarters I may rest under the shadow of a cloud, that if the same feeling which animated the delegates on that committee had prevailed in this convention, we should have had no such scenes as have been exhibited here to-day, and the business which our credentials sent us here to perform would have been brought to a conclusion. I have no feelings in relation to the subject just brought to the notice of this convention. If it was designed in any form to affect the fortunes of either of the distinguished gentlemen, Scott or Fillmore, I repudiate it, and so does every friend of Scott, as unjust to their candidate and themselves. I don't care who is the author.”

A voice — “ It is a newspaper article, telegraphed back to Baltimore.”

Mr. Johnston continued: As the gentleman from Louisiana has said, it is false in all its particulars. I hope that there will be a better state of feeling, and I appeal to gentlemen on both sides, to act as they have heretofore acted, — as brothers of the same party, and not like those who are hostile to one another.”

Mr. Raymond rose to a question of privilege, amid loud cries of “Take him out!” and “Order!”

Mr. Richardson (Raymond’s colleague) was understood to say: “If you sustain me, I will introduce a resolution that the nomination of this convention shall be supported by the whole of the New York delegation, or faint. I am a good Whig, — rule me out if you choose, but I beg to be heard. Gentlemen, in the name of New York, although I am but one individual here, I ask that you will give me my rights. I represent the twenty-second district of New York.” [Cries of “Order!” and “Go on!”]

Mr. Richardson — “We sat in union two days, and” —

At this point the confusion became terrific; delegates in every part of the hall jumping up, and shouting “Mr. President!” all wishing to say something. The New York delegation was in a ferment. Many remarks were made; but what they were, it was impossible to tell.

Mr. Raymond again rose to a question of privilege and personal honor, amid deafening cries of “Order!”

The chairman called to order, but the excitement grew more intense.

A delegate from Illinois explained that neither Mr. Richardson nor Mr. Raymond was a regular delegate; that the name of the authorized delegate had been stricken out of the credentials, and the name of Henry J. Raymond inserted; and that the name of Mr. Raymond had been interlined in the document in a different handwriting from that of Mr. Bruce, who was the proper delegate. The speaker further contended, that the committee had no evidence before them that Mr. Bruce was authorized, by the district convention which appointed him a delegate, to appoint a proxy, and therefore they took

no action upon said proxy, believing that the question belonged exclusively to the decision of this convention.

Mr. Watts, of Virginia, said he felt himself called upon, as chairman of the Committee on Credentials, to make a correct statement of the pending case; and, if his power of language would sustain him, he would do so. The morning on which he made his final report to the convention, and while the committee was engaged at its last sitting, the gentleman from Louisiana presented the paper just read. He then learned that on the previous evening, while he (Mr. Watts) was temporarily absent from the chair, the claim of Mr. Raymond to a seat in the convention was informally acted upon by the committee, and his name entered on the roll with those of New York, duly accredited as such. The credential paper presented by the gentleman from Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the committee, and rejected by a vote of nearly two to one. In the report Mr. Raymond was retained as a qualified member, and was therefore entitled to his seat. But, said Mr. Watts, looking behind that report, and regarding the question as an original one, I have said, and repeat again, that Mr. Raymond is no more entitled to a seat in this convention, than I am to a seat in the Legislature of California.

Mr. Vinton said the convention were engaged in executing the duty of selecting a presidential nominee, and that it was not in order to proceed with anything else.

This common-sense proposition was finally agreed to, and the convention resumed its balloting for the remainder of the day, without success.

On Monday, June 21, the conflict over Mr. Raymond was renewed, a formal motion was made for his expulsion from the convention, and the scene again became tempestuous. After the journal had been read, and some preliminary business transacted, and before the balloting began, Mr. R. Renneau, delegate from the Atlanta district of Georgia, rose to a question of privilege. He said he held in his hand a newspaper edited by a member of the convention, in which a charge was made against the honor of other portions of this

body, which demanded their attention. Three States were named in that paper, and a specific charge was made against them of having, by bargain or corruption, endeavored to secure from the Northern Whigs the adoption of a platform. Those three States were distinctly named, and then a general charge of the same character was also brought against all the Southern States. [Cries of "Read it!" "Read it!" here arose, accompanied by calls of "No!" "No!" "Order!" "Ballot!" etc., etc.] Mr. Renneau continued: "I propose to read that article, and although I wish to create no disturbance here, and to introduce no subject which can cause any, I still hope we shall not be prevented from examining this case a little. Has the day come, sir, when the representatives of a free people, assembled in convention, are to be charged with corrupt bargaining and intrigue, when, if any one of them were guilty of such conduct, he ought to be expelled? If any members of the Southern delegations have been guilty of it, let them be known, that they may be branded by their constituents with the infamy they deserve." [Applause.]

The Chair — "Will the gentleman state his motion"?

Mr. Renneau — "I understood I had the right to preface my motion with a few remarks. I will read my resolution. It is as follows:—

"Whereas, Mr. H. J. Raymond, who holds a seat in this convention, by a questionable title; and whereas, he has accused its members of corruption and foul play; and whereas it becomes them to disavow these charges most unequivocally; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this convention will show to the country and the Whig party of the Union its emphatic denial of his imputation on its honor and sincerity, by depriving said Raymond of his seat, and that the said Raymond be and he is hereby expelled from this body."

The preamble and resolution were received with applause and hisses.

Mr. Renneau continued: "I hope, sir, that this entire convention will look at this resolution according to the merits of the subject in hand. The delegations from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, are specifically named as having entered into a bargain of this sort. That if the friends of General Scott

would avow and sustain the Compromise they would then support Scott. I have great respect for General Scott; but when the integrity, honor, and patriotism of the delegates of three sovereign States are assailed, and held up to the country, and the delegates of other Southern States, though not specifically named, I, as a Southern delegate, feel that every delegate of Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, and other Southern States is charged with foul corruption and intrigue. We are not only Whigs, but American citizens, and we hold our sound honor above all other considerations. I do not know Mr. Raymond (having never seen him before I saw him here), except as the editor of the *New York Daily Times*; but I never expected he would make such a charge against any of the delegates. If this resolution be adopted, I would sympathize with him; but I feel it is due to the whole South — to all Whigs — it is due to all the candidates — it is due to Winfield Scott, that hero of many a well-fought battle — it is due to Mr. Fillmore — it is due to Mr. Webster — due to all, that this Mr. Raymond be expelled, unless he can produce the names of those delegates who have committed this wrong, and sustain the charges. [Great applause.] I will read the article."

[Mr. Renneau then read Mr. Raymond's despatch to the *Times*; but was frequently interrupted by laughter, and at its close he was greeted with a general laugh, cheers, and hisses.]

Mr. Renneau continued, by saying that this despatch had been sent by lightning. Uncle Sam's mail-wagons were too slow for it. He hoped the convention would take prompt action upon the subject.

Mr. Cranston, of Rhode Island, rose immediately, and said that the thermometer was already too high to allow them to go into an investigation of newspaper paragraphs. He moved to lay the resolution on the table.

[Cries of "No!" "No!" "Shame!" "Let him be heard!" "Raymond!" "Raymond!" etc., etc.]

Mr. Raymond appealed to the gentleman from Rhode Island to withdraw his motion, in order that he might be heard.

Mr. Cranston said he would cheerfully withdraw his motion for the gentleman to explain, if the matter would stop there but

it would not, — the whole day would be consumed in debating this matter.

[Cries — “Never mind!” “Vote it down!” “He *shall* be heard!” etc., etc.]

The question was then taken, and the motion was rejected by acclamation.

Mr. Cranston demanded a vote by States upon the motion.

Mr. Botts — “It is too late; let Mr. Raymond be heard.”

The Chair decided that the motion to lay upon the table was lost, and that the call for a vote by States came too late.

Mr. Raymond then spoke upon the resolution as follows: —

“Profoundly as I regret that anything so comparatively unimportant as my personal rights, and my claims to respect from my fellow-men, should be thrust upon this convention, to the delay of the important business before it, — every man of honor in this convention and out of it will certainly hold me excused for whatever delay may be necessary to allow me a hearing upon such a resolution as this. I do not ask you to reject the resolution; but I do ask that you give me hearing. When that is concluded, it will be for the convention to say whether you reject it or not. To say that I am indifferent to your action upon it would be to belie the ordinary feelings of human nature; but I do say that I consider it infinitely more important to myself that I should put myself right before the convention, than that I should remain a member of it. *All* I ask, is what the great Athenian asked: ‘*Strike, but hear!*’ [Applause.]

“There are just two points in this resolution to which I shall direct attention; and the first is that which naturally comes first in order, — namely, my right to *be* here, or to speak here, at all.” [Voices — “Waive that!” “Skip it!” “We are all satisfied about that!” “Go on!” etc.] “If I could waive it and leave my character still sustained, I would gladly pass it without another word. But the resolution pronounces my right to be here ‘questionable,’ and the accusation which that phrase implies has been too widely echoed within my hearing here to suffer me to pass it without remark. What I have to say, however, shall be said in the briefest terms.

"I came to this convention as the Editor of the *Daily Times*, and upon business connected with that paper, and not as a delegate. On Thursday morning the second day of the session, the chairman of the New York delegation informed me that Mr. Bruce, one of the two delegates from the Twenty-Second Congressional District, had been compelled by sickness to leave for home; that there were two delegates from this district, neither of whom could count its vote unless they were agreed, and that Mr. Bruce had left in his hands a blank proxy to be filled up with the name of any person whom he might designate. The blank had been filled twice already: first with the name of Ogden Hoffman, and then with that of George W. Blunt; but for some reason, to me unknown, both these gentlemen had declined to act, and the chairman asked permission to insert my name, and that I would act as Mr. Bruce's substitute. That consent I gave, and the chairman inserted my name in that place, where it now stands in his own handwriting. Doubting (as I still doubt) the right of either Mr. Bruce or the chairman thus to fill that vacancy, I submitted that certificate to the New York delegation for their action; and as their minutes show, they confirmed the course adopted by their unanimous vote at one of their regular meetings. Still doubtful as to the course most proper to be pursued, and unwilling to exercise any doubtful right, I called your attention, sir, as the presiding officer of this convention, to the subject; and at your suggestion I laid it before the Committee on Credentials. At a late hour on Thursday night that committee, as its chairman, Mr. Watts, of Virginia, has already stated, without even the formality of a vote, and with not a single dissenting voice, accepted the certificate as sufficient, and inserted my name in the list of regularly appointed delegates. That list was embodied in the majority report of that committee, and as such reported to, and endorsed by, this convention. And now, sir, there is another point to which I ask attention in connection with this matter. On Saturday, last, when my right to a seat was called in question, the delegate from Louisiana who filled the place of that State upon the Committee on Credentials (Mr. J. G. Sevier), rose upon this

floor, in this aisle, and said that he had in his hands a paper which would put this matter *right*, and show clearly how the case stood. It was, he said, *signed as the report of a large majority* of the members of that committee; and it declared that I had *no right* — ”

Mr. Sevier — “ I rise to a question of privilege. I said no such thing; and all the newspapers have misrepresented me. I only said that the paper was signed by a *number* of the members of the committee.”

Mr. Raymond — “ I repeat, sir, that the delegate from Louisiana did assert that it was *the report* of a large majority of that committee, adopted and signed by them as such. I assert this, sir, from my own distinct recollection, as well as from other evidence.”

Mr. Sevier — “ I call the gentleman to order. I said no such thing.”

Mr. Raymond — “ I refer, in corroboration of my statement on this subject, to the plain consideration, that unless the paper *was* presented as the report of the majority, the gentleman's assertion that it would ‘ put the matter *right* ’ was an absurdity; as it could have no weight at all upon that point. And I refer to the additional fact that the chairman of the committee, Mr. Watts, rose immediately afterwards, and said distinctly, that ‘ this identical paper, presented by the gentleman from Louisiana, instead of being *adopted*, ’ as the delegate from Louisiana had asserted, ‘ was *rejected* in committee by a vote of nearly two to one.’ ”

Mr. Watts — “ Will the gentleman allow me to correct him? I did not use the words, ‘ as the delegate from Louisiana had asserted.’ ”

Mr. Raymond — “ No, sir; nor do I wish to be understood as imputing those words to the chairman of the committee. But he *did* say that ‘ this report, instead of being *adopted*, was presented in committee and *rejected*; ’ and I add, as my own inference, that this language already implies, that the delegate from Louisiana *had* asserted that the report was adopted. And the only object I have, in thus alluding to the matter now, is to show that in spite of his present denial, the delegate

from Louisiana (Mr. Sevier) *did* assert what he knew, and what was instantly proved to be untrue.

"And now, sir, I come to the second point, — the *gist* of the resolution before the convention. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Renneau) has laid me under special obligations by reading the whole of the article in the *Daily Times*, on the strength of which it is proposed to expel me from this convention. I am the more anxious to express to him my thanks for this, inasmuch as the other gentleman, who figured in this affair on Saturday, Mr. Duncan, of Louisiana, thought proper to stop short of this act of simple justice, and to read only so much of it as promised to answer his special purpose. I desire it to be understood, in the first place, that this matter was brought to the notice of this convention through the agency of James Watson Webb, partly for political purposes, and partly from motives of personal malignity towards me; so base and dishonorable in their grounds that he dare not authorize any one to avow them upon this floor."

Mr. Renneau — "The despatch was not addressed to Webb. It was addressed to the Hon. Moses H. Grinnell." [Cries of "No!" "No!" — "To the care of James Watson Webb."]

Mr. Raymond — "If the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Duncan, by whom that despatch was presented to the House on Saturday, has it in his possession, he will oblige me by handing it to me."

Mr. Duncan — "I handed it to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Senator Dawson), from whom I received it; and I regret to learn from him that he has left it at his room. I believe, however, that it was addressed to James Watson Webb and Moses H. Grinnell."

Mr. Grinnell rose, and said that he knew nothing about the despatch. He had never seen it until it had been shown upon this floor to a number of persons. It was a matter which he knew nothing whatever about. The despatch was not addressed to him.

Mr. Ashmun, of Massachusetts, said that he was, perhaps, the means of this despatch having at first been brought before the convention. He saw it in the hands of Mr. Webb, and,

after reading it, thought its statements so extraordinary that it ought to be shown to those inculpated in the charge. He had, therefore, obtained Mr. Webb's permission to place it in the hands of Mr. Dawson, of Georgia. As to its subsequent disposition, he knew nothing about it.

Mr. Raymond — "Very well. My statement was that the despatch was addressed to James Watson Webb, and by him brought to the notice of this convention; and that, too, from motives partly political, but mainly of personal malignity towards me. And that is sustained to the letter."

Mr. Sevier — "I call the gentleman to order. [Hisses and applause.] We do not sit here for gentlemen to settle their private differences. [Hisses and cheers.]

Mr. Raymond — "I am aware that this is a matter entirely personal to Mr. Webb and myself; and declaring my willingness to meet the responsibility of the issue I have raised with him, I shall not trouble the convention with any further reference to it."

The President — "The gentleman from New York will please to confine himself to the question."

Mr. Raymond — "Certainly, sir; I intend to do so. The article, of which complaint is made, was published in the *Daily Times* of Saturday morning, and was sent from this city at a late hour on Friday night; the platform having been adopted in convention on Friday afternoon. The only part of the despatch which is held up here as involving the damnatory charge of bargain and corruption, to which gentlemen on this floor are so naturally and so justly sensitive, is this: —

"To-morrow, it is *believed*, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and one or two others, will give Scott the nomination on the third or fourth ballot. The Northern Whigs gave way on the platform with this *understanding*."

"Now, sir, the only possible way in which the faintest shadow of excuse can be found or framed for construing this into a charge of corruption, is by considering the word *understanding* to mean bargain. And yet, such a construction of that word, as used in this connection, is so violent, so palpably opposed to the evident intent and meaning of the paragraph, that even the

ingenuity and eloquence of the gentleman from Georgia cannot make it plausible for a single moment. Moreover, sir, even if the word was susceptible of such a construction, the phrase by which the whole subject is introduced — ‘*it is believed*’ — shows clearly that I was not stating a *fact*, that I was not asserting, of my own knowledge or upon authority, that any such bargain was made, or any such understanding had. It is impossible, sir, for any man of common sense, uninfluenced by passion, to derive any such meaning from the paragraph, or to regard it as implicating any man, or any body of men, in any such charge. And so far as such a charge is concerned; so far as the imputation of any such bargain as a matter of *fact* is supposed, or suspected to be implied, I wish to relieve it and myself, and all concerned, from every possible taint, by declaring that no such thought was for an instant present to my mind; and that I did not intend to convey any such idea. I disclaim — I disavow and repudiate, utterly and entirely, in the strongest language I can use, all thought or intent of making any such charge, or imputing any such bargain to any committee, to any delegation, to any member, or to any man on the face of the earth. This disclaimer I desire to apply to the whole paragraph, so far as it has been, or can be, supposed to assert any matter of *fact*. The paragraph was simply the expression of an *opinion* — formed and expressed for myself, — an opinion which, whether right or wrong, I had a right to form, and a right to utter, through any channel open to me, — an opinion which I believed just then, — and which I believe just now, — and which, as this convention happens to be open to me now, I shall not hesitate to reaffirm and proclaim, in all its length and breadth, at any hazard of dissent, or even of expulsion on the part of this convention. I asserted then, and assert now, that in giving way as they did, upon the platform, — in conceding, as they did to their brethren of the South, an important position, and which *you* know, as well as I know, was, and still is, quite as dear to them as your position and your principle can be to you, — the northern Whigs did it in the belief, and with the expectation, that they would be met in a similar spirit of concession and conciliation

by the Whigs of the South. They did it with this understanding on their part. And if they had proved to be mistaken, — if after all that had been done and said and seen in this convention, — if after the South had carried every vote but one against the North — after the whole business of this convention had been planned and its whole character shaped by a majority of *States* as such, instead of the majority of numbers — after the important amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Judge Jessup), securing to the democracy of numbers, so much distrusted by the senator from Georgia (Judge Dawson), its proper consideration and weight, had been carried by a decisive vote — after the Whigs of the North had voluntarily receded from this position and surrendered their part which they had gained, and which was justly theirs — after they had withdrawn that amendment and handed back the supreme power to the oligarchy of States for the sole purpose of promoting harmony and conciliating their southern brethren, — if after all this — and especially, if after they had gone still further and conceded the platform dictated by the South, repugnant as it is, and as you *know* it is, to their principles and their feelings, — if after having done all this for the sake of promoting harmony in the party and securing to it unity of feeling and of action, you of the South had not met them in a similar spirit, and conceded to them the poor boon of the candidate of their choice, I tell you now, that you would have been exposed to the charge of bad faith; you would justly incur the imputation of demanding for yourselves what you will not concede to others; you would have failed in the duty which Whigs of one section owe to Whigs of every other; — and as one Whig of the North, at all events, I would charge you here and everywhere with a breach of that ‘good faith’ which you owe to us, and which your own honor demands that you should preserve inviolate.” [Cheers.] “If *that* be treason or slander — if *that* deserve expulsion — *make the most of it!*” [Loud cheers and applause.]

Mr. Duncan — “That may do; but we want explanations as to the other part.”

Mr. Raymond — “You shall have, sir, whatever you desire;

and if you, or any other gentleman, wish for explanations upon any other point, it shall be forthcoming."

Mr. Cabell, of Florida — "I ask the gentleman to go on with the article, and give us some explanation as to the latter part of it. He there charges that the New York delegates were admitted by fraud on the part of this convention; and says that if Scott is not nominated, the New York delegation would repudiate the action of the convention." [Cries of "Oh! Oh!"] "I wish some explanation upon that point."

Mr. Raymond — "You shall have it, sir. But, in the first place, the assertion that I have charged *fraud* upon this convention, in the rejection of the New York delegates, is untrue; and its untruth is so bold and palpable, that the gentleman from Florida should not have allowed himself to utter it, especially as the whole article had just been read in his hearing." [Cries of "Order!" "Order!" cheers and hisses.]

Mr. Cabell — "Does the gentleman — Sir, I cannot, I shall not submit to language of this kind." [Cries of "Order!" cheers, etc.] "Sir, is it possible that such language is to be indulged in here? The chair must enforce the rules. But I ask no protection from this convention; I can and will protect myself. I said that I understood that fraud was charged upon the convention."

Mr. Raymond — "It is not true, sir. No such charge was made."

Mr. Cabell — "I ask the gentleman to read it."

Mr. Raymond — "The gentleman can read it for himself, sir. He might complain of omissions if I were to read it." [Cheers, etc.]

Mr. Cabell — "Will the gentleman please hand me the paper?"

Mr. Raymond — "There is another copy of the paper in the gentleman's vicinity of the house. I prefer to retain this in my own possession." [Cries of "Good!" "Order!" cheers, etc.]

The President said he had heard no remark reflecting personally upon Mr. Cabell.

Mr. Cabell — "I am not to be charged by implication with making a false statement. I did not see the paper; I only spoke from what I had heard said of its contents."

Mr. Raymond — “The gentleman said that I had charged *fraud* upon this convention in the admission of the New York delegates. I spoke of this as an untruth, which was the less excusable, as the paper had just been read. The gentleman says he will not *submit* to language of this kind. Permit me to tell the gentleman from Florida, that when he puts words into my mouth which I have not used, for the purpose of founding an accusation upon me, he *will* submit to whatever language I may see fit to use, in repelling his aspersions.” [Loud applause, cheers, cries of “Order!” “Order!” and general confusion.]

Mr. Cabell — “I admit, most cheerfully, the right of every gentleman, when charged with uttering falsehood, to submit or defend himself. I have already stated that I did not see the paper, and that I spoke only of its contents as I had heard them mentioned. It was on the presumption that the word *fraud* was used, that I spoke as I did.”

Mr. Raymond — “I accept, as entirely satisfactory, the explanation of the manner in which the gentleman was led into what seems to have been only a misunderstanding on his part. But he must allow me to say, that he ought not to interfere in a controversy in which he is not personally concerned, without an accurate understanding of the subject in hand. It will be noted that the words ‘breach of faith’ were not used in regard to the admission of the New York delegates, but of another subject, which has been already explained.”

Mr. Langdon, of Alabama — “Let us hear about the New York protest.”

Mr. Raymond — “In regard to that matter, sir, I am ready to make just as full explanation as this convention desires to hear. That is a matter which concerns, in the first place, my own accuracy in regard to the statement made; and upon that point I do not think it worth while to trouble the convention further; and in the next place, it concerns the New York delegation alone. I have to say that the delegation took no action, so far as I know, in regard to that matter. And after this general statement, if any member of that delegation desires further remark, he shall have it. If not, I shall relieve the

convention of any further trouble upon this subject, and leave them to act at once upon the resolution for my expulsion."

Mr. Williams, of Kentucky, moved to lay the resolution upon the table, which was carried by acclamation; and, so far as appeared, without opposition.

Mr. Raymond, however, had a habit of finishing any task he undertook, and in a "Note" to the full report of the debate in the *Times*, he finished the controversy and Mr. George H. Andrews, in the following fashion:—

"Mr. Andrews, in his anxiety to give the 'exact words,' entirely omits the very important words, '*To-morrow, it is believed,*' which plainly show that our publication did not intend to assert any negotiation, or arrangement, or agreement whatever, but simply an expectation, founded on a supposed spirit of conciliation. And he also omits the important words '*BY IT,*' which give the whole character to our remark about the indignation of New York Scott men at the rejection of their delegates. If the nomination of Scott had been defeated by that extraordinary rejection, their indignation should have been as lasting as it was just."

Considered in all its aspects, the result of this conflict was a decided triumph for Mr. Raymond. The warfare upon him originated in a difference of opinion between himself and James Watson Webb on the question of slavery; but Raymond became a leader of the Free Soil party, and Webb's influence rapidly waned. The "personal malignity," to which Raymond was subjected, followed him to Baltimore, and produced a tremendous explosion; but he escaped injury. In his person, the South attacked free institutions; but the South was defeated. He was put upon his mettle, at a time when to be an "Abolitionist" was to encounter obloquy and danger; but he displayed ability and courage which bore down the enemies arrayed against him. He was pitted against the trained and polished debaters of the South; but he proved himself their master in the skill of fence. As an editor, also, he displayed the quick perception, the correct judgment, and the careful precision, which are the qualities most essential to the conductor of a public journal; and his combat was a great help to the *Times*.

Colonel T. B. Thorpe, of New York, has written a lively

account of the scene in the convention, derived from the personal observation of a Southern delegate. It is worth preservation.

“ ‘In the year 1853,’ writes Colonel Thorpe,* ‘I was paying a visit to Judge John Moore at his house, in the parish of St. Mary, Louisiana. The Judge was a pioneer of the State, one of the most substantial citizens, an ex member of Congress, and an ardent admirer of Mr. Clay. Among many subjects discussed during the evening was that of the personal and moral courage of Northern and Southern men; and the Judge illustrated his conversation with many anecdotes of desperate encounters which had occurred under his observation, including duels and rough fights, the result of sudden unbridled passion. Perceiving that I was interested, he gave me the details of several fights of desperadoes, and of the coolness displayed by refined gentlemen on the ‘field of honor,’ his heroes being, without an exception, ‘Southern men.’”

“ ‘But,’ said he, finally, evidently intending to end the conversation so far as the unpleasant subject under consideration was concerned, — ‘the first perfect specimen of real, genuine courage I ever witnessed was displayed by a Northern man last year at the Baltimore Whig Convention. This man, strange as it may appear, was a Yankee, of rather small stature, college-bred, and of a high intellectual character; and this man showed more true courage — moral and physical — than I ever witnessed elsewhere in all my experience.’”

“With a great deal of curiosity, I asked who the person was. He replied, ‘A young man attached to the New York press, and identified, I understood, with Greeley and the ultra-Abolitionists. He came to the convention as reporter, but it was proposed to make him a member to fill an unexpected vacancy, and the majority of our (Southern) members took umbrage at it and determined to keep him out. I did not approve of the intention, nor the manner in which it was to be done; but I was powerless to oppose, and so said nothing about it, presuming from the obnoxious gentleman’s appearance that a few words of objection would put an end to the proposition. When the proper time came, a motion was made to admit the gentleman a member of the convention; and I was myself surprised at the opposition the motion called forth, — it acted like a spark of fire on a body of tinder. Cabell, of Florida, a veteran debater, distinguished for his reckless physical courage and sharp tongue, had volunteered to make a speech against “the Abolitionist,” and he opened with a degree of bitterness that was unparalleled in any body governed by parliamentary rules, and he was in the mean time supported and cheered on by apparently a large majority of the house. The gentleman assailed, who had an almost boyish appearance, kept his feet (for Cabell spoke against his having the privilege of a personal defence), and with fixed eye watched the Floridian as he went on with his unqualified denunciations, made up almost entirely of personalities. Several gentlemen sprang to their feet, intending to enter the fight, but the more they looked at the object of the attack the more he appeared capable of taking care of himself. Two or three times Cabell stopped, perfectly infuriated at the unexpected coolness and

* In a letter to the *New York Evening Mail*.

self-possession of his supposed victim, but the moment he commenced his defence, Cabell would begin again, each time egged on by those who sympathized with his intention, namely, to put "the Abolitionist down." This struggle continued for nearly *three long hours*, but when it did end, the assailed had the attention of the convention. His calmness, self-possession, and patience were eloquent in his behalf, and many of Cabell's warmest supporters at first, while they admitted that all he (Cabell) had said was true, still they contended that the assailed man was entitled to a hearing.

"At last, the then (except in his own locality) unknown Henry J. Raymond commenced a defence of his position, and satisfied, in a few moments, every logical mind within his hearing of the propriety of his right to the seat made vacant by the unavoidable absence of Gen. Bruce. Had he stopped here, his political status would have been secured; but he demanded more than this. Changing his voice, and turning upon Cabell, he opened upon that gentleman with a speech that was full of argument, wit, and burning sarcasm. He denounced what he called the fashion of certain Southern men to bully Northern representatives in Congress and in national conventions, carrying their points by overbearing insolence and threats of personal injury. He shook his finger at Cabell, and said that he defied this cowardly and unmanly practice, and that he had determined for all time to yield everything to courtesy, reason, and brotherhood, but nothing to threats or intimidation. He then turned upon the North, and demanded to know why its public men were so frequently put in a false position by allowing themselves to be crowded to the wall by such creatures as the man who had that day assailed him, and through him the free state of sentiment of the entire country."

"The Judge said the speech annihilated Cabell, not only in the convention, but he never got rid of its damaging effects when he got home. This display, concluded the Judge, who could command no language to do his feelings justice, 'was the finest specimen of the true, moral, and physical courage I ever witnessed,' and he added: 'when all Northern public men take this young Raymond's position, it will be better for the North, the South, and the country at large, and we will add, that, if they had done so, slavery would have been extinguished upon the field of the forum, instead of the battle-field,—reason, and not the sword, would have decided the conflict.'"

Another interesting reminiscence was published in the *Albany Evening Journal* after the death of Mr. Raymond, and from this account also we transcribe a few passages:—

"During the progress of the convention—which was divided up into Scott, Fillmore and Webster factions—the Scott men found themselves without a ready debater, able to cope with the trained experts from the South, who, as usual, were provokingly insolent and overbearing. To meet this deficiency, it was arranged that Mr. Raymond should take the seat occupied by General Bruce. This proposition met with opposition, and the excitement was intensified when, subsequently, it was seriously proposed to expel him from the body. On this impudent proposition, and others of kindred spirit, Mr. Raymond bore himself with becoming calmness and dignity. But his real

power and fearlessness were most conspicuously developed at a later stage of the proceedings, when he was personally arraigned for a statement embodied in a telegram which he had sent to the *Times*. Mr. Cabell, a ready debater from the State of Florida, was his chief assailant. His manner was of the highest type of Southern insolence. Mr. Raymond responded with a dignity and firmness which excited the admiration of his friends, and greatly provoked the pro-slavery delegates. His calm demeanor was met by bluster and threats; but he held his ground unmoved, meeting every argument with irresistible and overwhelming logic, and every threat with a calm defiance, wholly new to the 'chivalry,' but which foreshadowed the inflexible resolution, courage, and purpose, which found full and triumphant development in after years. His bearing seemed to those who witnessed it, and who were in sympathy with him, not merely grand, but sublime. It excited the intensest enthusiasm; and when the excitement was at its highest, if any Southern bravo had so much as lifted his finger in violence, the physical strength as well as the moral courage of the representatives of the North would have been made fearfully manifest.

"Fortunately, whatever may have been their original purpose, the Southern delegates and their boisterous claquers confined their demonstrations to words and hisses; and, after a protracted and stormy discussion, Mr. Raymond achieved the victory and the 'chivalry' met with their first serious defeat in a National Whig Convention.

"It is only by the light of all that has since transpired that we can appreciate the significance of what was said and done upon that occasion. From that hour the Whig Party assumed a new character, and its representatives (with a few disgraceful exceptions) a bolder attitude in the press, on the stump, and in the halls of legislation. Mr. Raymond's clarion voice, upon that memorable occasion, sounded the opening notes in the death-knell of slavery, and definitely initiated the movement which has culminated in the complete triumph of the principles for which he then so fearlessly and so eloquently contended.

"We revive this incident, not merely to do honor to the memory of the lamented dead, but to remind the living that courage was as necessary to throw off the influence of the slave power in our political national councils, as it was to overcome its physical prowess upon the battle-field. And to further remind those who are all too willing to forget, that equal honors are due to the heroic men who began the struggle against slavery, while it was in the full vigor of lusty life, as to those who had the fortune and the honor to strike the blow which effected its overthrow and death."


CHAPTER XIV.

THE TIMES IMPROVED, AND RAYMOND ELECTED LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

RAYMOND'S RESOLUTION TO DEVOTE HIS LIFE TO JOURNALISM — NEW WRITERS ENGAGED FOR THE TIMES — CHARLES C. B. SEYMOUR — FITZ-JAMES O'BRIEN — DR. TUTHILL — CHARLES WELDEN — CHARLES F. BRIGGS, HURLBUT, GOKIN, SEWELL AND DE CORDOVA — RAYMOND AGAIN IN POLITICS — ELECTED LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR — ADDRESS AS PRESIDENT OF THE STATE SENATE — DECLINES THE NOMINATION FOR GOVERNOR.

TWICE a champion, — the champion of Hungary against its enemies in the American Press, and of Freedom against the assaults of the Slave Power in a National Convention, — Mr. Raymond had now become widely known beyond the limits of his profession. He had proved his readiness and skill in public debate; he had shown his antagonists that, in a fair field and with open lists, he could wield a lance as bravely as the best, and strike with the strongest; he had convinced his professional rivals that he was able to hold his own. But the *Times* needed his care, and to it he determined to devote his time, his energy, and his skill.

Mr. Raymond said to the writer, and to others, in the year 1852, that he had fully resolved to abandon political life, for the broader and better field of Journalism; believing the office of an Editor to be more honorable and more influential than any place which could be bestowed by party. For two years he adhered strictly to this resolution. It was the great misfortune of his life that he afterwards yielded to seductive temptation; forgetting his earlier and better purpose in the pursuit of political preferment. Had Raymond remained a journalist, untouched by the corrupting influences of party chicanery, and unsullied by evil association, the record of his life would have had no deep shadows.



SECOND OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK TIMES, CORNER OF NASSAU AND BEEKMAN STS.,—1834-7.

View taken the day after the fall of the spire of Dr. Spring's Church in 1857.

In 1852, the space added to the *Times*, by doubling its size, gave Mr. Raymond ample opportunity to make a good newspaper. Some of the best writers of the day became regular contributors; bright wits sent sparkling papers; new men were introduced into the staff of editors; cost was not counted when a good article was to be secured; and the *Times* became the best family paper ever published in New York. Four writers, whose productions appeared regularly in the columns of the *Times*, in the course of this second year, are now dead; but their effusions live, and, if collected and edited, they would form an interesting volume. One of these contributors was Charles C. B. Seymour, — a young Englishman, who was subsequently the musical and dramatic critic of the *Times*, and died while holding that position. Another was Fitz-James O'Brien, an Irishman who was absurdly ashamed of his Irish birth, but who was one of the most brilliant of all the brilliant brotherhood of the Bohemians of New York at that day. He was killed in Virginia in the first year of the Civil War, while acting as aide-de-camp to the late General Lander. Another was Dr. Frank Tuthill, a Long Island man, from the "East End," who had taken up his residence in New York to practise medicine, and, while waiting for patients who did not come, amused his leisure by writing quaint papers on rural and domestic topics for the *Times*. The vein of quiet humor and the uniform good sense which characterized these productions especially attracted Raymond's attention. An offer of an editorial position in the *Times* office was soon made to Dr. Tuthill, and accepted. He remained in the service of the paper for several years, and then went to California, by invitation of Mr. Simonton, to take charge of the San Francisco *Bulletin*. Subsequently he became proprietor of a part of the *Bulletin*, but ill-health compelled him to relinquish his duties. After a brief visit to the South of Europe, he returned to New York, and died soon afterwards in Brooklyn. The fourth, Charles Welden, wrote a series of charming papers, under the name of "The City Hall Bell-Ringer," which were remarkable for their play of pleasant fancy and the piquancy of their style. Welden died suddenly a few years ago.

Later, Charles F. Briggs, well known as "Harry Franco," joined the *Times*, and with him were associated William Henry Hurlburt, E. L. Godkin, and William G. Sewell. Mr. Sewell was the author of the excellent book entitled "The Ordeal of Free Labor in the West Indies." R. J. De Cordova, since a popular lecturer on humorous subjects, was also engaged upon the paper for a short time; and Mr. Edward Seymour and others were added to the editorial force from time to time.* Down to the year 1857, few who had been employed by Raymond yielded to any temptations to leave his service; and continual additions were made. Since that date, many changes have occurred, of which this is not the place to speak.

In 1854, Raymond again lapsed into politics. For a time, the agitation which followed the passage of the Nebraska-Kansas bill by Congress had enlisted only the pen which directed the course of the *Times*; but the party with which Raymond acted soon clamorously demanded his personal services. His political ambition was again aroused, and, in the summer of 1854, he took his seat in the Anti-Nebraska State Convention, at Saratoga Springs, as a delegate from the district which he had already twice represented in the Assembly.

The action of the Saratoga Convention was not final. Much was left to be decided by circumstances; and the events of the campaign led to the calling of an Anti-Nebraska Nominating Convention, which met at Auburn a few weeks later. The regular Whig State Convention, however, had met in the interval between the conventions at Saratoga and Auburn, and had unanimously nominated Myron H. Clark for governor, and Mr. Raymond for lieutenant-governor. The Anti-Nebraska Convention accepted these nominations; and the State Temperance Convention immediately afterwards pursued a similar course. Mr. Raymond was therefore again launched into political life; and, strengthened by three separate and unani-

* A singular fatality seems to have attended the men who were identified with the earliest history of the *Times*. Of the whole number, Raymond and Seymour and O'Brien, Palmer and Tuthill, Welden and Sewell, have departed;—seven in all. All, too, died young.

mous nominations, he saw that his election to office had once more been secured. He accepted, and was elected by a handsome majority over his Democratic and "Native American" opponents. The "Know Nothing" candidate for the lieutenant-governorship, beaten by Mr. Raymond, was General Gustavus Adolphus Scroggs. Raymond's vote in the State exceeded that given for Clark, the successful candidate for the governorship. Raymond received 157,079 votes; and Clark, 156,770. Raymond thus ran ahead of his ticket by 309 votes. The contest, however, was close; Clark obtaining a majority of only 313 over Horatio Seymour.

In January, 1855, at the opening of the session of the new Legislature, Mr. Raymond took his seat as presiding officer of the State Senate, and delivered the following brief address:—

"SENATORS:—In the discharge of the constitutional functions of the office to which I have been elected, I am present to preside over the deliberations of this branch of the State Legislature. I am profoundly sensible of the dignity and responsibility of the position I am called to fill, and of the extent to which I shall need your indulgence in the execution of its trusts. My task will not be difficult; for it is only to direct your attention to the provisions of those rules which you will adopt for your own government in the prosecution of your labors. I shall endeavor to secure the practical application of these rules with promptitude, with exactness, and with entire impartiality. I solicit, senators, your generous confidence in the sincerity and uprightness of my intentions, your aid in the performance of my duties, and your kind consideration to the errors I may commit.

"The Senate is now in order for the transaction of business."

At the end of the session he returned to New York, to resume the charge of the *Times*. His term of office as Lieutenant-Governor expired in 1857; but in the interval he had declined a nomination for the governorship of New York, and had become celebrated for his participation in national affairs.

In August, 1856, Senator E. M. Madden addressed to Mr. Raymond a letter, requesting permission to present his name to the convention which was to meet in the following September, for the nomination for Governor. Mr. Raymond sent this reply:—

"NEW YORK, Sunday, Aug. 30, 1856.

"MY DEAR MADDEN:—I am under great obligations to you for the very kind manner in which you speak of me in your favor of the 28th, which I

have just received, and feel highly complimented by its expressions of political partiality.

"I shall not affect any distaste for the honors, the associations, and the duties of public life, nor deprecate the opportunities it affords for promoting cherished principles and advancing measures deemed essential for the public good. Like all other spheres of useful labor, it has its drawbacks; but, in spite of them all, it has attractions to which few are insensible.

"The prospect, moreover, of renewing for another year the acquaintances and associations in the Senate, which I found so agreeable last winter, would, of itself, be for me a strong inducement for desiring a re-election to my present office. But other considerations—personal, domestic, and professional—outweigh even this, and constrain me to decline being a candidate, under any circumstances, for any official position whatever in the coming canvass.

"Even if I had no other reason for this determination, I should find a sufficient motive in the desire to remove whatever obstacle even my name might offer to the perfect harmony of the movement against the aggressions and usurpations of slavery. Nothing can be nobler than the courage and independence with which your old associates in the Democratic ranks are breaking the bonds which that interest fastened upon the party at Cincinnati. They are proving themselves disciples of Jefferson, by acting in defiance of party ties, upon the principles which he professed. I am confident that they will far outweigh in numbers, as in influence, those old Whigs whose subservience to slavery destroyed the party with which they were formerly allied, as it will that which has now adopted them for its leaders.

"We have been fortunate even beyond expectation in a candidate for the Presidency. I trust that we shall be equally wise and equally fortunate in selecting for the State officers to be chosen this fall, men of high character, firm principles, and a strong hold on the confidence and respect of the whole community.

"I am, very truly, your friend and servant,

"HENRY J. RAYMOND.

"HON. E. M. MADDEN."

The history of the Pittsburg Convention of 1856, and of the share taken by Mr. Raymond in the formal organization of the Republican party in the United States, is narrated in the ensuing chapter.

CHAPTER XV.

BIRTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—THE PITTSBURG CONVENTION.

THE FREE-SOIL STRUGGLE — ORIGIN OF THE CONVENTION IN PITTSBURG IN 1856
— PRELIMINARY ACTION — THE NEW PARTY — AN ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE
OF THE UNITED STATES SUBMITTED BY MR. RAYMOND — ITS ADOPTION — THE
PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST — FREMONT DEFEATED — RAYMOND'S DISCUSSION
WITH LUCIEN B. CHASE.

THE Republican party of the United States was born at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, in February, 1856. Its godfather was Henry J. Raymond, — for the Address to the People which defined the purpose of the new organization, and established the foundations of the party, was his work; and the fact is valuable to history. The Republican party was the culmination of the long and bitter struggle of the Free-Soilers against the encroachments of the Slave Power. The agitation begun by William Lloyd Garrison a generation before, widening in its reach until it had spread from Massachusetts through the whole of the North, had touched the springs of national legislation, had convulsed the Union, had maddened the South, and had drenched the soil of Kansas with blood. The issue had at last been fairly made, and the struggle for absolute mastery had begun. Raymond was one of the earliest to see that the time was ripe for a decided expression by the Free States; that a new political party, pledged to the maintenance of territorial rights, but not identified with the so-called "Abolitionism" of the day, would gather to it elements of strength. The Kansas feud had aroused a bitter feeling, for which the South had only itself to blame. The Free-Soil men planted themselves firmly upon the ground of equal rights in all the territories of the United States, and the scenes of violence enacted upon the

border fired them to zeal and courage. Out of this feeling grew the reaction which found tangible form and adequate expression in the action of the Pittsburg Convention of 1856.

The "Pittsburg Address" is reproduced entire in the Appendix to this volume,* because it is the history of a remarkable movement, — a movement that resulted in the establishment of the great party which twice elected Lincoln, which fought the War for Freedom to a successful termination, and which placed Grant, the hero of the conflict, in the Presidential chair. The convention met in Pittsburg on Washington's Birthday. Its function was formative — not final. The delegates who took their seats at the opening of the proceedings had not assembled from all parts of the Free States to nominate a candidate for the Presidency; but to consult together as to the best methods of practical organization. The choice of a standard-bearer was left to another convention, which was finally appointed to be held in Philadelphia in the following June. The basis of action for the nominating convention, as well as for the new party and all its members, was defined, sharply and logically, in the Address submitted by Mr. Raymond.

The Address opened with a statement that the convention was composed of representatives of the people in various sections of the Union, who had assembled to consult upon the political evils by which the country was menaced, and the political action by which those evils might be averted. It then declared the fixed and unalterable devotion of all the delegates, then and there assembled, to the Constitution of the United States, and the ends for which it was established, and to the means by which it provided for their attainment. It also avowed an ardent and unshaken attachment to the Union, and abjured all prejudices of geographical division, local interest, or narrow and sectional feeling; but insisted upon the right of all the people to the inheritance of equal rights, privileges, and liberties. Holding these opinions, and animated by these sentiments, the convention, adopting the Address, declared its conviction that the government of the United States

* See Appendix B.

was not at that time administered in accordance with the Constitution, nor for the preservation or prosperity of the Union: but that its powers were systematically wielded for the promotion and extension of the interests of Slavery, in direct hostility to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, in flagrant disregard of other great interests of the country, and in open contempt of the public sentiment of the American people and of the Christian world.

Then, in an orderly and temperate style, the specifications of these grave charges were set forth. The points considered were: First, an historical outline of the progress of Slavery towards ascendancy in the Federal Government; second, the sentiments of the Constitution concerning Slavery; third, a full history of the Missouri Compromise; fourth, the story of the Annexation of Texas and the War with Mexico; fifth, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; sixth, the invasion of Kansas by the South, and the action of the General Government; seventh, the pleas urged in defence of the aggressions of Slavery, and the argument that the Missouri Compromise was not a compact, and that Congress had no power to prohibit Slavery in the territories.

One demand and three positive declarations concluded the Address.

The demand was for the repeal of all laws permitting the introduction of slaves into territories once consecrated to freedom. The declarations were:—

First: A determination to resist, by every constitutional means, the existence of Slavery in any part of the territories of the United States.

Second: To support the people of Kansas in their resistance to the usurped authority of their lawless invaders, and to favor the admission of Kansas as a State of the Union.

Third: To overturn the existing party in power, which had proved weak and faithless.

The convention then set in motion the machinery of a perfect organization, issued a call for a nominating convention to meet in Philadelphia, and adjourned. In June, the Philadelphia convention nominated John C. Fremont as the first candi-

date of the Republican party for the Presidency — and the new era in American politics began. The war that ensued was fierce. The gauntlet had been thrown; the defiance was accepted. Thenceforth, until the end of the Civil War in the spring of 1865, bitter feelings were to be intensified, sectional animosities were to grow, blood was to flow; but Freedom triumphed, and Slavery died. The campaign of 1856 was a triangular fight. The Democrats of North and South united upon James Buchanan; the discontented Whigs, who could not overcome their servility to the Slave Power sufficiently to become Republicans, concurred with the "American" party in the nomination of Millard Fillmore. Fremont was beaten in the election, and no other result was expected; but the party which supported him developed a degree of strength which occasioned surprise even among the most sanguine of those who had participated in the proceedings at Pittsburg. Eleven free States cast their electoral votes — 114 in all — for Fremont; Buchanan obtained 172 electoral votes, including those of all the Slave States except Maryland, and those of five Free States: namely, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, and California. Had Pennsylvania and Illinois cast their votes for Fremont, they would have given him the election. Millard Fillmore received the electoral vote of Maryland only.

The lines were strongly drawn, and the contest was well-fought by the new Republican party, as well as by its opponents. Mr. Raymond took an active part in the canvass, and his public discussion with Lucien Bonaparte Chase, in the Broadway Tabernacle in New York, especially attracted attention. This discussion was begun at the Brooklyn Museum, on the 11th of October, 1856, and resumed on the evening of the 20th of the same month, in the Broadway Tabernacle, before an immense audience. Mr. Chase, a Tennessean, represented the South; Mr. Raymond defended the North. The chairman (Mr. S. P. Russell, a Democrat) announced that Mr. Raymond was to be allotted an hour to open the debate, and that Mr. Chase was to be given an hour and a half in which to reply. Mr. Raymond was then to rejoin for half an hour.

Mr. Raymond was vehemently cheered on coming forward.

He announced his intention to submit to the criticism of his friend Mr. Chase, and the audience, some of the reasons which induced him to believe that it would not be for the interest of the common country, to elect James Buchanan President. He desired to say, in the first place, that he had nothing to say against Mr. Buchanan personally; and then proceeded to criticise, in caustic terms, the Cincinnati platform, upon which Buchanan stood: a platform pledged to extend human Slavery over all the territories of the United States. Raymond then recited the history of the pro-slavery party, from the days of Washington down to the time of Pierce, and pointed to the baneful effects of Slavery, closing with these words:—

“The Southern States, with a population only half that of the Free States, wielded the whole power of the government. They had a majority in the Senate, and thus controlled the treaty-making power. The fact that property was represented in the South, and not in the North, gave them twenty-five to thirty of a representation in the House of Representatives, more than they would be otherwise entitled to. Their policy now was to acquire an absolute ascendancy in the Congress of the United States, and thus wield all the powers of the government for the benefit of their interest alone, regardless of the other great interests of the country. And was this right? Was this just? Was this what the freemen of America ought to consider as a desirable fate for their common country, in the days that were to come? [Cries of ‘No! No!’] This same project of extending Slavery was not a matter of accident. In the South they were now vindicating Slavery upon principle. It was the only ground they could consistently take upon the Kansas question, for if it were not claimed for Slavery that it was a legitimate moral institution, they could not have the assurance to demand its extension into the territories. The ground taken by all the Southern Democratic supporters of James Buchanan was, that this was a contest between capital and labor. The question then was, whether labor should be independent of, or the servant and slave of, capital; whether

capital should own labor, or the laborers should stand by themselves, independent of it, making their own terms with it, consulting their own interest in it, building themselves up by the side of capital, and making labor what John C. Fremont called it, — ‘the natural capital of a free country.’ [Applause.] Now, if we were to extend Slavery into Kansas, we must extend it, with all the social and all the moral influences that attend it everywhere; and were those such as to recommend it to the favor of a free Christian community? Its relations to freedom of speech and of the press afforded a sufficient answer. Whether they were satisfied to aid in extending it over our common country was the question which he now left to the criticisms of his opponent, and to their own judgment.”

Mr. Chase followed in reply. He said that the speech of his opponent had proved, if proof was wanting, that the Republican party was a sectional party. It had been claimed, he said, by the Republicans, that Slavery had been, and was now, aggressive; that it was the controlling power of the General Government. If they would set aside the first five Presidents, they would find that the North had had four Presidents and the South three. Count General Taylor, and it would stand from the South five; from the North two. Then there were two hundred and fifty heads of departments at Washington, and one-half of that number were from the Northern States. To the charge that the Slave Power was aggressive, he would further say, in refutation, that when the Constitution was adopted, nearly every State held slaves, and now Freedom holds full two-thirds of the land. He then took up the thread of Mr. Raymond’s argument and reviewed it in detail to prove that he had erred on many important points.

Mr. Raymond closed the discussion with a rejoinder which was remarkable for logical reasoning and for its fair statement of the issues of the campaign; and on resuming his seat he was greeted with enthusiastic cheers.

This discussion added to the political reputation Mr. Raymond had obtained, and was not without an influence upon the


canvass. Fremont was defeated; but his defeat was almost a victory. Four years later, the Republican party elected Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency; and for eight years it fought the battle of Freedom, — first with the ballot, and then with the bullet.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE TIMES ENLARGING ITS BOUNDARIES.

THE OLD BRICK CHURCH PROPERTY IN NEW YORK — OLD KNICKERBOCKERS' REMINISCENCES AND REGRETS — A LARGE PURCHASE FOR THE TIMES IN THE PANIC YEAR — THE WONDER OF THE DAY IN NEW YORK — UNHEARD-OF EXTRAVAGANCE — HOW THE OLD NEWSPAPERS HAD BEEN HOUSED — DINGINESS AND DECAY — THE NEW ORDER OF THINGS — VISITORS THROGGING THE TIMES OFFICE — FULL DESCRIPTION OF THE BUILDING.

IN the "Panic Year," an old landmark in New York was destroyed, to give place to the handsome range of stone buildings now known as the "*Times* Block." The triangular space, bounded on the south by Beekman Street, on the east by Nassau Street, and on the west by Park Row, had long been occupied by the "Old Brick Church,"—a noted Presbyterian place of worship, under the pastoral care of the Reverend Gardiner Spring. This church, with its ancient vaults, its musty Chapel, and its mouldering memories, had become sacred in the eyes of the sturdy old Knickerbockers, whose fathers had found spiritual consolation within its walls. The tender reminiscences which clustered about it were reminiscences of the days when green fields stretched away on either hand, when the bulk of the city's population led a quiet and happy life at the lower end of the Island of Manhattan, when the Battery was the fashionable promenade, and the circle about the Bowling Green the abode of republican nabobs. The "Old Brick Church" was a link that bound the placid days of the past to the stirring days of the present; and with a chivalrous feeling which reflected much honor upon the sentiment that awakened it, the older members of the congregation long resisted the effort to uproot the edifice. Finally, however, the inexorable demands of business prevailed, and the walls of the "Old Brick" fell.



THE BUILDINGS NOW OCCUPIED BY THE TIMES.

WILSON & CO. BOSTON

This was in the beginning of the year 1857. The *Times* was in its sixth year. It had prospered beyond the most extravagant hopes of its projectors, — once already it had been compelled to seek for ampler quarters;* and now, for the second time, it needed room for expansion. Its proprietors, with far-seeing sagacity, determined to procure for its use a site at once permanent and prominent, and, moreover, at the point of the greatest probable appreciation in value. The opportunity sought for was given, when the church property came upon the market. Many bidders appeared, and legal difficulties supervened, but the *Times* finally secured the site.† Ground was broken for the erection of the *Times* Building, on the 1st of May, 1857; the corner-stone was laid on the 12th of the same month; and on the 1st of May, 1858, precisely one year from the day of the first excavation, the new office was occupied. From these premises the *Times* has been issued, without interruption, for nearly twelve years.

The *Times* Building was the wonder of its day, — for the idlest schemer, the most extravagant spendthrift, had never yet conceived the idea that a newspaper office should be a place of comfort. The older class of New York journals had always been housed in dilapidated quarters. Their editors had toiled painfully up long flights of dark and dirty staircases, to indite flaming political essays in dingy cocklofts. Ungarnished apartments had been assigned to the editorial assistants; and hapless reporters had been heard to utter thanksgivings when their chairs held firmly together for a week, or to express their sentiments blasphemously when desks and chairs alike fell into one common ruin, from sheer dry-rot, at some accidental jar. The exterior of the old newspaper dens was as unpromising as the internal appointments were uncomfortable. The bricks, washed clear of paint by the tempests of successive winters, took on a dull red hue; the signs above the doors grew wan

* On its removal to the corner of Nassau and Beckman streets, May 1, 1854. This corner is now occupied by the Park Hotel.

† With the proceeds of the sale, the Brick Church congregation secured eligible lots on Fifth Avenue, upon which was erected the new edifice in which the venerable Doctor Spring still officiates.

with age ; windows remained unwashed till the grime of years formed cakes ; and diligent spiders spun dense and endless cobwebs in uncleansed corners.

It was, therefore, with a feeling of surprise, mingled with envy, that the newspaper trilobites of the day regarded the sumptuous outfit with which the *Times* set sail at this point of its career. The wise shook their heads in solemn doubt ; old and young came to see ; the new office was thronged for months by visitors, attracted by the fame of the frescoes, and the plate glass, and the tessellated pavements, the ciphers, the library, and all the harmonious appointments. The birth of the *Times* had marked one era in the Journalism of New York : — its palatial surroundings created another. The example has since been followed, — perhaps improved upon, — and notably in the instances of the *Herald*, in New York, and the *Public Ledger*, in Philadelphia.* Newspapers have become potent ; their conductors liberal. There is now space in which to breathe, even in the poorest buildings devoted to the issues of the press ; and the lines of the journalist are cast in pleasanter places than before.

A full description of the *Times* Building is not out of place here ; for, although changes have been made in the interior, the general features remain unaltered : — the office may still be regarded as a model, and its excellent appointments merit the notice of the reader.

The building occupies the northern end of the block bounded on the east by Nassau Street, and on the west by Park Row ; abutting upon the open space formed by the junction of six streets, and known as Printing House Square. This square is sacred to the Press ; for within a stone's-throw of each other are situated the offices of four of the leading daily papers of New York, — the *Times*, *Tribune*, *World*, and *Sun*, — and those of a

* The new *Herald* building, on the corner of Broadway and Ann Street, constructed of white marble, is costly and handsome, but its internal arrangements are inferior to those of the *Times* establishment. The building occupied by the *Ledger*, in Philadelphia, however, surpasses both those of the *Times* and the *Herald* in the elegance of its appointments. Mr. George W. Childs, proprietor of the *Ledger*, is celebrated for his generosity as well as for his enterprise.

dozen weekly journals and the Sunday papers ; besides the great printing establishment of the American Tract Society, the warehouses of paper manufacturers, the shops of book-dealers, job-printing houses, and a countless variety of places in which print is in one way or another coined into ready cash. No other spot in the city is more appropriately named than Printing House Square ; and in the most prominent situation stands the office of the *Times*.

The principal fronts, overlooking Park Row and the Square, are substantially the same in design, but of different dimensions. The first story forms a continuous colonnade, with five rusticated stone piers on the western front, and four on the northern. The intervals between these piers are occupied by thirteen iron arched windows and entrances, resting on iron fluted pillars with Corinthian capitals, finished by an iron cornice.

The Park Row front is divided into three compartments by richly ornamented pilasters, supporting a pediment, on which is an inscription, in large gilt letters, cut in relief, *The N. Y. Times*, 1857. The first three stories are finished with square-headed windows. The fifth story has arched windows, five of which are clustered in the centre, rising to the pediment. The roof is surmounted by a tall flag-staff. The Nassau Street front is of plainer architecture, the narrow street forbidding the display of more elaborate ornamentation. The total height of the building from curb to cornice is eighty-six feet, and the northern front is sixty feet in length.

The press-room vaults are of extraordinary dimensions, extending around the three fronts of the building, and having the following measurements : On Spruce Street, one hundred feet by twenty-six ; on Park Row, one hundred by twenty ; on Nassau Street, ninety-five by fifteen, with a uniform depth of twenty-four feet below the curb. These vaults contain Hoe's great cylinder presses, upon which the *Times* is printed from stereotype plates.

On the Nassau Street side are the steam-boilers and engine ; on the Park Row side, the folding and mailing rooms and the store-rooms for paper, — the latter opening to the pavement by

means of a huge movable vault-light, which admits of the passage of the largest reams of paper required in printing. The vaults are admirably lighted and ventilated.

The publication office occupies the entire first floor of the building, opening on three streets. Its ceiling and walls are elaborately frescoed, and the cipher T is set in panels. The floor is tessellated with marble, and the office is lighted by eleven plate-glass windows. On the wall behind the counter are excellent medallions of Faust and Franklin. The business department of the paper is comprised in this part of the building. The publisher (Mr. George Jones) occupies a snug apartment partitioned off from the main office, in the south-west corner; separate desks are occupied by the cashier, advertising clerk, and subscription clerk; and the appointments are adjusted with careful regard to the prompt despatch of business.

The second and third floors are occupied by offices, and the fourth floor is devoted to the uses of the Editorial department. The wide iron staircase which leads from the main entrance opposite the Park ends upon this floor. Directly at the head of the staircase are the editors' rooms, — one for each department of the paper. The private office of the editor — that inner sanctuary known since newspapers had being by the name of the *sanctum sanctorum* — occupies the north-west angle of the building, commanding fine views of Printing House Square, the City Hall, and the Park. Adjacent to this room is a spacious library, fitted up with shelves, tables, books, maps, and charts, and containing files of newspapers running through a series of years. Adjoining the library is the general writing-room, devoted to the use of assistants. The central apartment, opening from the main entrance, is also occupied by assistants, one of whom is in charge of the paper after all others have finished their duties and retired for the night. Smaller rooms are devoted to foreign and domestic news, and the commercial and musical departments of the paper. The city department is assigned a room of large dimensions, affording ample accommodation for the large force of reporters who are in service day and night throughout the year.

The composing-room, or printing-office, takes up the entire

fifth floor, forming a spacious apartment about sixty feet by forty, with a height of twenty feet. The ceiling is pierced by sky-lights and ventilators, opening to the roof. In this room every appliance of the typographic art is ready for instant use. Frames of solid iron support the cases at which the printers work; the foreman has his desk in the centre; three dumb-waiters communicate respectively with the sanctum, general room, and publication office, with a code of signals for each; a steam hoistway extends to the vaults below the pavement, for the purpose of raising and lowering the plates which now take the place of the bulky "forms" of type. Iron tanks, filled with water, cap the closets at one side of the room; storage-room is provided for the reception of surplus material; the proof-readers are assigned a quiet corner, and each printer has his number. The view from this room in all directions is superb. Its height of upwards of eighty feet elevates it above the surrounding buildings, and the upper part of New York is spread out before the eye in one grand panoramic view.

CHAPTER XVII.

SLAVERY, DISUNION, AND THE WAR.

RAYMOND'S RETURN FROM EUROPE, AND HIS ENCOUNTER WITH SECESSION IN 1860 — HIS UNWAVERING LOYALTY — CLEAR FORESIGHT — PROPHETIC UTTERANCES — SPEECH IN ALBANY IN 1860 — HIS LETTERS TO WILLIAM L. YANCEY — WAR — RAYMOND'S PATRIOTISM — THE RIOT WEEK OF 1863, AND THE TIMES — RAYMOND'S ATTITUDE.

To return to Mr. Raymond. After a brief visit to Europe in 1859,* he resumed his editorial chair, in season to meet and to do battle with the Secession element which was soon to plunge the nation into war. He early saw the danger, and was constant in warning and entreaty. When the blow fell he showed himself brave and loyal; and while the crisis was impending he was neither disheartened nor dismayed. His course through the whole of that trying period was eminently honorable, and thoroughly consistent, making so fair an offset to his errors of judgment after the conflict of arms had closed, that a broad charity may forgive, if it cannot forget, the latter.

That he was alive to the dangers of the hour; that he regarded Secession as a possible, or even a probable, event; and that with shrewd foresight he discerned the results of Secession, his public addresses, and the political articles from his pen which appeared in the year 1860, abundantly prove. In an elaborate speech on "The Political Crisis," delivered at a Union mass meeting in Albany, on the 12th of January, 1860, he discussed with great care the condition of the country, the responsibility for its disquietude, and the nature of the remedy. With clearer sight than many of his contemporaries

* The year of the Italian Campaign, the events of which were discussed by Mr. Raymond in lively letters to the *Times*.

of like party faith, he warned his hearers that angry passion might, at any moment, light the flame of war; and, moreover, demonstrated by irrefragable argument that Slavery was but an incident of the impending contest; that the struggle was to be made between opposite systems of civil polity, and for the restoration of the balance of power in the South, as against the North, — or, in the words of Mr. Seward's formula, an irrepressible conflict was to be fought out, soon or late.

"We are told," said Mr. Raymond, "that the fear of danger to the Union is idle and groundless; that the Union cannot be dissolved; that the interests of its sections bind it indissolubly together, and render its disruption impossible. I grant the difficulties of the case, the extreme improbabilities of the catastrophe. I concede fully that nothing but the madness of passion could prompt either States or individuals to such a step. But I have yet to learn that anything is impossible to nations, or to great communities, when they are frantic with rage or resentment. I should like to know what excess nations are not capable of, when they are profoundly swayed by the passion of fear or resentment against some real or some fancied wrong. Talk of national interest arresting the outbreak, or checking the sweep of national passion! What instance of the kind does history exhibit? Are not its pages filled with the record of wars waged, and governments overthrown, and rulers slain, and thousands slaughtered, in the heat of popular frenzy, and under the stimulus of popular passion? Did not France rush into a revolution which drenched her with blood? Did not England, under passionate fear and dread of the first Napoleon, plunge into a war which drained her of her children and her treasure; which loaded her with an inextinguishable debt, and which is even to this day felt, by its oppressive results, in every cabin and every workshop of the British realm? Were these the results of cool calculation of the national interest? Have the many revolutions which have taken place in France, in Germany, in Spain, and the Italian States, been the work of sober reflection, of careful consideration? All great movements of great communities are movements of passion. *States and nations seldom or never stop to count the

cost. The great events of history have been the offspring of aroused sentiment; of profound, pervading, resistless passion. If our fathers had foreseen the cost of independence, — had foreseen the years of toil and of suffering it would take to achieve it, they would scarcely have plunged, as they did, boldly, and with uncalculating faith in the unknown future, into the long and bloody war of the Revolution. It is when great bodies of men are stung by a sense of wrong, or frantic with apprehension of some impending danger, that they rush rashly into rebellion, daring the worst that may happen, and throwing to the winds all estimate of results."

Then, tracing minutely the causes of Northern ascendancy and Southern discontent, he rebuked alike the extremists of the Abolitionist school, and the extremists of the South. For, with Lincoln and the greater proportion of the members of the Republican party, he had yet to be converted to Abolitionism by the events of a long and bloody war. He concluded with the following sharp analysis of the causes underlying the excitement of the time:—

"The disturbances of the country connected with slavery are partly political and partly moral. So far as they are purely political, I have strong confidence that they will work out their own remedy in the natural course of events. In every country there must be a just and equal balance of power in the government, an equal distribution of the national forces. Each section and each interest must exercise its due share of influence and control. It is always more or less difficult to preserve their just equipoise, and the larger the country, and the more varied its great interests, the more difficult does the task become, and the greater the shock and disturbance caused by an attempt to adjust it when once disturbed. I believe I state only what is generally conceded to be a fact, when I say that the growth of the Northern States in population, in wealth, in all the elements of political influence and control, has been out of proportion to their political influence in the Federal Councils. While the Southern States have less than a third of the aggregate population of the Union, their interests have influenced the policy of the government far more than the interests of the Northern States. Without going into any detail to establish this fact, a general knowledge of the action of the government for the past ten or fifteen years, the decisions and composition of the Supreme Court, the organization of the committees in the Federal Senate, the rule that obtains in the distribution of Federal office, etc., are quite sufficient to show its general truth. Now the North has made rapid advances within the last five years, and it naturally claims a proportionate share of influence and power in the affairs of the Confederacy.

“It is inevitable that this claim should be put forward, and it is also inevitable that it should be conceded. No party can long resist it; it overrides all parties, and makes them the mere instruments of its will. It is quite as strong to-day in the heart of the Democratic party of the North as in the Republican ranks; and any party which ignores it will lose its hold on the public mind.

“Why does the South resist this claim? Not because it is unjust in itself, but because it has become involved with the question of slavery, and has drawn so much of its vigor and vitality from that quarter, that it is almost merged in that issue. The North bases its demand for increased power, in a very great degree, on the action of the government in regard to slavery — and the just and rightful ascendancy of the North in the Federal councils comes thus to be regarded as an element of danger to the institutions of the Southern States.”

The questions at issue were further discussed by Mr. Raymond in the fall of 1860, in his celebrated “Letters to William L. Yancey,” which are given in full in the Appendix to this volume.* In these letters, Mr. Raymond accepted a personal challenge from Mr. Yancey to a discussion of the bearings of Slavery, and the effects of Disunion, considering, first, the position of the Northern States in relation to the slave-trade in 1787; second, the motives and objects of the disunion movement in the South; third, the unconstitutionality and peril of Secession; and, fourth, the precise nature of the pending issue. In conclusion, he defined the duty of the North, and the true policy of the Slave States, in terms at once temperate, logical, and forcible. The Yancey letters are justly regarded as among the best of Raymond’s productions; and in the light of subsequent events they attain a certain measure of historical value.

War began in April, 1861; the event so long dreaded occurring, at last, so suddenly that the whole North was stunned by the report of the guns that roared against Fort Sumter. Mr. Raymond was among the earliest of the effective champions of the Union. His editorial utterances, his public addresses, his conversation, influence, and example were unreservedly devoted to the highest expression of patriotic ardor; and even in the darkest hours of the long conflict, his faith never wavered, and his energy never failed. When the Fainthearts grew

* Appendix C

weary of the way, he still fought on with voice and pen. When contemporaneous journals grew clamorous for Peace on any terms, however disgraceful,* the *Times* steadily encouraged the disheartened, stimulated the daring, and defied the foe. It is a lasting honor to Raymond that the newspaper over which he presided preserved a consistent and noble record.

A signal illustration of Raymond's courage in the presence of danger was given in the terrible "Riot Week" of July, 1863, when, under pretence of resisting a draft for troops, the mob of New York committed the vilest excesses, and for days held undisputed possession of the city, encouraged to deeds of violence by the Governor of the State, and by incumbents of judicial office, and sustained by the traitorous journals of the day. The offices of the loyal newspapers were put in posture of defence, to avert apprehended attack, and the proprietors of the *Times* planted revolving cannon in their publication office, and provided great store of other death-dealing weapons with which to repel invasion. Beneath the shelter of battery and bomb, Raymond steadily poured a galling fire into the ranks of the mob, its official supporters, and the editors who encouraged it. After the first news of the outbreak, the *Times* published the following in displayed type:—

"CRUSH THE MOB!

"Mayor Opdyke has called for volunteer policemen, to serve for the special and temporary purpose of putting down the mob which threatened yesterday to burn and plunder the city. Let no man be deaf to this appeal! No man can afford to neglect it. No man, whatever his calling or condition in life, can afford to live in a city where the law is powerless, and where mobs of reckless ruffians can plunder dwellings, and burn whole blocks of

* For instance, the *New York Tribune*; which printed the following editorial paragraphs in 1863:—

"If three months more of earnest fighting shall not serve to make a serious impression on the rebels; if the end of that term shall find us no further advanced than its beginning; if some malignant Fate has decreed that the blood and treasure of the nation shall ever be squandered in fruitless efforts,—let us bow to our destiny, and make the best attainable peace."
—*January 22, 1863.*

"If the rebels are indeed our masters, let them show it, and let us own it. . . . If the rebels beat Grant, and water their horses in the Delaware, routing all the forces we can bring against them, we shall be under foot, and may as well own it."—*June 17, 1863.*

buildings with impunity. Let the mob which raged yesterday in our streets, with so little of real restraint, obtain the upper hand for a day or two longer, and no one can predict or imagine the extent of the injury they may inflict, or the weight of the blow they may strike at our peace and prosperity. This mob must be crushed at once. Every day's, every hour's, delay is big with evil. Let every citizen come promptly forward and give his personal aid to so good and so indispensable a work."

On the third day of the riot, Raymond wrote:—

"We trust that Gov. Seymour does not mean to falter. We believe that in his heart he really intends to vindicate the majesty of the law, according to his sworn obligations. But, in the name of the dignity of government and of public safety, we protest against any further indulgence in the sort of speech with which he yesterday sought to propitiate the mob. Entreaties and promises are not what the day calls for. No official, however high his position, can make them, without bringing public authority into contempt. This monster is to be met with a sword, and that only. He is not to be placated with a sop; and, if he were, it would only be to make him all the more insatiate hereafter. In the name of all that is sacred in law and all that is precious in society, let there be no more of this. There is force enough at the command of Gov. Seymour to maintain civil authority. He will do it. He cannot but do it. He is a ruined man if he fails to do it. This mob is not our master. It is not to be compounded with by paying black mail. It is not to be supplicated and sued to stay its hand. It is to be defied, confronted, grappled with, prostrated, crushed. The government of the State of New York is its master, not its slave; its ruler, and not its minion.

"It is too true that there are public journals who try to dignify this mob by some respectable appellation. The *Herald* characterizes it as the people and the *World* as the laboring men of the city. These are libels that ought to have paralyzed the fingers that penned them. It is ineffably infamous to attribute to the people, or to the laboring men of this metropolis, such hideous barbarism as this horde has been displaying. The people of New York, and the laboring men of New York, are not incendiaries, nor robbers, nor assassins. They do not hunt down men whose only offence is the color God gave them; they do not chase, and insult, and beat women; they do not pillage an asylum for orphan children, and burn the very roof over those orphans' heads. They are civilized beings, valuing law and respecting decency; and they regard, with unqualified abhorrence, the doings of the tribe of savages that have sought to bear rule in their midst.

"This mob is not the people, nor does it belong to the people. It is for the most part made up of the very vilest elements of the city. It has not even the poor merit of being what mobs usually are,—the product of mere ignorance and passion. They talk, or rather did talk at first, of the oppressiveness of the Conscription law; but three-fourths of those who have been actively engaged in violence have been boys and young men under twenty years of age, and not at all subject to the Conscription. Were the Conscription law to be abrogated to-morrow, the controlling inspiration of the mob

would remain all the same. It comes from sources quite independent of that law, or any other, — from malignant hate toward those in better circumstances, from a craving for plunder, from a love of commotion, from a barbarous spite against a different race, from a disposition to bolster up the failing fortunes of the Southern rebels. All of these influences operate in greater or less measure upon any person engaged in this general defiance of law; and all combined have generated a composite monster more hellish than the triple-headed Cerberus.

“It doubtless is true that the Conscription, or rather its preliminary process, furnished the occasion for the outbreak. This was so simply because it was the most plausible pretext for commencing open defiance. But it will be a fatal mistake to assume that this pretext has but to be removed to restore quiet and contentment. Even if it be allowed that this might have been true at the outset, it is completely false now. A mob, even though it may start on a single incentive, never sustains itself for any time whatever on any one stimulant. With every hour it lives it gathers new passions, and dashes after new objects. If you undertake to negotiate with it, you find that what it raved for yesterday it has no concern for to-day. It is as inconstant as it is headstrong. The rabble greeted with cheers the suppliant attitude of Gov. Seymour, and his promises with reference to the Conscription law, but we have yet to hear that they thereupon abandoned their outrages. The fact stands that they are to-night, while we write, still infuriated, still insatiate.

“You may as well reason with the wolves of the forest as with these men in their present mood. It is quixotic and suicidal to attempt it. The duties of the executive officers of this State and city are not to debate, or negotiate, or supplicate, but to *execute the laws*. To execute means to enforce *by authority*. This is their *only* official business. Let it be promptly and sternly entered upon with all the means now available, and it cannot fail of being carried through to an overwhelming triumph of public order. It may cost blood, — much of it perhaps; but it will be a lesson to the public enemies, whom we always have and must have in our midst, that will last for a generation. Justice and mercy, this time, unite in the same behest: *Give them grape, and a plenty of it.*”

The temper of Raymond’s mind, and the tone of the *Times*, so long as the rebels were in arms, were relentless. “Strike fast and strike hard” was his counsel, until the foe had yielded; and in this strongly set purpose he never wavered for an instant. The judgment, the sentiment, the patriotic instincts, the innate honesty of the man, were all enlisted in the cause of the country; and he was uniformly brave and true. It was only after the smoke-clouds of the battle-field had lifted, and when the beaten foe had submissively yielded, that he began to look at the other side.

It is needless to enter into a relation of the petty acrimo-

nies of the period of the War, or to revive the memory of the more serious attacks which were made upon Mr. Raymond and the *Times*. The paper and its editor lived and prospered, through and beyond the fight, and the whole record of that bitter season throws no shadow upon the fair fame of either.

But with Peace came Raymond's political failure.

CHAPTER XVIII.

RAYMOND IN CONGRESS, AND THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION.

RAYMOND IN 1862-4 — SPEECH IN WILMINGTON, DELAWARE — ELECTION TO CONGRESS IN NOVEMBER, 1864 — THE VOTE IN HIS DISTRICT — OPENING OF THE THIRTY-NINTH CONGRESS — ANDREW JOHNSON'S CONFLICT WITH THE REPUBLICAN PARTY — RAYMOND IN THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION IN 1866 — THE PHILADELPHIA ADDRESS — RAYMOND'S EXPLANATORY SPEECH AT COOPER INSTITUTE — A NOMINATION FOR THE FORTIETH CONGRESS DECLINED — LETTER FROM MR. RAYMOND — HIS OPPONENTS — INJUSTICE.

THE years 1862, 1863, and 1864 were busy years for Mr. Raymond. Besides his daily labors for his paper, and his active participation in all the movements of loyal men in support of the war, he also mingled in the local and State politics of this period, and occupied a prominent place as a Republican leader. On the 6th of November, 1863, he delivered a memorable address at Wilmington, Delaware; in the course of which, although speaking to an audience in a Slave State, he insisted with much boldness upon the necessity of quelling the rebellion at any cost, of restoring the Union, and of re-establishing the supremacy of the Constitution. In May, 1864, he was appointed a delegate to the Republican State Convention in New York, and by that body was chosen delegate at large to the Republican National Convention, which assembled in Baltimore in the following summer. In the latter body, Mr. Raymond was made chairman of the New York State delegation, and in great part to his efforts Andrew Johnson was indebted for the nomination to the Vice-Presidency. Mr. Raymond was also chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, and shaped the platform of 1864. He was afterwards appointed a member of the Republican National Committee, and became its chairman. His services in the political campaign of 1864, contributing greatly to the success of the Republican party, in the State of

New York as well as in the Presidential election, his political strength and influence were continually augmented, and up to this time he had made no mistakes. But evil days were in store for him.

In November, 1864, he accepted the Republican nomination for Congress in the Sixth District of New York. This district comprised the ninth, fifteenth, and sixteenth wards of New York city, and three candidates besides Mr. Raymond appeared in the field. The campaign was unusually spirited. Abraham Lincoln had been nominated for a second Presidential term, and was opposed by George B. McClellan. Reuben E. Fenton was the Republican candidate for Governor of the State of New York, in opposition to Horatio Seymour. Full Congressional delegations were also to be elected. National, State, and local issues accordingly entered into the political controversies of the day, and all the lines were sharply drawn. The district in which Raymond ran included the ward which had previously sent him to Albany as its representative in the Legislature; and he alone had the advantage of successful precedent over the candidates arrayed against him. His majority over the Mozart (Democratic) candidate, Eli P. Norton, was 5,668; his vote exceeded that cast for the Tammany candidate, Elijah Ward, by 386; the irregular Republican candidate, Rush C. Hawkins, was beaten by a majority of 5,968. The whole number of votes cast in the district was 17,238; and the poll stood as follows: Raymond, 7,315; Ward, 6,929; Norton, 1,647, and Hawkins, 1,347.

Taking his seat in the House of Representatives at the opening of the Thirty-ninth Congress, in March, 1865, Mr. Raymond found himself fated to take part in the solution of the weighty question of Reconstruction. The speedy end of the War, closely followed by the assassination of Lincoln, threw upon Congress a burden more difficult of adjustment than all that had gone before. Andrew Johnson, elevated to the Presidency by an accident which was not more lamentable in its immediate result than in the consequences it entailed, so soon belied his former professions that he first amazed the nation, and then excited it to frenzy. His opponents and his partisans

soon became arrayed in hostile attitude; and from the halls of Congress the violence of party strife and the struggle for party supremacy extended and widened, until the whole country again became convulsed. The unwise and inconsequential proceeding of the impeachment of the President was the final result of this conflict, and, soon afterwards, the retirement of the latter, at the close of his term of office, ended the disgraceful scene.

A lamentable fatality attended the efforts made by Mr. Johnson's friends to sustain his power, and to defend his cause before the tribunal of the people. Mr. Raymond, unhappily for himself, espoused the cause of the President with mistaken ardor. In the attempt to secure for the defeated South a fair measure of justice, he accepted the arguments advanced by Mr. Johnson, and pressed them with a degree of zeal which was untempered by discretion. Unquestionably his purpose was good, but his unfortunate tendency to temporize, in all circumstances except those of pressing emergency, led him into the wrong path.

This tendency of Raymond's mind was singularly illustrated by his course in the Philadelphia Convention. On the 14th of August, 1866, sixteen months after the close of the war, a "National Union Convention" assembled in Philadelphia, composed of delegates from all the States and territories of the United States, who then met together for the first time in six years. North, South, East, and West, — Republicans and Democrats, — those who had rebelled against the authority of the Union, and those who had always been loyal to the Union, — again united, by common consent, to consider the condition of the country. Mr. Raymond was a prominent member of this convention; and his New York colleague, in the committee on the Address, was Mr. Sanford E. Church, a leading Democrat.* The hatchet was formally buried, and

* The names of the committee appointed to draft resolutions and address are as follows:—

Edgar Cowan, CHAIRMAN.

Maine — R. D. Rice, and George M. Weston.

New Hampshire — C. B. Bowers, and H. Birgham.

peace and good-will reigned. Mr. Raymond was deeply impressed by the tender associations of the moment, and his desire to placate the South found a decided expression in the celebrated "Philadelphia Address," the preparation and adoption of which cost him his place as the Chairman of the National Executive Committee of the Republican party.

The Philadelphia Address* opened with a declaration that, since the National Convention of 1860, events had occurred which had changed the character of our internal politics, and had given the United States a new place among the nations of the

- Vermont* — C. N. Davenport, and J. H. Williams.
Massachusetts — General D. S. Couch, and C. L. Woodbury.
Rhode Island — Wm. Beach Lawrence, and Thomas Sterne.
Connecticut — James Dixon, and O. S. Seymour.
New York — H. J. Raymond, and S. E. Church.
New Jersey — Colonel Ingham Coriell, and Abraham Browning.
Pennsylvania — Edgar Cowan, and W. Bigler.
Delaware — Joseph P. Comegys, and Joseph Ayres Stockley.
Maryland — R. Johnson, and Jno. W. Cusfield.
Virginia — Richard H. Parker, and John W. Marge.
West Virginia — General John J. Jackson, Parkersburg, and Daniel Lamb, of Wheeling.
North Carolina — Wm. A. Graham, and N. Borden.
South Carolina — S. McGowan, and R. F. Perry.
Georgia — B. W. Alexander, and A. R. Wright.
Florida — Wm. Marian, and Mr. Wilkinson.
Alabama — C. C. Langdon, and T. J. Foster.
Mississippi — Wm. Yager, and A. Murdock.
Louisiana — John Ray, and Judge Baker.
Texas — B. H. Epperson, and L. D. Evans.
Tennessee — John S. Brien, and John Baxter.
Arkansas — Wm. Byers, and W. L. Bell.
Kentucky — Garrett Davis, and E. Hise.
Ohio — Sol. Hinkle, and Col. Geo. McCook.
Indiana — John S. Davis, and Thomas A. Hendricks.
Illinois — O. H. Browning, and S. S. Marshall.
Michigan — W. B. McCreery, and Chas. E. Stewart.
Missouri — Austin E. King, and James A. Broadhead.
Minnesota — Henry M. Rice, and Daniel S. Norton.
Wisconsin — C. A. Eldridge, and J. J. R. Pease.
Iowa — Charles Mason, and T. H. Benton.
Kansas — Gen. Charles W. Blair, and W. C. McDowell.
California — R. J. Walker, and J. A. McDougall.
Nevada — Governor G. M. Beebe, Frank Hereford, and G. Barnard.
Oregon — G. L. Curry, and E. M. Barnum.
District of Columbia — B. T. Swart, and Dr. Charles Allen.
Dakotah — A. A. Folk.
Idaho — C. F. Powell, and Henry W. Pugh.
Nebraska — Major H. H. Heath.
New Mexico — Geo. P. Este.
Washington — Edward Lander.
Colorado — Milo Lee.

* See Appendix D.

earth. The government had passed through the vicissitudes and the perils of civil war. Severe losses in life and in property had been endured, and heavy burdens had been imposed upon the people. The war, too, like all great contests which rouse the passions and test the endurance of nations, had given new scope to the ambition of political parties, and fresh impulse to plans of innovation and reform. But now, for the first time after six years of alienation and conflict, every State and every section of the land was again represented in a National Convention, the members of the body again meeting as citizens of a common country. Therefore the address continued: it should be remembered, first, always and everywhere, that the war has ended and the nation is again at peace; that this convention had assembled to take friendly counsel, and that its work was to be, not that of passion nor of resentment for past offences, but of calm and sober judgment and a liberal statesmanship. In the second place, the address argued the necessity of recognizing the full significance and promptly accepting all the legitimate consequences of the political results of the war. Thirdly, it insisted upon the importance of an accurate understanding of the real character of the war, and of the victory by which it was closed. Then came a declaration that the constitution of the United States remained precisely as before the war; that this had been iterated and reiterated by the Executive and by Congress; and that only since the war had been announced "the right of conquest and of confiscation, the right to abrogate all existing governments, institutions, and laws, and to subject the territory conquered and its inhabitants to such laws, regulations, and deprivations as the legislative department of the government may see fit to impose." After this followed an elaborate argument adverse to the action taken by Congress, turning upon the point that it was unjust to refuse to ten States a representation in Congress, — unjust because those States were not in rebellion, but were one and all "in an attitude of loyalty towards the government, and of sworn allegiance to the Constitution of the United States."

To this address was appended a "Declaration of Principles,"

— and this Declaration conveyed a promise of support to Andrew Johnson.

The President, however, gained nothing, while Mr. Raymond lost all. From the date of the publication of the Philadelphia address the name of Mr. Raymond was dropped from the list of Republican leaders; his cordial affiliation with the members of his party ceased; the Republican National Committee met and removed him from the chairmanship, and the next State Convention ratified their action. Mr. Raymond quickly perceived the false step, and endeavored to retrace it, but he was never able to regain his former political position. Nevertheless, he continued to give a hearty support to the candidates of the Republican party.*

* Raymond was accused of having gone over to the Democratic party. This accusation is set at rest by the following letters, which were first published in the *Albany Evening Journal* in the fall of 1866:—

“EDITORS OF THE ALBANY JOURNAL, —

“GENTLEMEN: It is due to the Hon. Henry J. Raymond that the following letter be published. It shows he never intended to join the Democratic party, and that he is consistent in supporting the Union State ticket.

“Respectfully yours, RANSOM BALCOM.

“*Binghamton, Oct. 8, 1866.*

“WASHINGTON, July 17, 1866.

“MY DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 14th. I think there can be no doubt as to the substantial unanimity of the Union party in our State, and elsewhere, in opposition to the general course of the President, and to the Philadelphia Convention. What may happen between now and election time, after the pressure of Congress is removed and when the people have had an opportunity to canvass the matter more coolly, it is not easy to say.

“I think it not unlikely that the Philadelphia Convention may have a wholesome influence on our State Convention, and make it somewhat more moderate than it would be otherwise. But it is not likely to disturb the integrity or ascendancy of the Union party.

“I shall be governed in my course toward it by developments. I do not see the necessity of denouncing it from the start, nor until more is known of its composition, purposes, and action. It looks now as though it would be mainly in the hands of the Copperheads. If it should happen to contain a majority of sensible men from all parties, who care more for the country than any party, it may possibly exclude the extreme Copperheads and Rebels, and lay down a platform which shall command the respect of the whole country. But this would be a kind of miracle which we have no right to expect in these days to look for.

“I think, in spite of all the rash things that have been said, and the crazy schemes that have been proposed by the Radicals this winter, what has actually been done by Congress merits approbation. All which it has done in a political sense is to pass the Constitutional amendments. I voted for them, and am ready to stand upon them as the platform of the party. I think the members from Tennessee and Arkansas ought to be at once admitted to their seats, as loyal men, who can take the oath and come from loyal constitu-

Mr. Raymond finally discovered the true character of the Executive whose cause he had undertaken to defend; and, when fully convinced of the utter baseness of the man, wrote in the columns of the *Times* these words:—

“We have tried very hard to hold our original faith in his personal honesty, and to attribute his disastrous action to errors of judgment and infirmities of temper. The struggle has often been difficult, and we can maintain it no longer. We give it up. It is impossible to reconcile his language in regard to our national debt with integrity of purpose, or any sincere regard for the honor and welfare of the nation. We only regret that foreigners should be able to cite a President’s message in seeming proof of our national dishonor and disgrace.”

It is but simple justice to the memory of Mr. Raymond to place upon record one of the most elaborate justifications of himself, and of the President, which he ever felt it his duty to make. It was a long and eloquent speech, delivered at a Union meeting in the Cooper Institute, in the city of New York, in February, 1866. At this meeting, Francis B. Cutting presided, and addresses were delivered by Secretary Seward, Postmaster-General Dennison, and Mr. Raymond. The immediate occasion of the gathering was Mr. Johnson’s veto of the Freedman’s Bureau bill. The supporters of the President improvised a mass meeting to stem the tide of popular indignation which the President’s action had created; and one of the resolutions adopted was as follows:—

Resolved, That we approve the general principles announced by the President in his annual message and in his late message, explaining the reasons for withholding his assent to the bill for the continuance and enlargement of

cies. If Congress would do that and adjourn, we could go into the canvass this fall without any fear of the Philadelphia Convention, or anything else. I think the President has made a great mistake in taking ground against those amendments. They are in themselves reasonable, wise, and popular. It is easy to take exceptions to details, and to the mode in which they have been passed, but the people will not be stopped by these trifles. They will go to the heart of the matter, and judge them on their merits. Yours very truly,

“H. J. RAYMOND.”

“HON. RANSOM BALCOM.”

Mr. Raymond’s letter, it will be observed, was written a month before the Philadelphia Convention met.

the Freedman's Bureau; and while we express this approval we give him our confidence, and promise him our continued support in all proper measures for the restoration of constitutional government in all parts of the country."

The time, it should be remembered, was the month of February, 1866. The Philadelphia Convention did not meet until the following August. Mr. Raymond, therefore, had not yet fallen into his fatal error. His speech is so fair an expression of the motives which had governed his course in Congress, and, at the same time, serves so well to explain some of his mental characteristics, that we append it entire, as revised by himself:—

"I need not say, my fellow-citizens, how deeply I stand indebted to you for the greeting with which you receive me upon my appearance here. I came here not to speak to you, but to hear you speak to me, to Congress, to the country. My duty for the moment lies elsewhere. I have been endeavoring to discharge it to the best of my ability, and with a conscientious purpose to serve as well as I could the country whose welfare we all have at heart. I came here not for inspiration from your presence, even, though any one who had any sensitiveness to the popular impulse which must always rule this land, might well draw inspiration from such a scene as is presented here to-night; but I trust I may say, without undue boasting, that in such a crisis as this, through which our country is just passing, I need no inspiration to do my duty but the sense of right and of obligation to the community.

"*It has been painful to me, must be painful to any one in public life, to separate himself on great public questions from those personal and political friends with whom he has been in the habit of acting; but I have done it, if I know my own heart, because I believed that the interests of the country required different action from that which they were counselling me to take.* [Applause.] I must do them the justice to say here that for the most part I believe them to be just as conscientious in their impulses and just as patriotic in their motives as I claim to be in mine. I do not believe that the Congress now assembled at Washington is desirous of permanently breaking up this Union; but I do believe that the action they are taking will have the effect of doing it for a time, but only for a time; for I agree most heartily and thoroughly with the distinguished Secretary of State [Mr. Seward], who has addressed you to-night in words of wisdom and eloquence which you will not soon forget, and which the whole country will hear with delight. I agree with him that the restoration of this Union is but a question of time, and that Congresses, or Governors, or Presidents even, can delay that time but for a little while. [Applause.]

"Why, fellow-citizens, it seems to me that he must be a blind and dull observer of the progress of history as it is being enacted in our time who can doubt that for a moment. What have we been doing for the last five years? For what have we been raising those vast armies by the voluntary action of our people—those vast sums of money? For what have our

brethren been shedding their blood on the field of battle, laying down their lives, sacrificing everything they had on earth? Why are we now loaded with a debt greater than this nation ever believed it would be called upon to bear? For what has all this been done, but to save the Union which our fathers gave us and charged us to preserve unimpaired to the latest generation? Did any of us ever hear from any source of authority, from the day when this war began to the day when it closed, any declaration of any other purpose in waging it than to preserve the integrity of the Union and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution of the United States?

“A VOICE—Yes!

“Mr. RAYMOND—Will you be good enough to name it? Congress declared over and over again, that the object, and the only object, of this war was to maintain the integrity of the Union, and to preserve the supremacy of the Constitution. Why, sir, during the first year of the war, that great and patriotic statesman, now deceased, John J. Crittenden [Applause], introduced into the House of Representatives a resolution declaring that, and nothing but that, to be the object of the war, and at just about the same time that other great and equally patriotic statesman, Andrew Johnson [Great cheering], introduced into the Senate a resolution declaring the same thing, in nearly the same words, and both passed unanimously. Congress has never from that day to this declared any other purpose. The Executive department, the Legislative department, every department of the government, from the beginning of the war to the end, when they spoke at all of its object, declared that object to be the preservation of the integrity of the Union and the maintenance of the authority of the Constitution. The President, in all his proclamations, from the first to the last, made that declaration, and Congress never disapproved it; but, on the contrary, reiterated and reaffirmed it.

“While individuals in Congress may have had other purposes in view, Congress itself, by its authority, declared that to be the purpose of the war, and declared furthermore, that when that purpose was attained the war ought to end. It was that purpose, thus declared, that united the people of this great nation as one man in their efforts for the prosecution of the war and the preservation of the Union. While there was a large party in the country who disapproved of the measures of the government, and who resisted and hampered the government in carrying out those measures, I am willing to do them the justice to believe that they acted from a sincere conviction that war would not preserve the Union, but would destroy it. They said no Union like this, depending wholly on the will of the people for its existence, could be preserved by force; and the reason they gave was, that even if the war should be prosecuted to a successful termination, if the rebellion should be crushed, the people conquered would never consent to come back again into a Union with the people who had conquered them. Now what is the fact in that respect? Are they not even now, when thoroughly subdued, ready to come back? Are they not anxious to come back? Do they not, though subdued and crushed by the suppression of the rebellion, see and acknowledge, one and all, that the only flag that can give them shelter is that of the glorious Stars and Stripes against which they have been fighting for years?

“VOICES — Yes, yes!

“Now, I have gone through all this history simply to say this one thing, that the people of the United States who have prosecuted this war and have given so freely of their money and of their lives to bring it to a successful conclusion, all for the purpose of maintaining this Union, will adhere to that purpose and that determination to the end. Do you suppose they are going to abandon that purpose, which carried them through the war, now that the war is over?

“VOICES — Never!

“In their resentment against those who brought this war upon the country, it is possible, nay, it is natural, that men should be unwilling to take hasty action in restoring the rebellious States to their rights under the Constitution. They do not feel it to be right, or proper, or safe, that the men who have been prosecuting this war against the government should, upon its cessation, instantly come back and resume their seats as members of it. The feeling is natural, and within limits it is entirely just and proper. We do not, any of us, wish to see men red-handed with the blood of our brethren, march up with an air of triumph, as though they were the victors, and take their seats among those who make our laws. We do not propose that this shall happen. Nobody has proposed any such thing.

“The President has said that whoever takes a seat in Congress, or fills an office under the Federal Government, should be a man loyal to the Constitution and the Union, and able to take truly any test oath the government may prescribe; and all that he asks is, that loyal men, representing loyal constituents, and able to take the oath prescribed for all, shall be allowed to come up and take their seats in Congress, in order that those States may be restored to their rights as members of the Union under the Constitution. [Applause.] As for disloyal men, who cannot take the oath prescribed, he has repeatedly said, and we all agree, that they had better go back to their constituents and give place to others better fitted to take part in the legislation of the land. And so say we all of us. But the President does think that a State loyal enough to furnish a loyal President; a State which, during the continuance of the war, adopted a free Constitution and abolished slavery; a State that reorganized itself on Republican principles, abjuring the rebellion and driving out the rebels from its borders; a State which has sent loyal men to Washington, — the President does think that the representatives of such a State should be admitted; and that there is no reason on the face of the earth for refusing them admission — for thus turning our backs upon loyal men and confounding them with disloyal men of the Southern States, in one common sentence of condemnation. [Renewed applause.] In that sentiment I believe the whole country will thoroughly, heartily, zealously, concur.

“Why, even this present Congress, as I have reason to know, was ready last Monday, by a majority of its votes in the House of Representatives, to admit the Representatives from the State of Tennessee to their seats in Congress. Why, then, did they not do it? Because, unfortunately, that House has surrendered its power to admit members without the consent of one of its own committees, or without overriding it; and because, moreover, the President of the United States, in the discharge of what he believed to be his

solemn obligations to his conscience and his oath, vetoed a bill which they had sent for his approval, and to show their resentment of that act, the House still further resolved that no member from Tennessee, or any other Southern State, should be admitted to either House, until both Houses had consented thereto.

“That action was taken in a moment of resentment. You all know how powerful for the moment resentments are, and how, under the influence of passion and excitement, where no time is taken for discussion or deliberation, resentments may decide very important action. The leaders in this case took care that there should be no discussion, by moving the previous question, and refusing to hear one single word from any man who disapproved of the action they proposed to take. It was thus, and thus only, that this resolution was passed. But if you know how natural and how powerful such resentments are, you know, also, how short-lived they are. You know that the passion which may lead a man to do an act to-day may subside, so that he will regret it to-morrow; and my own belief is, that if time can be afforded for calm reflection on this great subject, Congress, as well as the country, will come to see that the path of wisdom, the path of safety, and the path of patriotism lies in quite another direction from that in which they have been walking hitherto. [Applause.]

“The immediate occasion of the resentment which has influenced Congress in this case is, as you have been told to-night, the veto of the Freedman's Bureau Bill, which was sent to the President, and returned by him on Monday last. The reasons which led him to disapprove that bill have also been set before you. The language used by the friends of the bill, in Congress and out of Congress, on this subject, — and I am sorry to see in this city, to some extent, — implies that the President's disapproval of that particular bill leaves all the slaves that have been made free under the amendment to the Constitution at the absolute will and mercy of the late rebels among whom they live. We are told that the President has abandoned them to their fate, and wholly turned them over to the rule of the rebels, their late masters. That is an entire misapprehension of the facts in the case. The President's message itself should have corrected that view, and will correct it in the minds of all who read it with candor.

“That message expressly states that, for one year after peace shall have been proclaimed by him or Congress, the present Freedman's Bureau Bill, of which no complaint is made, and which gives full and complete protection to that class of persons, will be in full and complete effect; and that after one year's experience, if it shall be found necessary, Congress, which will then be in session, can pass a law better adapted to the state of affairs which shall then exist. Is not that sensible? Is it not reasonable? The President has not left it to be inferred that he is indifferent to the fate of the colored race in the Southern States. He insists, as the people of the whole country will insist, that their freedom shall be established and protected, — that all the rights of free men shall be secured to them, — that they shall have access to courts of law as parties and as witnesses, for the protection of life, liberty and property, — that they shall have the right to make contracts, to own real and personal estate, to enjoy the returns of their labor, and in all respects involving their civil and personal rights to be placed upon the same

footing with other citizens living under the Constitution of the same country. He has repeated this over and over again in his public declarations. He recognizes the obligation of the government to protect them during their transition from slavery to freedom. And he stands ready to execute fully and freely all the provisions of the existing law, — which will be in full force for at least one year longer for securing this great end. But why this hot haste, this impatient and intolerant determination of Congress, to pass a new law a year before it can be required, — conferring upon the President enormous power which he does not wish to exercise, and thrusting upon him vast sums of money that he does not wish to spend?

“It is not for me to canvass the motives of public action; but I can easily understand that in this case it may be quite other than that which appears on the surface. Certainly it cannot be purely and exclusively a desire to protect this class of our people, for the existing bill does that. Why, then, disturb it, — why interfere with its operation? Unfortunately it is a question of sentiment, or passion, and action taken under such influence often aims at other results than those which its authors would be willing to avow. I must say that I look with distrust upon the actions of the Committee in whose hands Congress has placed the entire control of this question. Not that I distrust the motives of the men upon it; but it is a novel thing, something entirely without example in our history, for each House of Congress to abnegate powers which the Constitution in express terms confers upon it, and hand them over to a joint committee which sits in secret, making no report of its action, and giving to Congress none of the information which it was created to give, but sending down to that Congress, from time to time, changes in our Fundamental Law, and demanding that they shall be adopted on the spot.

“I say it is a new portion of our history, and it does not seem to me in accordance with the principles of our Republican government. It reminds me too much of the revolutionary committees appointed to take charge of legislative affairs in the revolutionary times of France. God forbid that the same unholy ambition should ever seize any of the leaders in our legislative body, or tempt them to emulate such bad examples! I do not know, however, nor do you know, into what extremities passion may lead desperate and daring men; and from the bottom of my heart I thank the President of the United States for recalling the attention of Congress and the nation to the great fundamental principles which underlie our institutions, and upon which our government, if it is to be permanent, must always rest. [Applause.]

“The President, in his annual message, and in this Veto Message, has laid down principles, without the maintenance of which this government cannot exist and continue to be Republican. Either we must adhere to those principles, or we must cease to be in fact, whatever we may be in form, a Republican government. We may, if we abandon them, still have a Congress; we may still go through all the forms of election under the Constitution; we may vote by universal suffrage; we may still have one in power at Washington who shall be called simply a President; but you will find that ‘the likeness of a kingly crown’ will sit upon his head, and he will wield more than kingly power, unless the principles laid down by the President continue to form the basis of our government. Republican governments are rarely, if

ever, overthrown by open and hostile force; they are undermined; their principles are disregarded, and other principles creep in under those very Republican forms which conceal their real nature. The Emperor of France sits on his Imperial throne to-day by virtue of universal suffrage; and his puppet Maximilian in Mexico holds his deputized authority there nominally in the name of the Mexican people. Forms are nothing when the spirit of despotism exists, when the purpose to create despotic authority pervades any considerable body of influential men in the State, and they have the power to give effect to their wishes. In such a case it makes little difference whether they abolish Republican forms, or infuse their poison into the veins of the body politic under those forms.

“James Madison, who, perhaps, more than any other man, was cognizant of the principles which were laid down in the Constitution of the United States, in one of the numbers of the *Federalist*, — I forget which one, — solemnly warns the American people that usurpation is much more to be dreaded on the part of Congress than on the part of the Executive; and he warns the people always to watch encroachments upon their liberties at the hands of Congress rather than on the part of the President of the United States. I cannot help thinking that the events of this passing time give practical force and weight to that solemn warning from that high authority; for I see that while in Congress there is a steady pressure for universal suffrage in the States, including all colors and all races, there is at the same moment an equally steady pressure at Washington for the consolidation of Federal power. There seems at first view to be a discrepancy here; but there is not the least in point of fact. Universal suffrage may only create more tools wherewith despotic power shall work out its own decrees. [A voice, ‘That’s the talk!’]

“It behooves us to watch with jealous care the dawns of usurpation. I have never been, of course, as all or nearly all of you have been, the advocate or disciple of that particular doctrine of State rights which was held in the Southern States, which gave to each State the right of sovereignty even against the superior sovereignty of the United States. Yet I have always held to the doctrine of the State rights as it is laid down in the Constitution of the United States, and I believe to-day that it is far more important for us to maintain those State rights as they actually exist and are recognized in the Constitution, than it is to increase the authority of the Federal Government. That authority, as events have shown, is ample for all emergencies. Why, who can raise any question hereafter about this Republic not being a strong government? We hear those sneers from the other side of the water sometimes, when they tell us that because we have no King and no Parliament, and depend wholly upon the will of the people, that therefore our government is weak. Our English brethren (we may as well give them that title as any other) [Laughter] told us from the beginning that the moment the emergency came to test the strength of our government it would fail; and they consoled themselves and cheered each other by repeating, during the first two years of our war, the comforting assurance that the Republic had failed, and that their predictions had been fulfilled. There is an adage that ‘he laughs loudest, who laughs last.’ [Laughter and applause.]

“I think, according to present indications from the same quarter, that they have made up their minds that this government has not failed. It proved its

strength in the crisis through which it passed; and there is not a single Englishman to-day who will not acknowledge to you that his own country could not thus go through a four years' war involving anything like the difficulties from which ours has successfully emerged. This government is to-day the strongest government in the world, because it has the will of the people for its basis and the Constitution of the United States for their guide. [Loud cheers.] The Federal Government is strong enough for all emergencies. We do not need to add to its strength, for that has been shown to be sufficient by the last four years of war. But we do need to maintain intact and in all their integrity those rights of personal freedom, control of personal action, laws of property, laws of crime, everything relating to localities, — we do need to maintain those rights in the States with a jealous eye. [Applause.] It may seem very well to announce to-day the policy and propriety of exercising absolute power in Washington over the rebel States because they have been in rebellion, and because we have by force subjected them to our will; but if you once establish the idea that the government can exercise absolute authority, without regard to the restrictions of the Constitution, over any one State, and you will find that every other State as well may be subjected to the same power under other circumstances. To-day it may be South Carolina, but who will say that to-morrow it will not be Massachusetts or New York? [Applause.] It will depend entirely upon the accidental ascendancy of political parties what States shall feel the power so created. We cannot afford to have the rights of States thus placed at the absolute control and discretion of any party at any time in Congress or elsewhere. We have a written charter of liberty — a written guide for our conduct; and that man to-day is the best statesman — that man from the day our country was formed has been the best statesman — who adheres most closely and rigidly and conscientiously to the letter and the spirit of that great instrument. [Applause.]

“Now, fellow-citizens, I for one believe these things to be true; so believing, I have acted upon them thus far during my short career in Congress, and I shall endeavor to do it to the end. [Cheers, and a voice: ‘And we will stand by you!’] I have no fears of public disapproval, not because I do not respect the popular will, for there is nothing to which I bow with more absolute deference, but because I have the most unconquerable faith that the people, the real government of this country, is a people of intelligence, of wisdom, of patriotism, and of devotion to the principles of the Constitution. And I know that in the end those principles will be maintained. I deprecate any temporary disturbance of the harmony that should exist among people having the same objects and the same purposes in view. But better even that, than a permanent departure of our government from the constitutional path in which alone they can walk with safety and with honor.

“There is a great deal said about the disloyal spirit of the Southern States. I have no doubt that there is a great deal of discontent and ill-feeling toward the North, and perhaps toward the government of the United States, in the South, but I have known and watched carefully this state of facts. When the armies of the Southern rebellion first surrendered, the whole Southern people surrendered with them. There seemed to be an entire abandon-

ment of everything which they had ever claimed as peculiarly belonging to them, and a submission to the will of the United States as a conquered people. That lasted all through the summer; during all the time that the President was directing the action of the government, and all the time that he was imposing upon them obligations, and advising them as to what measures they had better take. I say their relations with the government, all the time that he was thus using his power as the Executive to set in motion the machinery of the State Governments, and bring the South into practical relations with the Federal Government, this feeling of loyalty, this desire to return, this willingness to be on the best terms with us in the North, constantly increased in the Southern States. I am not prepared to say that it is as strong to-day as it was four months ago; but I cannot help saying that it began to decay just when Congress met, and began to denounce them, and repel all their efforts to return to the Union they had endeavored to destroy.

"If, therefore, there is an increase of ill-feeling, my own conviction is, that we may justly ascribe it to the language and action of Congress, and of some presses and men in the Northern States. [Applause.] But suppose it to exist now, and that this is not the cause of it; what is to be done about it? Are we to exclude those States forever from the duties, the power, and the responsibilities of this government? Are we to excuse them from paying their share of the interest and principal of our public debt? Are we never to look to them again to swell the great tide of our commerce, which, before the war, whitened every sea, and brought treasure from the ends of the earth to our imperial coffers? Why, certainly, no one dreams of this. We must collect our taxes there, they say. How? Collect taxes to pay our debts from subjugated provinces at the point of the bayonet, by deputies from Washington, sent down there from the North? Treat them as subjugated provinces, and do nothing toward restoring their prosperity? Why, this is the dream of a madman! Every section of any country that had men in it fit to live, would become exasperated and goaded into rebellion within one year after such a policy should be inaugurated. [Applause.] And we, moreover, should be deprived of the consolation of believing their rebellion wrong. It is precisely that which drove our fathers into rebellion.

"Read the Declaration of Independence, — the recitation there of the wrongs that justified that great revolution, and you will see that they are the identical wrongs which a portion of our people at the North propose to inflict upon the Southern States to-day. If it were right to do this, or if the Constitution gave us power to do it, we could not afford to do it. This government cannot afford to treat with despotic power and arbitrary rule any portion of this nation, no matter how small that part, or how great its sins may have been. [Cheers, and cries of 'Good!'] If this Republic is to live at all through time to come, it is to live as the great exemplar of self-government, where all the subjects of law have a voice in making that law, and in choosing men by whom that law shall be made and carried into effect. And we should do ourselves an infinitely greater wrong than we should do them, if we continued permanently to make laws for the Southern States, and not allow them any influence or voice in the making of those laws.

"I need not tell you that I say this from no sympathy with the rebels who

plunged our country into so desolating and terrible a war. You here, who know and watch my political course, for I am compelled to express my opinions upon public topics from day to day, instead of concealing them for six months, and then adapting them to the emergencies of the occasion [Laughter] — you all know that, from the very day that this war was threatened, I have done everything in my power to enforce its prosecution with the utmost vigor. [Cries of 'Yes, yes!' and 'Good!'] We had one duty to perform, and that was to crush it. When it is crushed, we have another duty to perform. Our lamented President, before he fell by the hands of the assassin, declared that it was our duty now to bind up the wounds of the nation, to take care of the orphan and the widow, and see to it that peace was restored to all sections, and to do this 'with malice toward none and with charity for all.' [Great applause.] It is a sentiment which any man might willingly die by; it is a sentiment which it is every man's duty to live by. [Applause.]

"Now, fellow-citizens, I hope that reflection and the subsidence of passion will lead all our people, in Congress and elsewhere, to see that we are to live with these people of the Southern States who have been in rebellion as fellow-citizens in peace and amity for all time to come. As living under one common flag, we are to see to it that we so cultivate in the minds of these men the spirit of patriotism and of loyalty that when we next meet on the battle-field it shall be side by side under that common flag, battling against despotisms and despotic powers whenever they may threaten our peace. [Loud applause.]

"If we are to have peace at all, we must seek it in the ways of peace, *not in the ways of malice, hatred, and uncharitableness*. We must be willing to let the past bury its dead, and to live for the present and for future generations. We must consult the welfare and growth of the Southern States as essential parts of our common union. We must do what we can to renew and reinvigorate the sources of their prosperity, to build up and aid the new development of industry upon which they have entered, which is as new and strange to them as the climate in which they live would be new to most of us from this Northern sphere. We must aid them, and not check and retard them, in their new career. We hope for such a state of things as will lead men of capital in the North to go down there, mingle freely with their people, and join their efforts for their common good, and that the men at the South shall communicate as freely with the North. With this spirit we shall have no difficulty in restoring more friendly relations than have hitherto existed, for the great source of our dislikes, distrusts, jealousies, and hatreds has been removed forever.

"Why, then, should we not join in this common cause? I believe we have a President who has at heart, more than any other particular sentiment of his being, the purpose to restore this nation to the relations of amity and peace from one end to the other. [Loud applause.] It seems to me that the course he has adopted is not only the wisest, the most just, and most likely to produce good results, but it is the one which in the end must be adopted, for neither Congress, nor any other power, can keep these States out permanently. If this Congress chooses not to admit a State, loyal or disloyal, we shall very soon have a Congress which will do it [Heartily ap-

plause], and one that I am afraid will be much less careful in the distinction it will draw between the loyal and the disloyal than we are.

“This is one reason of my anxiety to have the present Administration and the present Congress bring about that great result. I believe they will do it wisely. I believe they will admit none but loyal men, — loyal to the Constitution and loyal to the Union, — who feel the same interest with us in promoting the common prosperity of our common country. The President proposes to restore the Union by the practical method of admitting loyal representatives of loyal constituents to take their seats in Congress just as fast as they shall be sent to Washington for that purpose. Congress proposes to exclude them — but it proposes nothing else. All its acts are mere obstructions, — purely negative, denying everything and accomplishing nothing. Why does it not bring forward its practical measures? Why does it not propose either to make these States provinces or territories, and govern them accordingly? Why does it not prescribe terms and conditions of admission? Why does it not put into the form of laws some of its theories of dead States, of confiscation, and of government by deputy? Why does it not exercise the power it is so fond of asserting?”

“If the President is a usurper, who has forfeited his head, why does it not impeach him? Why content itself with talking and scolding about what the President is doing, instead of doing something positive and practical itself? Now, my fellow-citizens, you know better than I can tell you that it is with you — the people of the Nation — that the final decision of this great question rests. You are the final arbiters of this great dispute. The destinies of the Union, which your armies have saved, rest upon your wisdom and your fidelity. We, who are in Congress to execute your will, have but a short time to live; our official existence is very ephemeral; our action is really of but trifling and temporary importance. In our two years of service, however badly we may behave, we can really inflict but little injury upon the long life of this great and vigorous nation. Its strength resists our most wicked blows — its vitality quickly heals the slight wounds we can inflict. If we act unwisely, you will very soon replace us by those who better understand, or will more faithfully execute, your wise behests. If we serve you and our country with discretion, with fidelity, and patriotic purposes that rise above all passions and all selfishness, you will give us that approval which is the only fitting recompense a public man can receive for good service to his country and his age. [Loud and long-continued applause.]”

In September, 1866, Mr. Raymond declined a re-nomination to Congress, which had been tendered to him by the Conservative Republicans of New York. The letter conveying the request that he would again permit the use of his name, bore the signatures of well-known citizens, and is here appended: —

“HON. HENRY J. RAYMOND, —

“DEAR SIR: — As the time is drawing near for the selecting of a candidate for the next Congress, we deem it proper to address you as our present Rep-

representative, to communicate what we believe to be the sentiments and wishes of the large majority of the union voters of this District.

“Your constituents fully appreciate the delicate and difficult task which has devolved upon you to perform during the present Congress. New and extraordinary measures have been submitted for legislative action, the very discussion of which might well have appalled the most profound and experienced statesmen; and we venture to say, that no member, however wise and patriotic, if at all active and outspoken, has been able to so shape his speeches, or his votes, as to meet with the unqualified approbation of all his constituents. Amid all the diversity of opinion upon the great political questions of the day, we have watched with no little solicitude your legislative career; and we have found you ready and able in debate, and fully equal to any emergency. You have, under the most trying circumstances, given utterance to your sentiments, and have sustained your views with marked ability and power. We admire your acknowledged statesmanship, and have implicit confidence in your political integrity, while we are proud to be represented by one who, in so short a time, has attained so high a rank in our national councils.

“In view of these facts, together with your ripe experience as a legislator, your thorough knowledge of the very important questions which still agitate and divide the people, we think it highly desirable that you should be continued in the office which, thus far, you have so ably filled.

“We, therefore, beg leave to ask the privilege of presenting your name as a candidate for re-election. Should you be the choice of the convention of the Sixth Congressional District, we doubt not that you will receive, at the polls, the cordial support of all who favor the union, peace, and prosperity of our common country.

“We remain, yours, etc.,

T. E. STEWART,
 PETER GILSEY,
 R. M. BLATCHFORD,
 E. C. BENEDICT,
 ANDREW CARRIGAN,
 PAUL S. FORBES,
 A. W. BRADFORD,
 ISAAC N. COMSTOCK,
 CHARLES LEFLER,
 JOSEPH P. BULL,
 M. FRELIGH, M.D.,
 W. F. HAVEMEYER,
 IVERSON W. KNAPP,
 HERMAN G. CARTER,
 STEPHEN A. PIERCE,
 M. WICKHAM,
 W. O. DENNISON,
 CHARLES JOHNSON,
 WILLIAM YOUNGS,
 SAMUEL LONGSTREET,
 JAMES W. BOOTH,
 JAMES HARRISON,

E. DENNISON,
 JOHN CREIGHTON,
 OBADIAH N. CUNNINGHAM,
 JEREMIAH PANGBURN,
 DAVID HUYLER,
 JOHN P. HONE,
 WM. H. ALBERTSON,
 ROBERT BEATTY,
 EDWARD GRIDLEY,
 ROBERT R. CARPENTER,
 JAMES WARES,
 GILBERT J. HUNTER,
 CYRUS W. PRICE,
 WM. SQUIRE,
 H. S. GOUGH,
 JOS. BRITTON,
 STEPHEN PELL,
 GEORGE B. DEANE,
 JOSEPH SOUDER,
 WILLIAM G. SPENCE,
 J. MCFARLAND,
 THOMAS LAUGHERY,

JAMES YOUNG,
 THOMAS L. BEEBE,
 B. SKAATS,
 JAMES MORE,
 ALEXANDER SHAW,
 ALEXANDER PAIRSON,
 JAMES L. SELDEN,
 JAMES J. DAVIS,
 WILLIAM E. DEVLING,
 JOHN ARMSTRONG,
 JAMES MAGEE,
 J. DENNISON,
 WILLIAM TAYLOR,
 WILLIAM FITTO,
 G. RENGERMANN,
 G. TIERMAN,
 CHARLES H. MORRISON,
 JAMES W. FARR,
 RICHARD T. EDWARDS,

ROBT EDWARDS,
 GEORGE STARR,
 MAJOR W. EDWARDS,
 GEO. W. BUSH,
 GOVERNEUR M. CRIST,
 JESSE TRAVIS,
 EDWARD F. BROWN,
 JACOB VARIAN,
 MARK M. DOBSON,
 EUGENE WARD,
 SEWELL V. DODGE,
 HENRY WILSON,
 JOHN SHANNON,
 GEO. W. BOGERT,
 J. HENDERSON,
 J. C. GREGORY,
 WM. M. WHITNEY,
 WM. H. VAN TASSEL,
 THOS. F. DEVOE."

Mr. Raymond's reply was a stronger justification of himself than that contained in the speech before quoted; the personal character of a correspondence giving him opportunity for explanation. It is due to his memory that this letter should be placed upon record:—it is also but a simple act of justice for the reader to weigh carefully the reasons assigned by Mr. Raymond for his course in Congress (especially in relation to the Freedman's Bureau bill), and in the Philadelphia Convention. The letter was as follows:—

“NEW YORK, Saturday, Sept. 15, 1866.

“GENTLEMEN:—I thank you most heartily for the expression of regard and confidence tendered to me as your Representative in Congress. I cannot accept as deserved the compliments you pay me upon the manner in which the duties of that position have been discharged; but I do accept, and am very grateful for them, as evidences of the kindly interest with which you have followed my course, and of the charitable construction you have placed upon my acts. I am especially gratified by your appreciation of the extreme difficulties of my position, and of the impossibility of meeting the wishes and expectations of all classes of those who gave me their votes, without sacrificing that independence of judgment and of action which alone makes a seat in Congress either useful or desirable.

“When I was elected, in the fall of 1864, the war had not closed, but its end was foreseen, and the question of restoring the Union had engaged a large degree of public attention. President Lincoln, in the previous March, had tendered full amnesty and pardon to such of the inhabitants of the States in rebellion, with certain specified exceptions, as would take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, and to the laws of Congress, and the proclamations of the Executive on the subject of slavery.

and had pledged himself to recognize and guarantee, as Republican in form, any State Government which such inhabitants might set up, provided they were in number one-tenth of the votes cast in such State at the election of 1860. In June, the National Union Convention at Baltimore adopted resolutions substantially indorsing the principles upon which this action of the President was based. My own position at the time of my nomination was well understood. I had repeatedly declared, in speeches and from day to day in the columns of the newspaper under my control, that *I regarded the States as still within the Union; that the war had in no respect enlarged the authority conferred upon Congress by the Constitution, and that the suppression of the rebellion would fully re-establish the supremacy of that fundamental law.* I was elected upon this platform, and so far as I was aware no one questioned its substantial accord with the sentiment of the Union party. When Mr. Johnson became President, after the close of the war, he made it the basis of his official action, and set in motion the machinery of government in the Southern States in conformity with its requirements. And the Union State Convention held at Syracuse, in September, 1865, passed a resolution approving his action, indorsing the policy of kindness and conciliation out of which it grew, and pledging to it their support.

“When I took my seat in Congress I endeavored to act in conformity with these principles to which I was thus pledged. *When a difference of opinion arose between the President and Congress, I did all in my power to prevent its growing into hostility, for I could see nothing but ruin to the Union party and disaster to the country from such a breach between the two departments of the government.* I soon found myself separated in this course from the majority of the Union party; but as the differences did not seem to be vital, or to touch principles upon which the party had ever pledged its members, I continued to act upon my own convictions of justice and of public policy. I voted and spoke always for the recognition of all the States as States in the Union, — for recognizing as valid the State Governments organized within them in conformity with the proclamations of Presidents Lincoln and Johnson, — and for completing the restoration of the Union by admitting to their seats in Congress loyal members elected from loyal States, who could take the oath prescribed by law, in conformity with what seemed to me the intent and meaning of the Constitution of the United States. And to prevent any intrusion into the preliminary action of Congress of men who could not take the oath prescribed by law, I introduced a resolution instructing the Judiciary Committee to report a bill changing the existing practice in regard to the admission of members. At present any person whose name the clerk may put upon the roll is permitted to vote for speaker, — the most important act of the whole session, — even if he should refuse the next hour to take any oath at all. I proposed to require every member to take the oath before taking any part in the organization of the House. This, it seemed to me, would afford a full and sufficient safeguard against the admission into Congress of men who had taken an active part in the rebellion. The resolution passed the House; but the committee did not see fit to report the bill.

“Upon incidental questions that arose during the session, I endeavored to act with a wise regard to the public welfare. *I voted for the Freedman's Bureau Bill when first presented, because I deemed the object it sought to secure,*

namely, the protection, support, and care of the enfranchised slaves, to be of the utmost importance. When it was returned by the President, I acquiesced in his objections, mainly in consideration of the fact that the existing law would not expire until April, 1867, and that the present Congress would have an opportunity, after a more full experience of its operation, to take such action in regard to it as that experience might show to be essential.

“The Civil Rights Bill, when presented in the form of a law, I did not support, because I believed, in common with Messrs. Bingham and Delano of Ohio, Hale, of New York, and other able Union lawyers, all of whom spoke against it, that some of its provisions were not warranted by the Constitution. But I introduced a bill to attain the same practical object by declaring all persons born on the soil of the United States to be citizens thereof, and entitled to the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens, in courts of law and elsewhere; and when this provision was afterward presented as an amendment to the Constitution, I gave it my support, in speeches and by my vote.

“And when, after a delay which seemed to me utterly needless, and calculated only to excite public passion and embitter political feeling, the Reconstruction Committee reported the Constitutional Amendment now pending in the several States for ratification, I gave it my vote, as I had previously supported every principle it embodied in various speeches during the session. I think the main principles of that amendment eminently wise and proper, and I trust it will be adopted by this State, and by enough others to become part of the fundamental law. I think every native of the country should be a citizen of the country; that the inequality of representation as proportioned to voters now enjoyed by the South should be corrected; that the prominent participants in the rebellion should not share for a time at least in the Federal Government; that the rebel debt should never be recognized or paid; and that Congress should have power to make laws to carry these provisions into effect.

“While I concurred with the Union party in Congress in supporting the amendment in which these principles were embodied, I differed from some of them in thinking that it should be submitted to the free judgment of the people in all the States, and that its adoption should not be made a condition precedent to the admission of any State into the Union, or of its representatives into Congress. I can find no authority for such a requirement in the Constitution of the United States, and I do not feel at liberty, as a member of Congress, to exercise a power not conferred by that fundamental law

“I believed at the outset of the session that Tennessee and Arkansas were loyal States; that they had loyal governments, republican in form, with loyal State officers throughout; that the Senators and Representatives they had sent to Congress were loyal men, who could take the oath required by law; and that they ought to be admitted to their seats in either House, if that House should find, upon due inquiry, that they had been elected, returned, and qualified according to law. I did all in my power to secure that result. I believed that such action promptly taken would avert the peril, since become so real and so disastrous, of a serious breach between the executive and legislative departments of the government; and that it would, without in-

volving any risk of admitting unsafe or dangerous men into Congress, give such an example to the other Southern States, as would encourage the sentiment of loyalty among their people, and bring them into accord, sooner or later, with the sentiment and policy of the Union party.

"I continued my efforts in that direction, in Congress and out, so long as I deemed them likely to be of the slightest service to the Union cause; and, as an important step toward that result, and *toward the re-establishment of a common Union basis, upon which men of all sections could again unite in common efforts for the common good, I took part in a convention of delegates from all the States, held at Philadelphia, in August last, and endeavored, in concert with others, not without a gratifying degree of success, to secure the assent of leading men from the Southern as well as from the Northern States, to the principles decided by the war; to the abandonment of the doctrine of secession, to the extirpation of slavery, the perpetual integrity of the Union, the supremacy of the Constitution, the invalidity of all obligations incurred in rebellion against the government, the inviolability of the public debt, and the equal protection by law, and by equal access to courts of law, of all the citizens of all the States, without distinction of race or color. I believed, and still believe, that in this I was endeavoring to do a useful and patriotic work, fully in harmony with the principles of the Union party.* Nor in seeking to promote such concert of action as should, while accomplishing these results, also lead to the election of members of Congress favorable to the admission of loyal men from loyal States, did I deem myself to be taking a course hostile to any purposes or objects which that party has ever sought to attain.

"Whether the policy I have thus pursued was wise and just, or not, it is for others rather than me to judge. I believed it at the time to be eminently conducive to the peace and prosperity of the country. And I still think, that if the President and the Union majority in Congress could have agreed upon the admission of representatives from loyal States, who can take the oath required by law, they could also have agreed in support of the Constitutional Amendment, and of such other measures as might be required to satisfy the solicitous loyalty of the country, and re-establish its free institutions upon a solid and permanent foundation. And if such an agreement could still be reached, in spite of all that has occurred on both sides to exasperate public sentiment, I should not even yet despair that it might be followed by such results.

"But the possibility of such concord of action between the President and Congress grows more and more remote. The rash and intemperate action by which leading men in Congress attempted to coerce or override the President has produced its legitimate results. The old contest between the Union party which stood by the government in its struggle with the rebellion, and the Democratic party which resisted and opposed it, is again renewed. I am disappointed that the controversy should have taken this shape. I hoped and believed that the differences of opinion, on the subject of representation, which prevailed in the Union party, could be settled within its own ranks, without involving the risk of bringing the Democratic party again into power. Everything that I have done has been done in that hope and to that end. In the face of evident and signal failure, I claim nothing for my action but a sincere purpose to promote the peace and harmony of the

whole country, by extending over the whole country and nationalizing the principles established by the war. I acted according to my best judgment, — confirmed by that of men to whose wisdom and patriotic devotion to the public good I have been accustomed to defer during the whole of my public life. If I erred in this I am consoled for my error by your kindly construction of its motive, and by your recognition of some degree of independence as not unbecoming your Representative in Congress.

“You have assumed, and with perfect justice, that I am now as I was when elected two years ago, — as I have always been, and shall always remain, — a member of the Union party, holding the faith as declared in its conventions, seeking its welfare, and striving for advancement and reform, in everything touching the public good, through its agency. *With the Democratic party, as it has been organized and directed since the rebellion broke out, I have nothing in common,* and should regard it, and should regard its re-established ascendancy in the government of the country, State or national, as a public calamity. There are no perils impending over the country which demand resort to so desperate a remedy, or which can be averted by it; and I have implicit faith that the people, while checking the excesses of rash and extreme men in the Union party, will still commit to its hands the restoration of the Union which its courage and devotion have saved.

“I am greatly obliged to you for your request that I would allow my name to be used as a candidate for re-election. But there are many considerations which would render this unwise. My past action does not command the approval of a large body among those who originally gave me their votes; and apart from such approval, so far as it can be had consistently with proper independence of personal opinion, *a seat in Congress ceases to have for me any attraction, or to offer any opportunity for useful public service; and I shall best consult my own self-respect, as well as the sentiments of my constituents and the interest of the Union cause, by withdrawing my name from the canvass altogether.* This involves no special sacrifice on my part, as I shall easily find opportunities, whether in office or out, for promoting Union principles, and for evincing my gratitude to you for the kindness and confidence with which you have sustained my efforts hitherto.

“Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

“HENRY J. RAYMOND.”

As a part of the history of the time, and also in explanation of the bitter hostility which followed Mr. Raymond to his grave, the editorial comments of the *Tribune* on the foregoing letter should be preserved. Mr. Greeley, in 1866, represented the extreme Northern sentiment, and the *Tribune* was the mouthpiece of the party which threw Mr. Raymond overboard. The expression of that journal was, therefore, the expression of the most relentless of Mr. Raymond's opponents. While the War lasted, Mr. Greeley had counselled the necessity of making peace with the rebels, and had fallen into a tremor

of apprehension in 1863; but when the sun again shone from behind the cloud, he grew brave, and attacked Mr. Raymond in the following terms:—

“MR. RAYMOND AGAIN WITH US.

“Mr. H. J. Raymond’s elaborate letter declining a nomination to the Fortieth Congress is before us; and, if it were simply an apology for his course, the Union party would cheerfully accept it. But, in attempting to excuse his errors, Mr. Raymond aggravates them. He has chosen to rehearse his recent career, when he might far better have left so delicate a matter alone. A partial confession is worse than none.


“That Mr. Raymond frequently voted in Congress with the Union party, we know; and that is the very fact which made his subsequent opposition to its principles a political crime. Had he been elected as a Copperhead, no one could have complained that he acted as a Copperhead, and had Judas been one of the Pharisees instead of one of the disciples, he would not be the worst example that Presidents and Congressmen can follow. It will hardly do to plead past fidelity to a party as an excuse for present treachery. Yet this Mr. Raymond does without blushing. He voted for the Freedman’s Bureau Bill, because he believed its object of the utmost importance; he sustained the President’s veto, because the existing law will not expire till 1867. How easily an excuse is found when it is needed! Mr. Raymond, on the same principle, voted for the Constitutional Amendment, affecting now to believe its provisions necessary to the safety of the Union, and yet sought to obtain the admission of the Rebel States without requiring that they should ratify it. Did he not know that they would *never* ratify it, could they get back into the Union without? We thought it was only Mr. Johnson who used the stultifying argument that the Rebel States should have a voice in determining the penalties of Rebellion, as if a criminal at the bar should also be a member of the jury. The Constitutional Amendment owes Mr. Raymond nothing; but its enemies are indebted to him for the direct encouragement he gave them at the Philadelphia Convention. When his address declared that Congress had no right to require its adoption of the Rebel States, he yielded the vital point in the whole struggle.

“But Mr. Raymond’s letter is more of a desultory narration than an argument, and need not be more closely followed. The gentlemen who offered him the chance of a nomination complimented his statesmanship before they had read his reply, or they might have been more chary of their praise. Statesmen rarely vote for a bill, and then to sustain a veto thereof, and the country has not yet forgotten that, in 1864, Mr. Raymond opposed the Constitutional Amendment abolishing slavery, on the ground that it would divide the Union party. That was the grand measure that recreated it, and placed it high above all danger of dissolution. His present regrets that the party is divided are unnecessary; for the desertion of Mr. Johnson and his car-load can scarcely constitute a division, even in the opinion of their warmest admirers. That he believes the success of the Democratic party would be a national calamity, we are glad to know, and only wish that he had thought

so when he tried to secure Gen. Dix's nomination at Albany. Finally, in the enumeration of his reasons for declining a nomination for Congress in the Sixth District, we are compelled to think he has omitted the most potent, — that he had not the slightest chance of getting it.

“Yet we rejoice, for his sake as well as the country's, that Mr. Raymond's unquestioned talents and industry are henceforth to be employed to sustain and strengthen the great and patriotic party he so recently sought to destroy. Of that party, the Republic has still urgent need; nor will its mission be complete till the full rights of citizenship are secured to every native and every naturalized citizen of the United States, and from the St. John to the Rio Grande, from the Bay of Fundy to Puget's Sound, there shall be no degraded caste, no unfranchised people, but the rights of the whole American people shall have been forever placed under the protection and safeguard of the votes of each and all.”

A careful comparison of Mr. Raymond's letter with the hostile criticism upon it, shows, on the one hand, that while Raymond was actuated by motives unquestionably pure, his natural tendency to temporize led him into acts more merciful than just; and, on the other hand, that the very frankness of his admissions, and the earnestness of his apology, were received with derisive mirth by those who exulted over his political downfall. If there was error on one side, there were also discourtesy and injustice on the other. Acknowledgment of a fault is, by common courtesy, accepted as the end of controversy; but, in the case of Mr. Raymond, his enemies refused him even this grace.



MR. RAYMOND'S SANCTUM IN THE PRESENT TIMES BUILDING.

CHAPTER XIX.

OUT OF POLITICS, AND BACK TO JOURNALISM.

MR. RAYMOND'S WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC LIFE, AND HIS RETURN TO EDITORIAL DUTY—DEPARTURE FOR EUROPE IN 1867—A FAREWELL DINNER—LETTER FROM REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER—SPEECHES BY MR. DANA AND MR. ROOSEVELT—A JINGLE OF RHYME—SPEECH BY MR. RAYMOND—THE PRESS DINNER TO CHARLES DICKENS—MR. RAYMOND'S SPEECH—INCREASED VALUE OF THE TIMES.

At the close of the Thirty-Ninth Congress, Mr. Raymond returned to New York, to resume his duties as Editor of the *Times*. That paper had become exceedingly profitable, — partly through the personal exertions of Mr. Raymond in a period of sixteen years, and partly through the energy and well-directed skill of its publisher, Mr. George Jones.* Under all circumstances, it had been a good newspaper; and even at the time when Mr. Raymond himself suffered temporary eclipse, in consequence of his political mistakes, its readers looked to it for early intelligence of the actions and the thoughts of the world. The work upon the *Times*, regarded simply as newspaper labor, was uniformly good: — its Editor fell into errors of opinion, and his editorial utterances were sometimes distasteful to his friends; but the paper suffered no losses so severe as those which had previously been inflicted,

*In the chapter entitled "The Foundation of the New York *Times*," mention has been made of the earlier financial relations of Mr. Jones and Mr. Raymond. It is proper to add that a long and close personal friendship had preceded their partnership; and that their mutual confidence and respect continued unimpaired until the hour of Mr. Raymond's death. Mr. Jones is a native of Vermont, and has been actively engaged in business, chiefly in Albany and New York, since the year 1833. His capacity, integrity, and experience have been of untold value to the *Times*.

through similar causes, upon its older contemporaries. At last, convinced of the errors into which he had been led, Raymond relinquished the pursuit of political honors forever, when he had finished his term of office as a Representative in Congress, and went back to the office of the *Times*, — once more a journalist, never again to be a politician. Unhappily for himself, and unhappily for his friends, his days were already numbered.

Exhausted by his long and exciting struggle in the political field, worn by anxiety and chagrin, and yearning for rest, he resolved to pass a few months in Europe in the companionship of his family, whose members had been domiciled in Paris for several years. On the eve of his departure, in the early summer of 1867, he was tendered the compliment of a farewell dinner, by a large number of his fellow-journalists and others. The banquet was given at the Athenæum Club House in New York, and Mr. Charles A. Dana presided. Reverend Henry Ward Beecher, unable to attend, sent the following graceful letter : —

“PEEKSKILL, Thursday, July 11, 1867.

“HON. CHARLES A. DANA :

“DEAR SIR : — It would give me pleasure, if I were in town, to accept your invitation to a dinner in honor of Mr. Raymond, before his departure for Europe.

“His services to the country during the great struggle which has changed the history of this nation were such as to entitle him to the gratitude of every patriot. I shall not forget the dark periods of that struggle, and I know who they were who animated the courage of our citizens, who, without wavering, maintained hope of a favorable result, and labored intelligently and bravely for it.

“The first critical period was that between the election of Mr. Lincoln and his inauguration, when every effort was made to intimidate the Republican party, and to induce them to relinquish, by a base compromise, the advantage gained by the verdict of the people, after a fair and unexampled canvass. Our second dark period extended between the first battle of Bull Run and the battle of Gettysburgh.

“I desire to express to Mr. Raymond my gratitude for his firmness, sagacity, and undeviating courage through these trying periods. Courage is easy now. The whole world is at our back. Then the world was against us; defeats lowered, and victories lingered. Courage then was worth arms and armed men to a cause which was to triumph only through much tribulation

"I beg you to convey to Mr. Raymond the expression of my esteem, and my best wishes for his prosperous voyage and speedy return.

"I am truly yours,

"HENRY WARD BEECHER."

After the reading of this letter, speeches were delivered by several gentlemen; Mr. Dana leading with a toast in honor of Mr. Raymond, and dwelling with great felicity upon the varied public services of the guest of the evening. Mr. Dana recurred to the period of his first introduction to Mr. Raymond, which had taken place more than twenty years before, in a lumbered and dusty attic in Ann Street (No. 30). The attic was the editorial office of the *Tribune*, and the person who gave the introduction was Horace Greeley. "I remember," said Mr. Dana, "that first meeting with Mr. Raymond very well. I remember that we sat down together, and at once plunged into a long talk on German philosophy and metaphysics; for we were both younger and nearer our college days at that time than we are at present."

Continuing in a vein of anecdotic reminiscence, Mr. Dana, in a peculiarly happy manner, adverted to the uniform kindness and courtesy of Mr. Raymond's intercourse with those he met, and paid the highest meed of praise to the services of the *Times* and its chief, to the nation in its hours of peril and darkness, to the State in its days of embarrassment and turmoil, and to the city of New York at all times when good counsel, sincere advice, and judicious guidance were the greatest need.

Mr. Raymond responded briefly, confining his remarks to a modest recognition of the kindness manifested by the chairman and the circle whose guest he was, and expressed the deepest appreciation of the compliment intended and conveyed by the demonstration of the evening,—a demonstration the more acceptable, because it came from friends, associates, and fellow-citizens of long standing and closest connection.

Brief addresses were then made by Mr. Theodore Tilton, Editor of the *Independent*; Lieutenant-Governor Woodford; Mr. J. F. Bailey; "Private Miles O'Reilly" (Charles G. Halpine, since dead); Mr. Robert B. Roosevelt, and others. Mr.

Roosevelt sang a parting song. "To Raymond on his Travels,"* and then he proceeded to compliment Mr. Raymond

*"TO RAYMOND ON HIS TRAVELS.

(AIR: *Jeannette and Jeannot.*)

- "Oh, your boat is at the pier,
 And your passage has been paid,
 But before you go, my dearest dear,
 Accept this serenade!
 For with friendliness we burn,
 And rejoicing come the rhymes
 To toast the health and safe return
 Of him who rules the *Times*,—
 To toast the health and safe return
 Of him who rules the *Times*.
- "If we all could get away
 From this town of cares and frets,
 To wander round the Elysées,
 And kiss the gay grisettes;
 Such skedaddling there would be
 As was never known before;
 Ten thousand steamers out at sea,
 And not a man on shore!—
 Ten thousand steamers out at sea,
 And not a man on shore!
- "But oh! delusive dream,
 For us no chance remains!
 Mere drudges of the desk we seem,
 With dull and throbbing brains;
 But, though *we* must stay at home
 To earn the painful dimes,
 Let us all rejoice that he can roam,—
 Our brother of the *Times*!
 Let us all rejoice that he can roam,—
 Our brother of the *Times*!
- "Oh, safely may he sail,
 And safely sail he back!
 His virtue, like a proof-of-mail,
 To ward off each attack!
 No beauty of the Boulevard
 Or nymph of other climes
 To win even half a thought's regard
 From him who rules the *Times*!
 To win even half a thought's regard
 From him who rules the *Times*!
- "Were I Marble of the *World*,
 Or young Bennett debonair,
 Do you think I'd see his sails unfurled
 And not his voyage share?
 By this wine-cup in my hand,
 By my hope of famous rhymes,

on the invariably conservative and steady tenor of his views; and said that in particular he desired to thank him on behalf of the property holders of our country for the scathing and superbly logical exposures and denunciations of agrarian and Fourierite-socialistic views which had been recently promulgated, in the far West, by Senator Wade, of Ohio. It was time, said Mr. Roosevelt, that the agrarian and revolutionary follies should be checked. It was time that no man capable of stirring up strife between these two great natural allies, capital and labor, should continue to be honored with the confidence of the American people. There were so many thousands, however, of the landless and thriftless whose votes could be secured by this species of demagogism that he thanked the *Times* and its Editor with all his heart, and all the tenderest sympathies and emotions of his breeches-pocket, for the frank, fearless, and able stand which had been taken in that paper against the first authoritative exposition of these chaotic and atrocious doctrines. He thanked Mr. Raymond for the conservative tendencies which could not see in the addition of four millions of ignorant blacks to our voting population any certain or assured blessing, or any additional guaranty for the security of our national debt.

Mr. Raymond thanked Mr. Roosevelt for the intended compliment expressed, but declined to accept the greater part, for it was, in his own judgment, undeserved. While correcting Mr. Roosevelt's errors, also, he desired that his answer should cover certain allusions to the "Conversatism" of the *Times* which had been made by Mr. Tilton. Mr. Raymond said the current talk concerning "Conservatism" and "Radicalism" was fast degenerating into a new kind of political cant. It was to be supposed that all good men had the best interests of the country at heart; but different methods and seasons occurred to different men as the best for accomplishing their common object. It was a question of time, rather than of

My foot should quit Manhattan strand
With him who rules the *Times*! —
My foot should quit Manhattan strand
With him who rules the *Times*!"

principle. Some men were in favor of sending a locomotive at high pressure after the political millennium, to harness up to it, and bring it along at seventy miles per hour, with a little colored boy seated on the engine's safety-valve. For himself, he could afford to be more patient. There were few things in the world worth impatience, and still fewer worth anger. There were few desirable objects that could be promoted by the introduction or agency of these passions. No differences of political opinion should ever, in the speaker's judgment, be allowed to interfere with social relations; and it was one of the bad signs of the days in which we live, that even so intelligent and worthy a gentleman as his friend, the editor of the *Independent*, could condescend to claim credit for not allowing divergences of opinion, honestly entertained, to be passed as a sponge over the erased and blotted tablet of a friendship which the speaker had prized and should always value.

There was far too much heat in the discussions of our day, continued Mr. Raymond; too little charity for the judgment of others; too great an inclination to "reconstruct,"—not the Southern States, however, but the bed of a political Procrustes in this country of once free thought; a bed into which every candidate for public favor or confidence must fit his pliant limbs, or suffer the torment of a rack that would force the reluctant trunk and members into the exact length and breadth of the moral and intellectual torture-couch. He was free to say that many measures now extolled by certain men as "unspeakable blessings," and as the "salvation of the country in her late peril," still seemed to him to wear an experimental character, from which he hoped the best, and would endeavor to make the best by every energy of his nature; but which he must still decline to regard as other than very hazardous experiments. When we shall have attained our best, when we have our whole system exactly fitted to suit our views, we shall all, if reasonable men, desire to "conserve" that system; we shall be all "conservative." At the very worst, therefore, in a few years, if their views be right, the "Radicals" of to-day will have reached a point at which the full fruition of their aims must compel them to join the ranks of the now despised

"Conservatives." As to the speech of Senator Wade, to which Mr. Roosevelt has so strongly referred, he desired to be understood as having only criticised the propositions of that speech as reported, while at the same time feeling for the general character and capacities of Mr. Wade only the profoundest respect. That speech, delivered in Kansas, had been reported by Mr. Seymour, of the *Times*, and not until long after Mr. Wade had seen it in print was there any disclaimer of the report. In fact, it was not to the report that Mr. Wade objected, but to the interpretation placed on certain of its passages in his (Mr. Raymond's) editorial remarks thereupon. To this interpretation Mr. Wade had very strongly objected, utterly disclaiming any such views; and with him (Mr. Raymond) this disclaimer was as final an abnegation of the hasty and ill-considered words as though they had never been uttered. That the report was correct in letter and spirit, none present who know Mr. Seymour could doubt. But at the same time, though Mr. Wade had not possessed many advantages of education in his youth, there did not then sit in the Senate, and he would even go so far as to question whether there ever had sat there, any gentleman of warmer patriotism, or holding a more disinterested desire for his country's good. To speak of Mr. Wade as one likely to encourage such agrarianism, or Fourierite-socialism, as Mr. Roosevelt had described, would be only to proclaim ignorance of the man's whole character. He was an humble artisan in early life, who had accumulated capital and property by honest industry, and who, therefore, must be opposed to any scheme for plunging back this continent into universal chaos.

Indeed, Mr. Raymond continued, there was less fear of agrarianism making headway here than anywhere else on earth. We effectually block it by the facilities given to every laboring man or mechanic to join the ranks of the men holding capital and property. Between labor and capital, in this happy land, the partition is not much thicker or stronger than a sheet of perforated tissue-paper. Atoms from each side are constantly passing back and forth; now a labor-atom from this side working its way over to the property-side; and now a prop-

erty-atom, in the absence of any feudal laws of entail or primogeniture, gradually gliding back through the perforations of improvidence into the ranks of the laboring and unproportioned poor.

As to his own career in Congress, he could only plead for himself that he had conscientiously striven to discharge his duty according to the best lights given to him by his Creator. On many points he could not agree with his former associates in political opinion; and it is a bitter and unpleasant position for any one to be compelled to fill, when, under the stress of a deep and earnest conviction, he has to fight with former friends, rather than along with them and against old foes. Such as his Congressional career had been, however, it at least thoroughly satisfied him of his unfitness for that particular form of public life, — at least in such times as these, or until more moderate and charitable counsels shall prevail; and it had likewise conferred on him the benefit of sending him back to his editorial sanctum thoroughly cured of any ambition for public life; and thoroughly satisfied that, for him, the happiest, most powerful, most remunerative, and most useful position must be found in the control of such a paper as his friend Mr. Jones had so largely aided to build up for their joint use and profit, and that of their associates, in the *New York Times*.

Mr. Raymond made a pleasant and profitable sojourn in Europe, regaining strength, and reviving cheerful memories. A few months sufficed to restore to his frame its customary vigor, and to his mind its wonted flow. He returned to his desk in the office of the *Times*, restored to full health, and prepared to devote himself to his profession with an ardor not less vehement, because it had for a time been diverted into other channels.

In the winter of 1867–68, Charles Dickens made his second brief visit to the United States; and on the evening of Saturday, the 18th of April, 1868, the members of the Press in New York gave him a farewell dinner. At this dinner Mr. Raymond delivered the following admirable speech, in response to a toast to "The New York Press:"—

“MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN:— It seems to me, as I have no doubt it will seem to every one of you, that the Press of America ought to respond, at this moment, through some appropriate organ, to the noble and generous sentiments expressed by our guest to-night. I have no commission, and no claim, and no right to speak for the Press of the United States. [A voice, ‘Yes, you have.’] I am here officially, and only officially, to speak for a section, a segment, of that great Press. [‘No! No!’] but on behalf of that section, and I think with the assent of the whole Press with which that section is so closely, so constantly, so intimately, and so proudly connected, I may say that we deem it an honor to us, the Press of New York and the Press of America, that we have had an opportunity to greet on this occasion the guest who sits at my left hand. [‘Bravo! Bravo!’]”

“The Press of New York, from its geographical position, to say nothing else, maintains a *quasi* prominence among the Press of the country. That Press has maintained an independent existence, not only in itself, but through its organization. For many years (if I may say *many* in speaking of the few years during which I have been connected with it) it has had an organization in form as a Press Club; and it is among the most pleasant of my recollections in connection with the Press of New York that in that form of organization it has been our good fortune, at various times, to greet as guests, and to entertain, with whatever hospitality we were able to extend to them, gentlemen of distinction and position, who did us the honor to visit us from the countries of Europe. I remember almost the first of those occasions, when that truly great man, then recently expelled from the office of Governor of Hungary, Kossuth, the exile [Applause] came to this country, charmed so many of our people by the sea-shore, and in the depths of the densest wilderness of the West, and in great cities, and everywhere he went, by the silver voice in which he uttered such sweet words in behalf of liberty and freedom, and by that sad, solemn eye with which, as our eloquent orator, Rufus Choate, has said ‘he seemed constantly to be beholding the sad procession of unnamed demigods who had died for their native land.’ He was one of the most honored guests of the New York Press. Then came to us, and honored us by his presence, as he has honored England and the world by his services, that great statesman whom your people, sir [turning to Mr. Dickens], now honor as they honor few among their dead or their living,— Richard Cobden. [Great applause.] Then, too, came to us, and greeted us with the right hand of brotherhood, your great brother in literature, William M. Thackeray. [Renewed applause.] And I may say that of the many things that touched the hearts of our people, none touched them more nearly, or struck home more closely, than the feeling and eloquent words of the heart in which he spoke to us of his brother in letters, Charles Dickens. [Great cheering.]”

“We did not need, sir, that he should tell us how much that name was cherished by the lovers of humanity all over the world, wherever the English tongue was spoken or read; but he never said one word in praise of that name that did not meet with as hearty a response here as human words ever brought from human hearts. He told us then, what was true then, and what has been growing more and more true ever since, that the writings of that illustrious brother of his in the world of letters had done more than any

other event or occurrence, more than any other service which he could call to mind, to make the men of the world feel that they were brothers, that they had common interests, that they were all sons of one father, striving and marching toward one end, and that each deserved and ought to have the love, the sympathy, the cordial good offices and kindly feeling of every other [Applause.] These, sir, are among the felicities of the New York Press. The Press of other parts of the country have enjoyed them also to a greater or less extent, and I know they have all sympathized with the feelings which pervaded our hearts at our good fortune in meeting such men, and hearing them speak such words of brotherly kindness and love. The President, the honorable, the distinguished, and the honored President on this occasion,* [Applause] has spoken in words which I know came from his heart, as they reached all our hearts, of the service rendered the cause of humanity by our guest this evening.

“We are all laboring in a common cause. I think it may be truly said that the Press, the free Press, all over the world, has but one common mission, — to elevate humanity. It takes the side of the humble, the lowly, and the poor — always of necessity, a necessity of its own existence — as against those who from mere position and power hold in their hands the destinies of the lowly and the poor, for whom the Press is instituted. We are all of us more or less directly, more or less exclusively, connected with the movements of governments, — governments of various forms, in different parts of the world, and through different agencies and ways, in that common effort to elevate the great mass of our fellow-men, to improve their material condition, and give them a higher ground to stand upon, and a stronger foot to go through the weary task that all of us, in some degree, have to undergo before we fulfil our pilgrimage here on earth. But it often strikes me, when I think of the labors of governments, and the labors of those who try to aid governments, and when I contrast them with the fruits of the efforts, and the machinery through which literary men labor for the same common end, — it often strikes me how coarse and rude and ineffective is the whole machinery of government to accomplish the great end of elevating humanity.

“It is not through machinery, it is not through organizations, through forms, through constraints, through laws, that we touch the real springs of human action. [Applause.] It is not through those agencies that we learn what it is that elevates humanity, what it is that purifies it, what it is that brings all men to think themselves brothers, and to act toward each other as brothers. It is those who deal with the secret springs of actions who, through the channels of fiction or of congenial and sympathetic human history, touch the springs of the human heart, and make us *feel* as well as convince our intellects; it is those who do most to carry the world on to what we all believe to be its ultimate destination. [Applause.] And certainly in the Press, or out of the Press, in the government, or out of the government, nowhere on the face of the earth, in any form or in any shape, or through any agency, have there lived many men — I might make it stronger, if I did not dislike to appear extravagant — have there lived many men who have touched so nearly the secret springs of action and of character of the human

* Horace Greeley.

heart, and have done so much in that way to bring about that unanimity of human feeling, that cordiality of human brotherhood, as the distinguished guest whom we have here to-night. Everything that he has ever written — I say it without the slightest exception of a single book, a single page, or a single word that has ever preceded from his pen — has been calculated to infuse into every human heart the feeling that every man was his brother, and that the highest duty he could do to the world, and the highest pleasure he could confer upon himself, and the greatest service he could render to humanity, was to bring that other heart, whether high or low, as close to his own as possible. [Applause.] What he has accomplished in that way, — how many human hearts he has thus brought together, — how much of kind feeling he has infused throughout society, among all men, of all classes, high and low, rich and poor, powerful and weak, — how much he has done to infuse into them all the spirit of brotherhood, I know too well the poverty of any language I could use to attempt to describe. [Applause.] But I know that there is not a man here, and there is not a man who has known any man here, who knows anything of his writings, who has made himself familiar with their spirit, or has yielded to their influence, who has not been made thereby a better as well as a wiser, and prouder, and kinder, nobler man. [Loud cheering.]


“Excuse the prolixity into which I seem to be running. I will not prolong my remarks. I only desire to return thanks, on behalf of the New York Press, for the compliment which has been paid it by the assembled Press of the United States. [‘Go on! Go on!’] I think I may fairly claim that the New York Press,—and I know no higher claim that I could put in for it here to-night than this,—that the New York Press from the very beginning, from the time when words first dropped from the pen of our illustrious guest, the New York Press has appreciated them, and I may add, appropriated them [Laughter], and that the fruits thereof are apparent in some of the changes, the improvements, the advances, which he has been good enough to speak of here to-night. We all know his characters. They seem like persons. We cherish them as friends. I feel as well acquainted with some of them, — yes, a great deal better acquainted with some of them, than I do with many of the men whom I meet here on the streets every day of my life. I know I have derived more good from some of them than from any, or at least many, of the friends whom I meet every day. They do everybody good, for they are always cheerful, always hopeful, always earnest, always kind to every one; and, in spite of all we may claim for our Republican institutions and our equality of rights, humanity in this country — I say it fearlessly — owes more of its substantial advances to the writings of Mr. Dickens than even to the Press of New York. [Laughter and applause.] His is a kind of public service, which is done without consciousness, and sometimes without intent. Such a man writes what he knows of men, and what he writes addresses itself to all men. It reaches their hearts, and through their hearts governs their conduct; and that is the only government of conduct worth a straw anywhere. [Applause.] I think often of these things in connection with the noble lines of one of our own poets, speaking of the unconscious work done by the great architect of Rome, in the building of St. Peter’s; and if you will allow me to quote those lines (and I am sure you will thank me for substi

tuting them for anything that I could say myself), I will close therewith. I mean that beautiful passage in Emerson where he says :—

“ ‘The hand that rounded Peter’s dome,
And groined the aisles of Christian Rome,
Wrought with a sad sincerity.
Himself from God he could not free,
He builded better than he knew;
The conscious stone to beauty grew.’ ”

After this, Mr. Raymond seldom appeared in public. Resisting every allurements again to turn aside from his profession, he devoted all his energy to the *Times*; and that journal, under his constant, watchful, and judicious supervision, rapidly gained in circulation, influence, and prosperity. Its shares, nominally valued at one thousand dollars, rose to the value of eleven thousand dollars each; and an offer for the purchase of its good-will and its real property for the sum of one million dollars was unanimously rejected by its proprietors at the beginning of the year 1869. Never, in the whole course of its history, had the *Times* been so prosperous.

But, through one of the mysterious dispensations of the Divine Will which no mortal can hope to fathom, in a moment the guiding spirit was removed.



RESIDENCE OF MR. RAYMOND, 12 WEST NINTH STREET,
New York, —THE PLACE WHERE HE DIED.

CHAPTER XX.

DEATH.

SUDDEN DEATH OF MR. RAYMOND—TRIBUTES TO HIS MEMORY—HIS ENEMIES
CONFESSING THEIR ERROR.

WHEN the skies were brightening, prosperity increasing, and the future giving brilliant promise, Mr. Raymond was suddenly stricken down by Death.

Returning to his residence in West Ninth Street at about twelve o'clock on the night of Friday, the 18th of June, 1869; an attack of apoplexy prostrated him in a moment. Two hours later, his stertorous breathing attracted the attention of one of his children. The alarmed family, hastening to assist him, found him lying in the hall-way, unconscious, and apparently dying. He had locked the outside door, and closed the inner one. The most eminent medical aid was summoned; but he remained unconscious, and died tranquilly about five o'clock in the morning.

Thus ended the earthly life of Henry J. Raymond.

The announcement of his sudden death evoked a unanimous expression of regret. Cut off in the flower of his days, when his position had become assured, when the rewards of his long wrestle with fortune had been obtained, when a career of dignity and usefulness seemed to be opening before him in the profession to which he had determined to devote the remainder of his life, the abrupt ending of his work produced a shock. He had just entered upon his fiftieth year. His frame was hardy, if not robust, and his general health had not been undermined by chronic disorders. He had effected new arrangements in the affairs of the *Times*, through which it was intended to give that journal increased strength and value. His domestic life had

resumed a pleasant aspect, by the reunion of its scattered members after several years' sojourn in Europe. All promise seemed fair; sound health, serene mind, abundant means, the return of children from whom he had long been separated, — all these were his sources of enjoyment, the solacing comforts which Providence had apparently bestowed in compensation for years of poverty, of anxious struggle, and of persevering thrift and industry.

But one heavy sorrow had fallen upon him, in this time of prosperity and hope, in the death of his younger son, Walter Jarvis, who had suddenly been taken away,* in the fifteenth year of his age.

On the 18th of June, Mr. Raymond, accompanied by his daughter, visited the grave of this child in Greenwood Cemetery. The thought did not enter his mind that he himself was never to see another day on earth. That night he died.

On the morning of the 19th of June, the *Times* appeared in mourning for the loss of its Chief; and the following touching tribute, from the pen of one of the editors of that journal who had long been drawn to Mr. Raymond by the closest ties of personal friendship, gave eloquent expression to the general feeling of sorrow:—

“OUR DECEASED FRIEND AND CHIEF.

“The *Times* has suddenly lost its founder, who was also its Editor-in-Chief to the day of his death.

“The grief that overwhelms his associates, as well as the members of his family circle, it were in vain, as it were out of place, to attempt to dwell upon here.

“Mr. Raymond's relation to journalism and politics during the last quarter of a century is known sufficiently well to make it unnecessary for the present writer to say much on this point. Entering into a journalistic career in early life, and at a time when the power and importance of the American Press were far less than what they are now, he at once took a leading part in elevating its position and enlarging its influence. All his vivacity, enterprise, energy, and genius were brought to his editorial duties, — and so were his skill, knowledge of affairs, and scholarship. With great original powers, which were enlarged and cultivated not only by collegiate studies, but by

* February 27, 1869.

literary research and extensive inquiry; — with a fresh and original style of thought and expression, — with the most remarkable intellectual equipoise and self-command, — with the noblest of motives and highest of aims, — he applied his life to journalism. It is beyond our power to estimate how greatly his editorial labors have influenced public opinion, the public Press, and the conduct of public affairs; but we believe that the scope and measure of his influence, as well as its beneficent character and results, have been worthy of journalism in the most exalted view of its purpose. In his more direct connection with legislation and the affairs of State he displayed the same characteristics as appeared in his editorial course. Though youthful in years when elected to the Legislature (of which he was chosen Speaker), and subsequently to the Lieutenant-Governorship (which made him President of the Senate), he soon showed himself possessed of extraordinary ability as a parliamentarian, debater, and administrator. Always ready, always temperate, always self-possessed, always clear-headed and sagacious, always courageous, always of the most perfect integrity and honor, political as well as personal, always free from petty ambition, and incapable of petty or selfish intrigue, always magnanimous and generous, always the true gentleman, — he stood in the foreground of State politics, and showed himself worthy of his place. In later years, when in Congress, with more matured powers and larger experience, he approached, with statesmanship, the great questions of the day; and though, at that time, our politics were characterized by the wildest party excitement, and the bitterest personal exacerbations, he never lost his independence, his courage, or his temper. For conciliation between the warring factions of the party, — for conciliation between the yet warring sections of the country, — for conciliation between the administrative and legislative branches of the government, — he labored constantly and pleaded eloquently and earnestly. As one of the founders of the Republican party, and one of its foremost leaders, — as one of the ablest and staunchest upholders of the government during the war, — he sought to subserve the party's interests; but, still more, he sought to subserve the country's interests, by the adoption of a policy of magnanimity toward the South which should again bring together the whole American people in the ancient bonds of union, fraternity, and glory. It is not for us at this time, or for any man at this time, to estimate the value of his course; but certain we are, that it was inspired by the highest sentiments, and the noblest motives that ever led any man, or any statesman, to earnest labor for the service of his country.

“But it was not the present purpose to attempt anything like a judgment or an eulogium of the public career of our deceased friend and chief. We would rather say a word of him as he was intimately known to us in the relation of chief and friend. A more genial or attractive manhood, a better rounded character, a warmer and truer friend, a more sympathetic and kindly nature, or one more generous and just, we never knew. Amid all the trials of editorial life, he never lost his suavity of disposition. To all his associates and subordinates, whether those employed by his side or those engaged in the humbles duties of the establishment, he was invariably amiable and considerate; kindly studying their interests, delicately respecting their feelings, and aiding in their advancement as though they were members of his own household. So even and perfect was his temper, that but the other

day he referred, as if it were a serious fault, to the fact that he was 'never in a passion in his life, and never had seen anything in the world that it was worth while to get angry about.' His friendships were close and abiding. To the day of his death he retained the friends of his youth, and amid all the vicissitudes of life and circumstance, of parties and politics, of personal fortune or public position, he never permitted aught to interfere with his esteem for those to whom he had once been attached. His sympathetic generosity toward the needy and friendless will be best appreciated by those who were its objects; but we may say that only those who knew him well could credit his long-suffering patience, through years and years, with the innumerable applicants for his help and bounty. Pleasant are the many memories which now gather around him; but pleasantest of all are the memories of his charities and his beneficence and his goodness. Nor did his sympathetic humanity merely assume a personal direction. For all the struggles of the oppressed and down-trodden, for all the efforts of the laboring classes, or of the still poorer and more helpless classes, to elevate themselves or improve their lot in life, — he had a lively and earnest interest. Let there be an appeal to the higher feelings of man's nature, in behalf of any object which his judgment approved, and his response was quick. Not only were his mental faculties balanced in the most marvellous manner, but the balance between his intellect and his feelings was still more remarkable. In forming judgments on questions of public policy, his faculties of perception, reason, causation, and relation, instantly ranged themselves for the task; and in coming to conclusions on questions of right and humanity, his heart was ready as his thought, but quicker and more active in its movements. The result of this perfect balance, in its twofold order, was just instinct and just conduct; justice in his own life and in his relations with his fellow-men. No consideration whatever could ever sway him from the course of integrity and honor. As a journalist, no man ever dared approach him with a corrupt or dishonest proposition. He was as incapable of being reached by the temptations of place and power as by the vulgar temptation of lucre. In journalism, he sought success only by the ways of honesty and justice. Through the very simplicity and transparency of his nature, he was frequently misunderstood; and circumstances were often thought to be the result of his designs when he was even unaware of the means by which they were brought about. Those who best knew his life and character know that he was utterly incapable of even conceiving anything in the shape of what is called a scheme, either political or personal; and he often smiled at hearing that he had set in motion the intricate machinery that had brought about projects of whose origin and very existence he was unconscious. In fact, we never knew a man more completely guileless, or whose life and character better illustrated the virtues of a true and ingenuous manhood.

"His conversation with those to whom he was attached had a wonderful charm. In youth he had been a close student of literature and philosophy; he had enjoyed opportunities of extensive travel; he had possessed the acquaintance and friendship of many of the most distinguished men in this and other countries; and he had the peculiarly valuable knowledge of affairs which is only acquired by intimate relations with them. Though, of late years, he occasionally showed some impatience with metaphysical specula-

tions, he always sought to grasp the principle that lay at the foundation of the actual or the apparent, and his logical habit demanded the reason and the sequence of whatever presented itself. Hence his conversation was singularly rich and attractive; and, at times of quiet and leisure, his monologues would, unconsciously to himself, assume the shape of closely concatenated, admirably illustrated discourses. Humor went along with pathos, reason with fancy, and philosophy and experience gave weight and value to his words. In other directions, as, for example, in his reminiscences of public life, public men, and journalistic incident, he was eminently happy and vivacious; and no one who ever heard will ever forget his sketches of the old days of journalism, or of the scenes of other times, in which figured Webster and Clay, and still later Lincoln and Douglas, beside Seward and many other notable public characters still living. We make note at this time, and in this place, of matters like these; because few of the readers of this journal, and few even of those who enjoyed his outside acquaintance, have ever had occasion to know anything of those more intimate personal traits which made him beloved as a friend as well as admired for his intellect and character.

“In the midst of a great and honorable career, — after having attained a distinguished position; while yet his life was in its prime, and his faculties were in their full strength and order, — he has been suddenly cut off. During the last year or two he has at times had slight indications of what seemed a paralytic tendency in the muscles of his right hand and wrist. But he gave little attention to the matter, and continued actively engaged in his editorial duties up to within a few hours of the time at which his life closed.

“And now, with all the memories and affections of the past, with our hearts overwhelmed with grief, and mingling our tears with those of the bereaved members of his family, — in the name of all his associates, we utter to our beloved friend this last FAREWELL!

“*Vale, vale, in æternum vale!*”

It is proper also to place on record the eulogies which appeared in the *New York Tribune* and the *New York Herald*, — for, in Mr. Raymond's lifetime, the conductors of these papers had been his bitter and unrelenting foes, pitilessly hostile and critically severe in their estimate of his political career and his personal character. In the presence of Death the tongue of detraction became silent, and the old professional and personal rivalries disappeared. The *Tribune* and the *Herald* printed in leading columns the words which follow: —

From the New York Tribune.

“BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

“In the great newspaper offices, in the club-houses, in Wall Street, in committee rooms, in all places where men of culture and of affairs meet together, a little whisper of news came yesterday which awed the bravest and sad-

dened the lightest heart. It was only the news that is told every day of some man well-known to his fellows; only the news that a kindly face would be no more seen among them, a heartsome voice be no more heard, a firm step no longer ring down familiar ways. And yet few faces could be more missed than this one lying upturned in such dreamless sleep; few voices die out of more listening ears; few steps fail whose coming had brought assurance of a friend's approach to a greater host of friends. 'Governor Raymond is dead,' said the brief report. But no man who heard it repeated it in that form. 'A great journalist is dead,' said one voice. 'An able politician is gone,' said another. And so multitudes remembered him, each giving him honor for some distinctive power, but all adding, in softer voice, 'and he had no enemies.' It is a good record to have left. A young man still; an over-worked, over-anxious, over-eager man; ambitious, liking position, liking money, liking all the prizes and all the warm, sweet gifts of life; in close relations with hundreds of men of most different capacities and purposes,— he leaves no personal enemy, not one who shall say, 'He was a false friend.' In his life there was much bitter speech about the politician, the officer, the legislator, the editor, — none concerning the man. Now that he cannot explain ways that seemed unwise or tortuous, his bitterest detractors, touched by the sweet charity and wisdom which are the gift of Death when he takes away one we have known, will be the first to explain the un wisdom or the crookedness. They will see that what they called disingenuousness and timidity might have been a fear of bigotry and onesidedness, and incapacity to regard any step, or declaration, or triumph as conclusive. A poor boy from the country, brown-handed, rustic, he achieved a college training, and came alone to a great city to conquer his place among men. He worked as no digger on the railroads could work. His place was low, his wage was small; but he bent his genius to the occasion as if he had been Premier, and the applause of the world his guerdon. By and by the obscure name was in men's mouths. By and by, again, he was himself a recognized power, and graduated from journey-work into the mastership of his own newspaper. He had conquered his place. Money, and influence, and applause were his. And in these prosperous days no one was so ready to help him who was down, to serve a friend at some cost to himself, to make the places of his associates pleasant and honorable, to do distasteful tasks which other men hesitated at.

"While his hands were full of business, and his life full of activities, the strange, swift order came to him to leave all this for larger occupation. There was no time to say his farewells to old associates; but they crowd to say a tender farewell to him. There is no journalist to take his place; the epitome of his power is written thus. There is no friend to take his place; the epitome of his kindness and loyalty is written thus. Pure sunshine floods the earth this morning, and filters down in mist of gold on the cool, sweet sward of Greenwood, where his eyes last looked on it. The golden mist will float above a new grave, where he shall lie beside the lad he loved so much, and, shimmering in the sun, will seem to make a ladder through the shining air whereon the angels of the Lord shall ascend and descend.

"His hands are folded on his breast;
There is no other thought expressed
Than long disquiet merged in rest."

From the New York Tribune.

EDITORIAL.

"In the death of Hon. Henry J. Raymond, editor of the *New York Times*, the Press of our city has lost one of its ablest and most eminent members. Mr. Raymond, after graduating with distinction at the University of Vermont, came directly to this city in the autumn of 1840, and was employed on the *New-Yorker*, for which he had written with force and spirit while a student. The *Tribune* was started the next April, and Mr. Raymond held the second place on its editorial staff from the outset until the autumn of 1848; when he resigned it to accept a like position on the *Courier and Enquirer*, which he likewise relinquished after a few years; visiting Europe with his family, and being repeatedly elected to the Assembly of our State, whereof he was in the second term chosen speaker. He now started the *Times*, of which he was from the first sole editor, though well served by assistants. He was chosen Lieutenant-Governor of our State in 1854, and elected to Congress from our Sixth District in 1864. Mr. Johnson, in 1867, nominated him for Minister to Austria, but the Senate did not confirm the selection.

"Mr. Raymond's official career, though evincing ability, did less than justice to his comprehensive knowledge and rare intellectual powers. Never so positive and downright in his convictions as his countrymen are apt to be, *he was often misjudged as a trimmer and time-server, when in fact he spoke and wrote exactly as he felt and thought.* If what he uttered to-day was not in full accordance with what he said yesterday, the difference evinced in his essay was a true reflection of one which had preceded it in his mind. He saw both sides of a controverted issue, and, if one of them seemed the juster to-day, the other might nevertheless command his preference to-morrow. *This mental constitution or mental habitude is rare with us, and he would have been more favorably judged as a journalist or politician in Great Britain than in this country.*

"Mr. Raymond would have ranked in England as a 'Liberal Conservative,' and would have followed the flag now of Gladstone, then of Lord Stanley, occasionally siding with Robert Lowe, and again with Beresford Hope. He was sincerely favorable to liberty, reform, and progress; he was no less sincerely averse to rash or violent changes, and anxious that progress should be regular and equable, never shocking a prejudiced nor fluttering a timorous breast. It is perhaps unfortunate, but none the less true, that giant wrongs and strongly fortified abuses are not thus to be overborne.

"There were probably others who evinced greater ability in some special department; but, regarding journalism in its broadest aspects, we doubt whether this country has known a journalist superior to Henry J. Raymond. He was an admirable reporter, a discerning critic, a skilful selector and compiler of news, as well as an able and ready writer. There was nothing in the whole range of newspaper work that he could not do well, and (what is of equal importance) with unhesitating promptness. He was never too sick to work when work had to be done, and always able and willing to do any amount of labor that the exigency might require. Others may have evinced a rarer faculty, which some might term genius; but Mr. Raymond embodied talents that have rarely been surpassed.

"Genial, unassuming, and thoroughly informed by study, observation, and travel, Mr. Raymond was a delightful companion, and his society was widely

courted and enjoyed. A thoroughly capable and effective canvasser, he has for years shunned public speaking whenever it could be avoided, finding enough to do without it, and having no decided love for the sound of his own voice. Snatched away so suddenly, in the prime of life and in the midst of its activities, *his death makes a void that will not easily be filled*, while his widow and children are called to mourn a loss at once astounding and irreplaceable."

From the New York Herald.

"THE DEATH OF HENRY J. RAYMOND — MODERN JOURNALISM.

"One of the central lights of the New York daily press has been suddenly extinguished. Henry J. Raymond, late the active head and controlling mind of the *Times*, is no more. The circumstances of his death yesterday morning, and the leading events of his public career, we give elsewhere in these columns. In the prime of life, and apparently possessing a physical constitution unshaken by his active public labors of a quarter of a century, the announcement of his death was somewhat startling, as another unlooked-for admonition of the uncertainties of this earthly existence. He leaves behind him the reputation of a brilliant speaker, an able and accomplished writer, a good, experienced, and successful journalist, a respected neighbor, and a useful citizen. His name is conspicuous in that distinguished catalogue of 'self-made men,' who, by dint of their individual energy, tact, industry, and perseverance, have risen from poverty and obscurity to influence and affluence. His example will be an encouragement to others setting out — excelsior — from the valley of humiliation for the distant table-lands of distinction and prosperity.

"The history of Mr. Raymond, however, is but the history of many others who have climbed from obscurity to distinction, varying only in its details. He came to this city a poor youth, seeking employment. He chose the career of a journalist, with an eye to practical results, and made it a success. His preliminary training as a reporter and sub-editor qualified him for the undertaking of a new daily on his own account. He was fortunate, too, in the opening presented (1851) for the *Times*. At that period the demand for morning newspapers in the city was greater than the supply. The machinery and facilities of the *Herald* establishment, for instance, were not equal to the morning's demand for the *Herald* at that day. The surplus of readers unsupplied offered a fair margin for a new journal, which it was the good fortune of the *Times* to seize upon, and, in bringing forward this new journal, Mr. Raymond's experience had taught him to abandon the old school of the old stage-coach and sailing-ship epoch of the *Courier and Enquirer*, and to fall in with the new school of the *Herald*, of the new epoch of steamships and railways. The *Times* was established on the *Herald* idea of the latest news, and, as Mr. Raymond comprehended it, upon the *Herald* idea of editorial independence. We had, in fact, opened a new placer, — a regular White Pine silver mine; and numerous diggers undertook to work the vein at various points. Thus the *Times* came into the field, and from the margin suggested to begin with as a penny paper, it gradually built up a constituency of its own, and became an established success. But had we possessed in 1851 our lightning presses and stereotyping facilities of the present day,

there would have been no opening for the *Times*, as there is no opening here now for a new morning newspaper, except upon an enormous outlay of capital, with the hazards of heavy losses for a year or two, and then a collapse.

“The costly machinery and appliances of modern journalism give a security to established popular newspapers which did not exist in the primary formation. Thus a morning daily, established upon all these modern improvements and advantages, becomes a fixed institution to be transmitted from one generation of conductors and readers to another. Hence we may conclude that the *Times*, notwithstanding the death of Mr. Raymond, will go on as before, and that ere long his son, now at Yale College, will put on the harness and worthily maintain the editorial status of his father, with the continued prosperity of his paper. From this modern school of established popular journals it is apparent, too, that as the whole newspaper press of the country has improved, and is improving, it will still advance with the spirit, the progress and the requirements of the age.

“But there is another lesson suggested from Mr. Raymond’s career, which is worthy of some attention. He was a politician as well as a journalist, and in attempting to subordinate his functions as a journalist to his aspirations as a party politician he failed in both characters. ‘No man can serve two masters.’ Mr. Raymond pushed the experiment to the wall; but, driven at last to a choice, he wisely abandoned the rôle of an aspiring party politician for that of the untrammelled editor. The wisdom, however, of the *Herald’s* example of standing aloof from intriguing and treacherous party politicians he had to learn from dear experience. ‘Old Thad. Stevens’ settled the question, and evidently satisfied Mr. Raymond that even in conducting a party journal which pays, it is unsafe to have any other irons in the fire. In the line in which he was successful, and in the political party adventures in which he failed, there are valuable lessons for newspaper men, while in his general editorial course of moderation, dignity, courtesy, and refinement, his example will command universal respect. Indeed, it would be well if with the public press it were the universal law.’

The New York *World*, which had also been engaged in fierce controversies with the *Times*, published the following estimate of Mr. Raymond’s character :—

“Mr. Raymond’s life, brief as it was, covered and was contemporaneous with the rise and growth and progress to maturity of the New York Press such as we see it to-day. He entered the ranks of the profession when it was but poorly and partially recognized as a profession at all; he has fallen in his ripe manhood, conspicuous among its chiefs, when its duties and its responsibilities have multiplied and come into the light, until it is seen and felt of all men to be the truest power for good or evil in the land. His work has been done through years few in number, but in pregnancy of meaning and of influence how grave and full! He rests from it now. May he rest in peace! And well will it be for the American press and the American people, if no journalist of equal ability and influence shall ever in the future less

worthily devote the one and exert the other than he whom we are called now to lay in what men call his 'untimely grave.' "

Tardy justice was done to Mr. Raymond by Horace Greeley, in the passages quoted, on a previous page, from the columns of the *Tribune*. The man being dead, the *Tribune* confessed that in his life he had been "misjudged;" that he had not been a "time-server;" that, "in fact, he spoke and wrote exactly as he felt and thought." Yet, through many years, Raymond was to Greeley "a little villain," — a phrase of *Tribune* invention too frequently used as a term of opprobrium, — a "trickster," a traitor to principle, devoid of honor, destitute of common honesty. Raymond died, and the *Tribune* at once retracted its harsh judgment. The alternative conditions, therefore, are simple: either Mr. Greeley's prejudice had obscured the truth while Mr. Raymond lived, or the truth was insincerely uttered when the man was dead. Let us, for sweet charity's sake, adopt the former, in the belief that the *Tribune* expressed its absolute conviction in the words of eulogy uttered at the last. Tardy justice is better than no justice at all; but the judicial impartiality which is not swayed by personal hatred, nor perverted by political antagonism, is in all cases the best and manliest. Henry J. Raymond was at no period of his career the character described by the *Tribune* and the *Herald*. Living, he was the target for poisoned shafts. Dead, his revilers confessed their error. Human fallibility had thus another illustration.

CHAPTER XXI.

AT REST.

FUNERAL CEREMONIES — ELOQUENT ADDRESS BY REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

THE funeral of Henry J. Raymond, which took place on Monday, the 21st of June, was attended by an immense concourse of relatives and friends. After appropriate ceremonies at the residence of the family in New York, the remains were conveyed to the University Place Presbyterian Church, at the corner of Tenth Street and University Place, the following-named gentlemen officiating as pall-bearers : —

The Mayor of the City,
Maj.-Gen. John A. Dix,
Judge C. P. Daly,
Mr. Thurlow Weed,
Mr. Horace Greeley,
Mr. A. T. Stewart,
Mr. George W. Curtis,

Admiral Farragut,
Maj.-Gen. I. McDowell,
Hon. E. D. Morgan,
James Watson Webb,
Mr. B. F. Tracy,
Mr. M. H. Grinnell,
Mr. C. C. Norvell.

On the arrival of the funeral procession at the church, the clergy, consisting of Rev. Dr. Tyng, Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Rev. Alfred A. Kellogg, and Rev. Dr. Shedd, proceeded to the porch, and there received the remains, which they preceded up the aisle, Dr. Tyng reading the appropriate services. The usual services of the Episcopal Church were then read by Dr. Tyng.

The following address was delivered by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher : —

“ It is not expected that I should indulge in eulogy, nor even that I should attempt to recount the prominent facts in the history of him who is gone. But a few days ago he walked in manly vigor and unceasing activity. But to-day ! Not when he was born, nor when he was in his cradle was he weaker

than now. This man of strength and power in his coffin! So sudden, so instant was his death, that it was as the fall of some mighty tree that had filled the air, wide and broad, with its strength and richness, but in an hour has felt the woodman's axe, and the place that knew it knows it no more, and will not forever. It is seldom that any one passes from life who has held any public position except the one he has built up for himself, on whose departure there has been so much sympathy, and good will, and admiration, and grief, and affection expressed as in the case of Mr. Raymond. He was called to a sphere of irradiation, in its very nature contestant, and was long habituated to discussion in times that have swayed men and the nation to the very bottom. Scarcely had his departure been flashed through the land, than with lightning-like rapidity comes back the testimony of his antagonists and friends to his goodness of nature, to his great capacity and the purity of his motives, and to the good work which he has done in his own community and the nation. It is a testimony of witnesses to the real goodness of this man, that those who were most opposed to him, that those whose hands were lifted with the pen of contest, laid it down to write his eulogy and express their heartfelt grief. He was a man who loved and was beloved. He was a man without hate, and, I might almost say, without animosity; a man the nearer you came to him and the better you knew him, the more you esteemed and loved him. You trusted him if you knew him; if you knew him it was to love him; and it is no small thing to say in this selfish world that his like is rarely met with. There are two things which I wish to emphasize in his public career, and only two. He stood in the widest pulpit that is known in modern society. The lawyer has his narrow sphere of the forum; the representative the close walks of the legislature; the minister has his parish and the walls of his church; and scarcely speaks beyond. But there is, in this day, a pulpit which has no limit. It is that of the Press. It is literally the voice of one that speaks, that is crying in the wilderness. For all creeds, and for all the populace of the land throughout the nation's territories, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, the daily papers speak; and there is not in modern civilization a power which can compare with this. There is no place in the land which has so developed the daily Press as this; and among the builders, — I do not say the founders, — but among the builders up of this foundation stands Mr. Raymond pre-eminently. Aside from his general abilities, he has conducted the Press; and I remark, — and it is most grateful in such a time as this to remark upon it, — I remark how singularly free his whole career has been from bitterness; how he refused to gain strength by the advocacy of passion; how he never used the malign passions, nor appealed to them in others; how reason and the higher moral sentiments breathed in his work; how to you in these higher feelings he uttered himself. And now that he has departed, to look back upon his career, and see how he wielded the mighty engine in behalf of good reason, in behalf of moral sentiments, covers a multitude of imperfections. I have it in my heart also to say, — because, in common with all of you, I have heard his instability cited, — I have heard it said that he was weak and trimming; but I never believed it. I recollect the time when the nation shivered like an aspen leaf, — when one man was worth an army. Those qualities which he possessed above all others were hope and indomitable courage. I remember, and ever shall feel

grateful to this man who pressed to the front rank, and who let his voice ring out clearly, without a moment's hesitation, with the most unceasing energy to the end of the contest, that gave courage and hope and life to this great people. If this was trimming, oh that there had been more such trimmers! That was a service which should enshrine a man's memory in a country's history, and make his name dear to the people. I thanked him for it. I still thank him; and I am glad to make mention of, and bear this testimony to, his fidelity in those days, when to be faithful required greatness of soul. My friends, it seems impossible that we are speaking of one who so little time ago walked among us; it seems impossible that we shall never see again that cheerful face, and take that cordial grasp; that we shall walk with him no more, and hear his counsel no more. But he is gone. He has fallen in the very prime of his life. The next ten years ought to have been worth more to us and to him than the last twenty were. He had taxed the resources of his life unduly, and has been cast down prematurely, because he had not lived within the due bounds of moderation in the use of himself. For obedience to God requires moderation in industries, not inordinate activities, even in the best spheres of life. He cannot repair the error, but it may be that we shall give some heed to it in this place of instruction. My voice can do him no good, or I would pour it out. Though I cannot do him any good by praise or by criticism, yet I hope that there may be some benefit to us in this solemn scene. For myself, for you, for all of us, is herein a lesson. What are those things which engaged his days and hours? What are the cares, the frets, the petty ambitions, the stinging annoyances, the small strifes, the friction, the sweat and tear of life? What are those things as we stand here and look back upon them, measured by this hour that should measure the worth of all things? What are those things that are past? How vain, how useless! What best may we do that, judged by this hour, we shall stand by his memory who lived not for himself, but so associated himself with the welfare of mankind, especially with the community in which he was placed, that the work he leaves behind him shall be his memorial? For no man is great enough to be remembered in selfishness. The things which shall make our names memorable are those things which we do upon others and for others. Not those who have lived for themselves, but those who have lived for others, for their country, for their age. You and I, too, ere long shall come to this hour. You are strong, the blood beats now healthily in your veins; but in a short time you, too, shall be in the coffin, and you shall be followed by your friends to the tomb. Could we, if you were called hence to-day, speak well of your history? Have you earned the right to be spoken of gratefully in this solemn hour, and have your name handed down to others? Are you living above the world while in it, Christianly, purely, and nobly? Are you living with fear of God and with hope of immortality? For surely it is no unmeaning service of respect that you pay to-day. You come here to wear a nobler manliness, to take off the vows of a higher fidelity, and to retain a sense of the urgency and importance of life. You come here to rebuke your passions, to seek the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, to check the uprising of pride and selfishness, and to take upon you the purpose and vows of fidelity to God and man. Blessed are they who when passing away need not the adventitious circumstance of place. Blessed are they whose mourners are those who have been the re-

ipients of their continued kindness; they who have made their memories dear to hearts which they have enriched and blessed. And now, to-morrow and next week his name will be familiar, and many of us will cherish it as long as we live. But this great thundering city is like the ocean, and as when one falls overboard and gives one outcry, and the flying water is disturbed, but the huge waves pass over, the wrinkles are smoothed out, and the sea is no fuller than before, so the great multitude will forget him and pass on. You who are so important to-day may be insignificant to-morrow. You who are taking hold of the very springs of life will drop them from your fingers. Oh that God may grant to us all such a sense of our weakness here and responsibility there, that we may so improve life that when we lay it down we shall take it up again beyond the grave in a land where death is no more, and where there is immortality and blessedness!"

On the following day, the remains of Mr. Raymond were conveyed to Greenwood Cemetery for interment.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE MAN.

MR. RAYMOND'S CAREER — HIS EARLY AMBITION — HIS APPLICATION — NEWSPAPER REQUIREMENTS — THE TIMES — RAYMOND'S TREATMENT OF SUBORDINATES — HIS HOSPITALITY — INCIDENTS — RAYMOND'S TACT — HIS HABIT OF DISCIPLINE — HIS IDEA OF JOURNALISM — HIS ERRORS — HIS METHODS OF LITERARY LABOR — THE BIOGRAPHY OF DANIEL WEBSTER — A COLLEGE ADDRESS — RELIGIOUS FAITH — "GATES AJAR" — DOMESTIC LIFE.

THE reader who has followed the story of Mr. Raymond's career, has found in these pages the record of his successes and his failures. Beginning life as a poor boy, with no advantages of fortune or position; pushing his way steadily forward, in defiance of obstacles which would have daunted a man destitute of the quality of resolution; achieving a marked success in the field of effort he had chosen; falling into error when the temptations of place assailed him, — but through all these phases preserving a simple, manly spirit, unclouded by petty meanness; and a warm heart, unchilled by adversity and unhardened by prosperity, — the Man was better even than the Journalist, in the same proportion as the Journalist was superior to the Politician.

When Raymond assumed the editorial chair as the Chief of the *Times*, he was happier than at any other period of his life. There was good reason for this happiness. He was but thirty-one years of age; yet he had reached the height of his ambition — all the ambition he had then cherished — in becoming the controller of a public journal. His unerring instinct told him his experiment was a success; he knew he possessed within himself the power of infusing into it the elements of strength. Naturally sagacious, he had not only seen the want of his time, but had determined to supply it. A good family newspaper was needed — he provided it. A cheap newspaper was essen-

tial — he sold the *Times* for one cent. Money was wanted to keep the new craft afloat in its early days — the generous zeal of the men who had full faith in Raymond supplied ample means. No paper was ever launched in New York under more favorable auspices.

From the beginning, Raymond set an example of application to all who were in his employ. Only those who have been placed upon the treadmill of a daily newspaper in New York know the severity of the strain it imposes upon the mental and physical powers. There is no cessation. The labor bestowed upon the preparation of one copy of a daily journal is equal to that for which a week is occupied in any other profession, or in the pursuits of commerce; for, the material of each day having been wholly consumed, a series of new processes is constantly required to replenish the exhausted supply. A good newspaper never publishes that which is technically denominated "old news," — a phrase so significant in journalism as to be invested with untold horrors. All must be daily fresh, daily complete, daily polished and perfect; else the journal falls into disrepute, is distanced by its rivals, and, becoming "dull," dies. The older newspapers in New York which have become extinct, lost vitality at the moment when they failed to be representative of the spirit of their time. The railroad, the telegraph, the advance of civilization, the applications of science to the common affairs of life, the resulting growth of inquiry, and the development of broader human sympathies, inspired a desire for daily mirrors to reflect faithfully all that the world was doing — all that men were working for — all that the progress of art and invention, of skill and industry, was accomplishing. Keeping pace in a certain degree with this growing desire, Bennett began the *Herald*; going a step further, Greeley established the *Tribune*; reaching still beyond these, Raymond started the *Times*; and the first lesson he gave his assistants was this: "Get all the news; never indulge in personalities; treat all men civilly; put all your strength into your work, and remember that a daily newspaper should be an accurate reflection of the world as it is." Upon this foundation the *Times* was built, — and the foundation was rock. Some severe tempests have

assailed the paper, in Raymond's time and since his death; but it was so strongly braced at the outset, and it has gained so many solid props from the support of patrons who have clung to it for eighteen years, that its stability is assured. The severe labor performed by Mr. Raymond in the earlier years of the *Times* is a tradition in that office to-day, and the sagacity with which he touched the public pulse gave the paper an impetus which has carried it constantly forward.* He saw that work — hard work — was essential to success; and late and early he was at his post.

In all the departments of Journalism he had become a model workman. Energetic as a reporter, assiduous as a correspondent, diligent as a compiler, impartial as a critic, fluent as a writer, and judicious as a manager, he had gained an enviable reputation in the ranks of the newspaper men of New York, many years before his elevation to the highest place in Journalism. When he became an employer, he extended a hand of manly welcome to the employed; regarding them, in the light of his own experience, as men to whom gentle consideration was due oftener than it was usually given. He was rarely mis-

*The New York *Nation*, edited by Mr. Godkin, long one of Mr. Raymond's assistants in the *Times*, very truly remarked after his death: "Nobody was more profoundly sensible than he of the defects and dangers of journalism as a profession — defects and dangers which nearly everybody sees but editors, and which it would be well if editors saw oftener — the recklessness, haste, indifference to finish and accuracy and abstract justice which it is apt to beget in the minds of those who pursue it, and especially of those who pursue it eagerly. Let us add that nobody has done more, we doubt if anybody has done so much, for the elevation of the profession. In the art of making a good newspaper, we need hardly say, he was a master. The *Times* under his management probably came nearer the newspaper of the good time coming than any other in existence; in this, that it encouraged truthfulness — the reproduction of facts uncolored by the necessities of 'a cause' or by the editor's personal feelings — among reporters; that it carried decency, temperance, and moderation into discussion, and banished personality from it; and thus not only supplied the only means by which rational beings can get at the truth, but helped to abate the greatest nuisance of the age, the coarseness, violence, calumny, which does so much to drive sensible and high-minded and competent men out of public life or keep them from entering it. Moreover, it rendered journalism and the community the essential service of abstaining from the puffery of worthless people, which does so much for the corruption of our politics."

taken in his selection of assistants ; still more rarely did he fail to attach them to himself by ties of personal regard ; and often these ties became strengthened in a bond of positive affection. He required honest work in the hours of work ; but the labor was not inadequately rewarded, and in moments of leisure the pleasant courtesies of society were freely interchanged. In carrying out his idea of conciliation and good-fellowship to its natural conclusion, he fell into the pleasant habit of extending to his assistants the hospitalities of his home. On "reception nights," or at social family dinners, the men of the *Times* often met together as fellow-guests, free from the cares of toil, and, by interchanging the civilities of life, came to know each other, and to feel a kindly interest, each for the welfare of the other, which would never have been excited in the hurry of purely professional routine.

An illustrative incident, revealed since the death of Mr. Raymond, shows that this tender regard for his subordinates continued unabated to the last. In the spring of 1869, calling aside his partner, Mr. Jones, Mr. Raymond spoke of the good service performed by three gentlemen in the editorial department of the paper, and added, "We don't pay them enough ; they must have more ; I don't see how they can live upon their salaries." The partners agreed that the compensation should be increased ; but the sudden death of Mr. Raymond threw the *Times'* establishment into confusion, and the compliment was postponed. It is due to Mr. Jones to add that the desire expressed by Mr. Raymond was subsequently fulfilled to the letter.

It should also be mentioned that, a few months before his death, Mr. Raymond contemplated an annual division of a percentage of the profits of the *Times* among four of his assistants, whose long and faithful service had commended them to his warm regard.

Acts like these not only endear men to those who serve them, but stimulate the recipients of the compliment to livelier interest and increased exertion. The repressive policy, niggardly at best, often defeats its own ends, by repelling good service, or by chilling the ardor of men whose circum-

stances compel them to submit. The open hand and the spirit of generous appreciation, in the end, outweigh the gripping fist and the sordid soul.

Mr. Raymond's tact was one of his most notable qualities. Better than the majority of men, he possessed the power of keeping his temper under control. He was never betrayed by anger into discourtesy. In the hours of business, in the office of the *Times*, the sole indication of a disturbance of his mental equilibrium was his occasional rapid transit through the outer editorial room to his private office, with an emphatic clink of his boot-heel upon the floor, but utter silence of the tongue. Curiosity was at once awakened, and, within the hour, some derelict person, who had made a blunder, or disregarded an order, was seen emerging, discomfited, from the presence to which he had been summoned, — for Raymond was always a strict disciplinarian, and in this fact, coupled with his own intimate knowledge of the proper quality of newspaper work, lay part of the secret of his power. He was not an ignorant pretender, destitute of practical acquaintance with the requirements of editorial labor, but a man who had himself done all that he required others to do, — and he was respected accordingly.

An amusing instance of Mr. Raymond's firm control occurred soon after the removal of the *Times* to the building it now occupies. One of the writers in the editorial force, nettled by the rejection of several articles upon which he had bestowed much thought, ventured a remonstrance, concluding with an announcement of his intention to cease writing, if nothing he had prepared was to be used. Raymond received this declaration with a placid air, mildly remarking, "There is but one Editor of the *Times*; and if your place is distasteful to you, you know you are at liberty to resign." The indignant writer did not resign, but continued in the service of the paper for several years afterwards.

On another occasion, a rebellious reporter, assigned by the City Editor of the *Times* to a task distasteful to him, appealed to Mr. Raymond for redress. He was politely informed, through the medium of a brief note, courteous but sharp, that

his duty was to obey orders, and that, in the opinion of the Chief, the order which had been given was entirely proper. Any repetition of this defiance of constituted authority — it was added — would be regarded as good cause for immediate dismissal. The protesting reporter never again protested; but, on the contrary, became one of the most valuable assistants in the *Times*.

Mr. Raymond's idea of Journalism was broad and generous. In the columns of the *Times* he sought to interpret the popular sentiment, rather than to guide it into unknown channels; honestly believing that the province of the Journalist is not that of the Reformer, but that of the Leader. He had no patience with the class of newspaper editors who seek to destroy, and never offer the faintest practical suggestion for building up. Iconoclasts in every department of human life he abhorred.

His theory, in effect, was, that the Press as a representative power should conserve all the best elements in society; and, while refusing to no Reform a fair hearing, should reject the radical plans intended to uproot all that men hold dear. Acting upon this belief, he opposed the Socialistic fallacies which had been introduced into this country by Brisbane and Greeley. Showing his faith by works, in his later years he battled with the Radical element in the Republican party, which had striven to reduce the conquered States of the South to a condition of territorial subjection. In both these phases of his life he was unquestionably honest. The records cited in this volume show that he was actuated, throughout, by a pure motive; and the admissions of his bitterest opponents after his death furnish in themselves abundant proof that neither the malignity of passion, nor the desire of political emolument, governed his course as a public character.

Nevertheless, justice requires a verdict founded upon actual truth; and it would be idle to deny that Mr. Raymond failed as a politician.

It is a false sentiment which bestows only fulsome eulogy upon the dead. In the imperfect constitution of mankind, great qualities are counterbalanced by the smaller; the good

Brevier Copyright Again,

We publish this morning a second letter of John Jay Esq. upon the general subject of International Copyright. Mr. Jay's special object is to define more precisely than before, his opinion upon ~~the~~ the Author's right of property in his books; and to guard against references ~~upon this point~~ drawn from language used upon this point in his former letter. Mr. Jay holds that an Author has a right of property in his books, without regard to laws upon that subject:— while the opposite we think much the most general correct opinion is, that whatever right he has is the creation of the law. He has

by the evil, — and in the character which is marked by qualities deserving the highest praise, there is inevitably something to deplore.

In analyzing the character of Mr. Raymond, it should not be forgotten that, while he was a man of honest purpose, his mental constitution led him to look at the negative as well as at the positive side of every question. This tendency was illustrated in his political career by his mistaken championship of Andrew Johnson, at a time when the name of the Chief Executive of the nation had become a byword and a reproach. We have shown in a previous chapter, however, that when convinced of his error, he was prompt to make frank confession. The confession atoned, in some measure, for the error; but the evil had been done, and the sting remained.

In his conduct of the *Times*, also, Mr. Raymond was sometimes fickle. He espoused with ardor the cause which commended itself to his better judgment; but was too apt, at times, to discover equally good reasons for taking an opposite course. "This duality of vision," said one of his friends, "was sometimes a torment to him;" and Raymond himself remarked: "If those of my friends who call me a waverer, could only know how impossible it is for me to see but one aspect of a question, or to espouse but one side of a cause, they would pity rather than condemn me; and, however much I may wish myself differently constituted, yet I cannot unmake the original structure of my mind."

This peculiar mental habit detracted from Mr. Raymond's force. Had his convictions been more intense, his will more powerful, his errors would have been fewer. But the errors existed; and they must be candidly acknowledged in making up the record of his life.

Mr. Raymond's methods of literary labor were peculiar. Always rapid in his movements, his hand had been educated by long newspaper practice to obey automatically the quick action of his brain. His thought was logical and clear, and his manuscript, dashed off with scarcely an erasure, and often without revision, went into the hands of the printer, ready for instant use. He possessed the faculty of concentration; holding an

idea firmly until he had given it fitting expression, undisturbed by the confusion and interruptions incidental to a newspaper office.* The accompanying *fac simile* of his "copy"—the first page of an article on the question of Copyright—is a fair specimen of the appearance of his manuscript. The style of the chirography is neat, plain, and simple.

Absorption in more pressing duties prevented Mr. Raymond from accomplishing any great literary work, aside from his contributions to the *Times*. His first serious effort as author or compiler was the preparation of a biography of Abraham Lincoln, published in New York in 1865. He found time, however, to make many elaborate speeches on topics of political importance; and in August, 1850, he delivered the annual address before the Alumni of the University of Vermont, at Burlington. The subject of this address was, "The Relations of the American Scholar to his Country and his Times." It was repeated, by special request, before the literary societies of Brown University, in Providence, at their annual celebration in the following September. In this address, ascending to the higher level of purely literary disquisition, and dealing with questions broader than those which occupied his pen in the daily routine of journalistic duty, Mr. Raymond displayed the resources of a highly cultivated mind, the best qualities of an accomplished rhetorician, and the broad sympathies and philosophical conclusions of a thoughtful observer. The address, interesting alike from its subject and its associations, is republished entire in the Appendix to this volume, as the best illustration of certain mental qualities in

* This was notably illustrated at the time of the death of Daniel Webster. The *Times* of October 25, 1862, contained a biography of Mr. Webster, twenty-six columns in length, every word of which was written and put in type in the few hours which intervened between the receipt of the intelligence that the great statesman was dying, and the moment when the *Times* of the 25th was put to press. Doubt has been expressed, since the death of Mr. Raymond, concerning the amount of this gigantic labor which he performed in person. The writer of these pages was witness to the work. Mr. Raymond wrote exactly sixteen columns of the biography, and two of his assistants indited the remaining ten columns. Mr. Raymond, therefore, actually wrote sixteen columns of the *Times* in less than half a day; and this, too, without the aid of any material previously prepared.

its author, which might have entitled him to rank among the scholarly orators of his time.*

On the 4th of July, 1854, Mr. Raymond delivered an address at the Fourth of July celebration in Geneseo, Livingston County, — his subject being "The Political Lessons of the Revolution." This production was better than the average of Fourth of July orations; but the occasion did not call for any elaborate effort.

Mr. Raymond's brain was tireless. In intervals of repose, after the duties of the day were done, his mind reverted to speculative fancies, or dwelt upon recondite problems. His principal recreation was the study of the metaphysical. This peculiarity, which had made him singular in College, clung to him through life, and it was natural to him to investigate with care all new phases of mental philosophy. His earliest training had been that of the extreme orthodoxy of the Presbyterian Church; and for many years after he had begun to think and act for himself, the old traditions governed his religious belief. Experience of the world, reading, study, travel, comparisons of conflicting systems of theology, subsequently shook his faith; and he was accustomed to speak with admiration of Coleridge's "Friend." The whole tenor of his thought on religious subjects was changed by the perusal of a book which he took up as it fell from the press. The book was "The Gates Ajar," a little volume written by Miss Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, and published in Boston a few months before the death of Mr. Raymond. Strangely impressed by this work, he read it with deep attention, and amended his theory of the nature of the future life. The fact is an interesting illustration of two points, — namely, the readiness of Mr. Raymond's mind to receive new impressions, and the unexpected effects sometimes produced by simple causes. An attached friend of Mr. Raymond — Rev. Henry M. Field — has written the following allusion to this incident: "I spent an hour with Mr. Raymond at his home, when the conversation ran from topics of business to other themes. He had lately had repeated domestic sorrow. But a

* See Appendix E.

few months before he had stood at the bedside of his dying father, and only a few weeks before, in the very house where we sat, a son, to whom he was greatly attached, had given up his young soul to God. Such events could not but produce a deep impression on a thoughtful mind. He told me he had been reading with interest that little book which has made so much stir in certain quarters, "Gates Ajar." He thought our ideas of the future life were too shadowy and dim; and he seemed to be groping after something more definite and real in his conceptions of the invisible world. Little did he think he was so soon to enter it; to pass within the veil, and to know the great mystery. What a solace to think of reunions beyond the grave, which can make the dead forget all the bitterness of past separations!"*

The domestic relations of Mr. Raymond are not properly the subject of extended remark. The veil of privacy should fall upon the home-life of any man, except in so far as the intimacies of the family circle are revealed to the gaze of the casual visitor, or in so far as they become the visible indexes of character.† That Mr. Raymond was kindly to all, is proved by his public record. That he was tender and affectionate in the closer relations of life, all who knew him will testify. He was apparently reserved in his manner towards those whom he encountered in ordinary channels of business, but he once explained that this reserve was the result of a deep-rooted habit of permitting no interference with the duties of the hour; for, like all men who occupy editorial positions, he was daily subjected to annoyance from the inconsiderate. But, once freed from the restraints of labor, he was remarkable for sociality and gentleness.

* New York *Evangelist*, June, 1869.

† While a student in college, Mr. Raymond became enamored of the lady whom he subsequently married, — Miss Juliette Weaver, the daughter of Mr. Warren Weaver, a citizen of the village of Winooski, in Vermont. Of seven children who were born to them, four survive. The oldest son, Mr. Henry W. Raymond, was finishing his studies in Yale College at the time of his father's death; and being soon graduated with the honors of his class, entered the profession of Journalism in the office of the *Times*, where he is now a diligent and faithful worker.

No finer tribute was ever paid by man to woman than that which John Stuart Mill has recorded in the moving Preface to his volume entitled "Liberty," in which he writes: "To the beloved and deplored memory of her who was the inspirer, and in part the author, of all that is best in my writings — the friend and wife whose exalted sense of truth and right was my strongest incitement, and whose approbation was my chief reward — I dedicate this volume. Like all that I have written for many years, it belongs as much to her as to me; but the work as it stands, has had, in a very insufficient degree, the inestimable advantage of her revision. . . . Were I but capable of interpreting to the world one-half the great thoughts and noble feelings which are buried in her grave, I should be the medium of a greater benefit to it than is ever likely to arise from anything that I can write, unprompted and unassisted by her all but unrivalled wisdom."

The man who could truthfully write such words as these is the man against whom the tongue of scandal never plays, — upon whose character no taint falls, — whose life is always pure and sweet and noble, — and upon whose memory there is no stain.

In closing the pages of this volume which bear directly upon the history of Mr. Raymond, a final tribute must be paid to the charming trait of filial devotion which was so strongly marked in his character. His love for his parents was simple and tender as that of a child, and it suffered no change to the latest hour of his life. His mother's words, uttered lovingly while she sorrowed for his loss, form the best epitaph that could be written over the grave of Henry Jarvis Raymond: "HE WAS ALWAYS A GOOD SON."

CHAPTER XXIII.

ANECDOTES AND INCIDENTS.

HOW BENNETT WAS BEATEN AT HIS OWN GAME—THE LOSS OF THE COLLINS STEAMER ARCTIC IN 1854—MR. BURNS'S NARRATIVE OF THE DISASTER, AND HOW THE TIMES SECURED IT—A RIDE IN A HORSE-CAR—ADVENTURES OF A NIGHT—THE ITALIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1859—MR. RAYMOND'S "BRILLIANT RUN"—THE TIMES AND THE "ELBOWS OF THE MINCIO"—A BOHEMIAN TRICK—HOW THE TIMES CARICATURED BENNETT—INCIDENTS OF THE CABLE EXCITEMENT IN 1858—THE WAR CORRESPONDENTS—NEWSPAPER REPORTERS—"JENKINS"—GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS ON "JENKINS"—PRECISION IN JOURNALISM—THE EVENING POST'S "INDEX EXPURGATORIUS."

RETURNING to the consideration of Journalism, aside from the personal career of Mr. Raymond, it is proper to allude to some of the incidents and anecdotes of newspaper life, a part of which are connected with the history of the *Times*.

Although the profession of Journalism is exigent, it has its humors; and many of these arise from the incidents of keen rivalry. One story of the enterprise of the *Times* has never been told, and this is a fitting place in which to tell it:—

HOW BENNETT WAS BEATEN AT HIS OWN GAME.

In September, 1854, the Collins steamer Arctic was lost at sea. Among her passengers were many prominent citizens of New York; and the news of the dreadful shipwreck carried poignant sorrow to hundreds of households. Early in October, when the steamer had been long overdue at the port of New York, on her return voyage from Liverpool, vague apprehensions of disaster began to prevail; and, as day after day passed, without tidings of the missing vessel, wild rumors filled the air. From day to day, the feeling of dread became intensified, and the excitement hourly increased. Finally, late in the night of the 10th of October, a rumor suddenly spread through the city, to the effect that the Arctic had actually been

lost; that there had been a fearful loss of human lives; that a solitary survivor had returned, and that this survivor had brought authentic intelligence of the disaster. This report reached the ear of the assistant who was then in charge of the City Department of the *Times*; but it reached him at an advanced hour of the night, when all but himself had finished their labors, and had returned to their homes. Sending reporters out in all directions, with strict charge to spare no pains in sifting the rumors of the night, he strove to gather authentic intelligence; but the effort was futile. The reporters returned with news that no trace of the survivor's movements could be found. A paragraph was accordingly written, announcing, in guarded phrase, that rumors of the total loss of the Arctic had been current during the night, but that nothing of a definite character was known. This announcement, placed in a prominent part of the *Times*, under a displayed heading, was all that it was possible to say. Discomfited, discouraged, and apprehensive, the head of the City Department then departed for his home.

But the adventures and the excitements of the night were not destined to be so speedily finished. The perturbed editor, instinctively feeling that there was something yet unrevealed, mused while dozing in a horse-car, at the hour of three o'clock in the morning; and his strung nerves made him sensitive. Scarcely had the car gone a half-mile from its starting-point, when a stranger, hurriedly coming down a side street, jumped upon the rear platform, evidently in an excited state, and began a conversation with the conductor, in the hurried and incoherent manner of a man who had simultaneously heard startling news, and had indulged in conviviality. The disjointed sentences which fell from the lips of this man furnished a clue to the watchful editor in the furthest corner of the car; whose hearing was as painfully acute as his professional pride was seriously wounded, — for defeat in the pursuit of news sits heavily upon the soul of the newspaper man. The words, "Arctic" — "only man who had got in" — "Burns" — "St. Nicholas Hotel" — "Herald Office" — "all night" — "tired out" — "bottle of wine" — conveyed distinct ideas. The words

formed themselves into this shape in the mind of the weary watcher in the corner: "A man by the name of Burns has escaped from the wreck of the Arctic; he is at the St. Nicholas Hotel; he has pushed on towards New York as fast as possible after landing; he has gravitated to the *Herald* Office, knowing that the *Herald* pays well for exclusive news; the *Herald* has got his story; and there is a trick to keep it away from all the other papers!" Out of the car dashed the *Times* man; down Broadway he tore; across the Park, and up to the printing-room of the *Times* he rushed. There he found the foreman placidly putting on his coat, in preparation for departure. "Stop the Press!" was the first order uttered. "Why?" inquired the foreman. "Because the *Herald* has got hold of a survivor of the Arctic, and is trying one of its old games; but we'll beat yet!"

A bell tinkled; a message went down the speaking-tube which led from composing-room to cellar; the great press stopped. A workman in the press-room was called up, and these words passed:—

"South,* you know the *Herald* office; they've got hold of a story about the Arctic, which belongs to all the Press, and they mean to keep it, and cheat us out of it. I want a copy of it. I want you to get it in any way you can; will you do it?"

"How do you know they've got it?"

The circumstances were recited.

"All right!" said "South;" "I'll get it, provided you don't ask me any questions."

The promise was given. "South" departed, to return a few minutes afterwards, with the information that the *Herald* office was all alight (the hour was four o'clock in the morning); that the press-room was fast-locked, and that all the carriers and newsboys had been excluded.

"What shall I do?" asked "South."

"Get the first copy of the *Herald* that comes off the press," was the order instantly given. "Buy it, beg it, steal it! any-

* A curious character, named John Long, — now dead.

thing, so long as you get it; and to-morrow you shall have fifty dollars for your trouble."

"Enough said," observed "South."

Twenty minutes later, he appeared in the office of the *Times* (then at the corner of Beekman and Nassau Streets) with a copy of the *Herald*, containing Mr. George H. Burns's narrative of the loss of the "Arctic," entire, printed in double-leaded type.

Meanwhile, the whole force of *Times*' compositors had been routed out of their beds, by messengers sent in urgent haste; each man stood at his "case," "stick" in hand, and when "South" returned, waving the next morning's *Herald* triumphantly over his head, a mighty "Hurrah!" went up, which might have been heard for several blocks. The *Herald* "copy" was cut up into four-line "takes;" in an hour the whole story was in type; and the people of the *Herald*, blissfully unconscious that a copy of that journal had been adroitly abstracted, withheld all their city circulation until nine A. M., sending off only the mail copies containing the long-expected relation of the dreadful disaster. By eight o'clock in the morning, the *Times* was procurable at all the news-stands in the city, and its subscribers had received the news an hour before. Edition after edition of the *Times* was called for; and its Hoe press ran without intermission from seven o'clock in the morning until two o'clock in the afternoon, to supply the continual demand.

Nor was this all, for on the following day the *Times* gave twelve columns of statements of passengers who had escaped by boats from the sinking steamer, and one column of editorial comment upon the disaster. Mr. Raymond, entering fully into the spirit of the occasion, volunteered his services as a reporter, and for one day actually put himself under the orders of the City Editor who had the matter in charge. It is needless to add that Mr. Raymond's report was the best of all.

On the following pay-day "South" received his gift from the proprietors of the *Times*, and the City Editor's salary was increased at the rate of five dollars a week, as a reward for the energy he had displayed.*

* Mr. Fletcher Harper, Jr., was then the publisher of the *Times*.

This incident illustrates one peculiarity of the profession of Journalism,—namely, the eagerness with which the earliest news is caught up. Unquestionably, the agents of the *Herald* attempted to play a trick, for the man Burns, exhausted by exposure and suffering, had trusted to the honor of the *Herald* to furnish to all the Press the important news he brought. There is reason to believe that a promise of this nature was given, and then broken. But the *Times* was able to “beat” the *Herald*, despite the trick.

Should the reader be curious to see the narrative which gave rise to all this excitement, here it is, in full:—

From the New York Times, of Oct. 11, 1854.

“STATEMENT OF MR. BURNS.

“The steamship *Arctic*, with two hundred and twenty-six passengers, exclusive of children, one hundred and seventy-five employés, a valuable cargo and heavy mail, is lost. Of the more than four hundred souls who left Liverpool on the twentieth ultimo, full of hope, gayety, and health, many returning from a European tour of pleasure, only thirty-two are known to have been saved, and certainly not more than one hundred man, by any possibility, have escaped a watery grave.

“In addition to all this, another large steamer, freighted with hundreds of human beings, has, in all probability met a like fate. The details of the horrible disaster are as follows:—

“On Wednesday, September 27, precisely at twelve o'clock m., in a dense fog, we came in contact with a bark-rigged iron propeller, with black hull, salmon-colored bottom, lead-colored poop and boats, and black pipe. She was bound eastward, and had all sails set, with a strong, fair wind. The speed of the *Arctic* at the time was about thirteen knots an hour. The shock to us appeared slight, but the damage to the other vessel was frightful. Captain Luce instantly ordered the quarter-boats cleared away, and the chief mate, boatswain, and three sailors went to her relief; before other boats left, the order was countermanded. The *Arctic* then described a circle twice round the wreck, during which time I caught a glimpse of more than two hundred people clustered on her hurricane deck.

“At this juncture it was first ascertained that we had sustained injury, and the water was pouring in at our bows. When the first officer came alongside to report, the captain was unable to take him up, but headed N. N. W. in the hope of making land. Our position on the previous day, at twelve o'clock, was lat. 48° 39', long. 45° 27'. We had run about three hundred and ten miles from the time of this observation until the moment of collision, and were supposed to be forty miles from Cape Race.

“The pumps were worked vigorously, and an anchor-chain thrown overboard; but, in spite of all exertion, the engines stopped and the water extinguished the fires. Four of the five other life-boats, believed to have been

well provisioned, containing the engineers, sailors, a few passengers, and all the officers except the captain and third mate, left the ship at an early stage. The majority of the passengers were working at the pumps, — some firing the signal guns, and others launching spars, under the direction of Captain Luce and Mr. Dorian, the third mate, to form a raft.

“In order to facilitate this latter work, the sixth and last boat was lowered. Dorian, one or two firemen, three of the other passengers saved, and myself, were busily engaged lashing water-casks and settees to the main-yard, two top-gallant yards, and several smaller spars, — the captain, with a number of gentlemen, protecting the work by keeping back the crowd, — when a panic seized all on board, a rush was made, passengers and firemen precipitated themselves headlong over the bulwarks on to the raft, and in a moment our little boat was full, and in imminent danger of being sunk.

“In this emergency, Dorian ordered the rope which held us to the steamer to be cut, and with our hands and axes we paddled from the raft’s side. The mate, who throughout preserved great presence of mind, and labored with heroic energy, cried out: ‘For God’s sake, captain, clear the raft, so that we can work; I won’t desert the ship while there’s a timber above water.’

“But the sea was now flush with the dead-lights. In less than three minutes from the time he spoke, the stern sunk, — the foam went boiling over the tumbling heap of human beings, — many were dashed forward against the pipe. I heard one wild yell (still ringing in my ears), and saw the Arctic and the struggling mass rapidly engulfed. Numbers yet clung to the imperfectly constructed raft; but, alas! we could render them no aid. Our own situation was no less precarious; and, cruel as it seemed, we were forced to abandon them to fate.

“Heaven forbid that I should ever witness such another scene! We, however, picked up two more men, and then, with an overloaded boat, without oars, tholepins, food or drink, avoiding with difficulty the fragments of the wreck, and passing many dead females, prepared for a night upon the ocean. We secured a floating pumpkin and cabbage, to guard against immediate starvation, lashed a spar to the bow of our boat to keep her head to the wind and sea, and thus drifted until daylight; the night was cold and foggy, with a heavy swell, and, in a cramped, drenched, and half-naked condition, we suffered terribly.

“Without dwelling upon our miseries, alleviated much by the consciousness that we had endeavored to do our duty to our fellow-men, suffice it to say, that at five o’clock on the afternoon of the 28th, we espied a sail, and raised a handkerchief to attract attention. We were successful. With the rude substitute for oars which we had constructed during the day by lashing planks to capstan bars, with a view of attempting to gain land when the sea subsided, we pulled toward the ship. On our way we passed the remnant of the raft, with one man on it, apparently alive.

“The bark proved to be the *Huron*, of St. Andrews, N. B., Captain A. Wall, bound for Quebec. Our men safe on board, the noble-hearted Dorian, with some of the *Huron*’s crew, returned to the raft, and rescued the poor fellow, who, for twenty-six hours, had clung to the spars. He states that after the steamship sunk, he counted seventy-two men and four women on the

raft, but at half past eight o'clock he was the only one alive. In the morning two bodies were beside him, much eaten by fishes, and at the time he saw our boat he was on the point of voluntarily dropping into the sea to end his agony. Coming from the raft, Dorian encountered and examined the life car of the Arctic. It contained a bottle of water, some cheese, and a lady's garment.

"By the humane captain of the Huron, and Mr. Wellington Cameron, a son of the owner, we were received with great kindness, our wounds dressed, fires kindled, and food and clothing provided in abundance. During the night of the 28th, Captain Wall hung out extra lights, fired rockets, and kept a horn blowing, in hopes of falling in with the remainder of the boats. But his endeavors were fruitless. On the evening of the 29th, he spoke the ship Lebanon, Captain Story, bound for New York, by whom eighteen of our number were taken off, kindly welcomed, and well-treated.

"We have this moment reached New York, by pilot-boat Christian Borg, No. 16, to which we were transferred from the Lebanon, and to the crew of which we are under great obligations.

"The fate of the propeller and our five boats is unknown. If the steamer was, as I have reason to think, the Charity, from Montreal to Liverpool, she is, I believe, built with water-tight compartments, or bulkheads, and will float, notwithstanding the damage to her bow. The fact that a boat left her which was capsized by our paddles augurs ill for her buoyant condition, though Captain Wall, of the Huron, on the morning of the 28th, saw a singular-looking craft far to leeward, but was unable to tell whether she was a steamer or sailing vessel.

"He says she had a nondescript appearance, and may have been the wreck of the propeller. The following is a list of those saved in the sixth boat:—

"TAKEN TO QUEBEC BY THE HURON.

James Abry, ship's cook.
 Luke McCarthy, fireman.
 Joseph Connelly, "
 Richard Mahan, "
 Thomas Conroy, " "
 James Connor, "
 John Drury, "
 Christian Moran, "
 James Ward, "
 Christopher Callaher, "
 Thomas Wilson, assistant engineer.
 Robert Byron, waiter.
 David Barry, "
 Erastus Miller, "

"ARRIVED AT THIS PORT IN THE LEBANON.

Edward Brien, fireman.
 Patrick Mahon, "
 Thomas Garland, "
 Patrick Casey, "

Patrick Tobin, fireman.
 Dobbin Carnagan, "
 Thomas Brennan, assistant engineer.
 John Connelly, engineers' steward.
 Thomas Stinson, officers' steward.
 James Carnagan, porter.
 Michael McLaughlin, boy.
 Peter McCabe (picked off the raft), waiter.
 Wm. Nicolls, Trescoa, Sicily Island, passenger.
 Henry Jenkins, " "
 James Thompson, New Orleans, "
 Capt. Paul F. Grann, New York, "
 George H. Burns, Philadelphia, "
 Francis Dorian, New York, third officer.

“ NAMES OF PERSONS KNOWN TO BE IN THE SHIP'S BOATS.

“ The five boats which may have reached land, or been picked up, are known to have contained

Mr. Goveley, first officer.
 Thomas Wilde, boatswain.
 Mr. Balam, second officer.
 Mr. Graham, fourth officer.
 Mr. Moore, New York, passenger.
 Mr. Rogers, chief engineer.
 Mr. Drown, first assistant.
 Mr. Walker, second "
 Mr. Willett, third "
 Daniel Connelly, fireman.
 John Moran, "
 John Flanigan, "
 Patrick McConloy, "
 Mr. Dingnel, engineer.
 Mr. Kelly, "
 Mr. Simpson, "

“ And a young man named Robinson, under instructions in the engineer's department, besides sailors and quartermasters.

“ Amongst those whom I last saw on the quarter-deck, whilst fastening life-preservers on the females, and who must have sunk with the ship, or perished on the raft, were Captain Luce and son, Mrs. E. K. Collins, Master Coit Collins, Miss Collins, Mr. Brown and family (connection of the senior of the firm of Brown, Shipley & Co., Liverpool), Mr. Thomas, importer of hosiery, New York; Mr. Adams, Brooklyn; Mr. Bowers, Cincinnati; Mr. Charles Springer, Cincinnati; James Muirhead, Jr., Petersburg, Va.; Mr. Hewitt, Mrs. Hewitt and daughter, Fredericksburg, Va.; Mr. Wood, New York; Mr. Ysahi, Mr. Schmidt, Miss Marston, Falmouth, England; a nephew of Mr. Bloodgood, hotel-keeper, Philadelphia, residing in Albany; the Duke de Grammont, of the French Embassy; second steward, wife and child; Annie, a colored girl, and Mary, stewardesses; Miss Jones, Mr. Petrie and

lady, Stewart Hollin, Washington, D. C.; J. Cook, Opelousas, La.; with many more, whose names I do not know, but whose features are indelibly imprinted on my memory.

"A Mr. Comstock, brother to the commander of the *Baltic*, was drowned by the capsizing of a boat whilst being lowered.

"Government despatches from France and England, entrusted to my care by Mr. Buchauan, I could not save.

"The boat in which we escaped was one of Francis's patent metallic, No. 727, from which her capacity can be ascertained and compared with the number rescued.

"Respectfully,

"GEO. H. BURNS.

"Adams & Co.'s Express, Philadelphia.

"New York, October 10, 1854."

In the list of passengers, received by the "Canada" from Liverpool, were the following among others:—

M. Dupassien, Mrs. Edward K. Collins, of New York, Miss M. A. Collins and Master C. Collins, O. Fabbriotti, Mrs. Howland and son, F. W. Gale and wife, Duke de Grammont and servant, Captain D. Pratt, Edward Sanford, of New York, and G. Gwynet, wife and child.

Mr. Burns, on the morning after his arrival in New York, went to Adams' Express office, where he was soon surrounded by a large crowd of anxious persons seeking an interview in relation to friends and relatives on board the "Arctic." Other survivors, brought by the *Lebanon*, went to the Seaman's Retreat, on Staten Island.

THE ELBOWS OF THE MINCIO.

IN the Italian campaign of 1859, the newspapers of England, France, and the United States were engaged in eager rivalry. The struggle to obtain early and "exclusive" intelligence of the events of the war continued unabated until the end of the struggle. The London *Times* selected its best correspondent for service in the Italian army; leading French journals promptly recorded the successes of Napoleon, and glorified the carnage of Solferino and Magenta; the New York newspapers had representatives on all the fields of battle, and the foremost among these was Mr. Raymond, to whom the *Times* and its

readers were indebted for the clearest and most complete of all the contemporaneous narratives.

The "brilliant run" executed by Mr. Raymond when he supposed himself pursued by an infuriated squadron of Austrian cuirassiers has been described in a vivid style, not by himself, but by his partner in that singular trial of speed, whose account is here copied from his own narrative, as originally published in the *Troy Daily Whig*:—

"Mr. Raymond has been much ridiculed for things which never occurred in connection with his visit to the seat of war in Italy in 1859, and for things which he was in no way actually responsible for.

"The notable expression, 'the Elbows of the Mincio,' which appeared in the *N. Y. Times* editorially, in the summer of 1859, was by the very accomplished scholar, but eccentric gentleman, who was then in charge of the editorial columns in Mr. Raymond's absence, and the writer of this heard Mr. Raymond denounce the article, when he first read it in Paris.

"But Mr. Raymond was the 'responsible' editor of the *Times*, and he never shirked or 'went back' upon his friends or coadjutors; so he never disavowed it. Besides, there was never much need of it, for it helped to convey the idea of a crooked river on the western side of the Quadrilateral.

"But ridicule did not stick to him, for every one respected his prodigious talents and industry as a writer, speaker, parliamentarian, and journalist.

"What I intended to refer to specially was the famous race at Castiglione. It has always been thrown at Mr. Raymond, as if it involved some lack of courage on his part, and as if it occurred at some time during the battle of Solferino, at the moment of some apparent reverse to the allied lines, upon which he took up his flight in consternation from the field.

"But an entire misapprehension exists as to the time, place, when, where, and what occurred. The 'race' having served its turn as a subject for joking, the mistake may now be corrected.

"The battle of Solferino was on Friday, the 24th of June, 1859; and the 'race' was on the next day, from the village of

Castiglione, after the fighting was all over, and the Austrians had retreated across the Mincio within their fortresses.

"There were in our party at Solferino three Americans, Mr. Raymond, 'Malakoff' (Dr. W. E. Johnston), the accomplished Paris correspondent of the *N. Y. Times*, and the writer hereof.

"Friday night, after the battle, our party were able, after considerable trouble, to find a small room in a little old tavern full of wounded officers, in the village of Castiglione, the nearest village to the battle-field in rear of the French lines, and as late as ten o'clock we all sat down about a small table with only a lighted candle upon it, to 'write up' the battle of Solferino.

"Mr. Raymond of course held the pen, each one contributing his observations of the incidents of the day, and the whole were engrossed and thrown into shape by Mr. Raymond. He was after the latest news of the Italian campaign, and was doing his utmost to beat all contemporaries, by placing the news of the battle in New York at the first possible moment for his paper, the *New York Times*. He succeeded, and beat even the *London Times* ten days into New York. It was done in this way: The account of the battle was made up in six hours of constant work during the night, and at four o'clock in the morning of Saturday 'Malakoff' was sent back with our horses and carriage to the city of Brescia, twenty miles to the rear, with the despatches for the *New York Times*, to be placed on the Emperor's Express to Paris, which would leave Brescia that day, with the army despatches.

"We had met the *London Times'* army correspondent on the field during the day, and several times during the night did Mr. Raymond exclaim, 'If I can only beat "the Thunderer" into New York with this news, the *Times* is made.'

"Mrs. Raymond was then in Paris, and he knew that she could certainly be found at her hotel without loss of time. 'Malakoff' was acquainted with many French officers, and could not he get one of the express messengers to go to her hotel immediately on his arrival at Paris, with a packet from her husband? The plan succeeded. She felt all the interest of her husband in the enterprise, and, opening the packet, she

found his directions to place the enclosure on the first and fastest steamer leaving either France or England for New York, at any expense of energy and money.

"She was equal to the emergency, and in less than thirty hours thereafter she placed the despatches herself on board the steamer just leaving Liverpool for New York, and his success was complete; for, although 'the Thunderer' got the news by the same express, it did not get to press and to Liverpool in time for the steamer, and *ten days* must intervene before it could reach New York.

"Now for the 'race.'

"'Malakoff' had gone to the rear with our horses and carriage, and could not return probably before the next morning (Sunday), and after a little rest and a poor apology for a breakfast, we hired a man to drive us out in a one-horse carriage over the field, for an inspection of the previous days' work.

"Mr. Raymond never took much rest if there was anything of interest to be seen or done, until after it was accomplished. He was even then — ten years ago — an overworked man, and I have since frequently noticed that his brain was too much for his physique.

"We went out on the battle-field and saw what we could in five or six hours of travel and inspection. The day was very warm, and about two o'clock in the afternoon we returned to the village of Castaglione for some refreshments. Our driver turned in with his horse to the first place he found, and we two walked on further into the village by the main street, and came to a tavern wholly occupied by wounded soldiers, where, sitting down on the platform, we called for and obtained some bread and wine.

"The village was filled with wounded men, — stragglers and prisoners taken from the Austrians, and they occupied every nook and corner of the place. And as the military authorities and the army, except the guards, had gone on and encamped some six miles beyond, everything was loose and demoralized in the place, for want of command.

"It was just at this moment, and before we had finished our repast, that an alarm was heard coming down the street from

the direction of the battle-field, and, increasing in its progress, developed into a full-fledged panic as it came to us, bearing along the narrow street crowds of all sorts of people, frantic with fear, and running for their lives, and exclaiming, 'The Austrians are coming to kill the wounded soldiers and liberate the prisoners.'

"The whole population was on the run down the street to the opposite side of the village, and out into the open country.

"Mr. Raymond and myself both joined that procession, and for the first mile kept up with the best of them, all making good time.

"When outside of the village, we turned off from the military road, which was thronged, and took a country road leading circuitously to the village of Monte Chiaro, five or six miles back on the same military road.

"Being somewhat exhausted at the end of the first mile, and beginning to collect our wits, and venturing to look over our shoulders for the Austrians in pursuit, and seeing none, we 'slowed down' into a walk, and made our way back into Monte Chiaro in about two hours, where we waited for the return of 'Malakoff' from Brescia, and with whom the next morning (Sunday), we returned to Castiglione, and so on to the battle-field again, to complete our inspection.

"The panic arose among the teamsters in the trains moving on the road leading from Castiglione, through the battle-field, toward Mantua.

"A small detachment of Austrian cavalry, which had been separated from its command on the day of the battle, and laid on the field over night, unable to make its way back into the Austrian lines, came up on to the road to surrender.

"Their appearance frightened the teamsters, who imagined the Austrians had returned, and they turned right about and drove back at top speed to Castiglione, with the hue and cry, and thus inaugurated a panic which extended for twenty miles along the military road, and was not stayed until it reached the walls of Brescia.

"'The situation' was this: The whole victorious French

Army was between us and the Austrians; and how *foolish* to be *startled* at such a cry at such a time, and to be borne along by such a crowd! It is conceded that a *panic* is a *senseless* thing; but we do not discover *that* till after it is all over. It takes us by surprise, and allows no time to reason.

"Thus was the 'Race' got up and run. Probably few prudent men could be found, who, under the circumstances, would have failed to take part in it.

"It was at least a new sensation, and the recollection of it, although often the topic of raillery, has not been without its compensations in cementing a friendship of more than thirty years.

"For it has since been our habit, annually, to commemorate in a social way, these two days, — the grandest in all my experience, — to fight the battle of Solferino, and to run the race from Castiglione over again, year by year, until now — Death has taken my friend and companion in the race, and 'I only am escaped alone to tell the story.' Peace to his ashes!"

Mr. William Henry Hurlbut was in charge of the foreign department of the *Times* while Mr. Raymond was absent from New York, and the latter was in no sense responsible for the comical article quoted below.

The essay on the "Elbows of the Mincio" consisted of phrases which, though disjointed, were in every sense spirited. The space occupied was one column of the *Times*; the title, "The Defensive Square of Austrian Italy." Opening with a concise statement of the self-imprisonment of the Austrians within "their famous strategic square," the writer proceeded to show the strength of the Quadrilateral. There were in this part of the article some clever touches; but the pause was sudden, and all that followed the introductory paragraphs was incoherent.

An effort was made in the evening edition of the *Times* to correct the absurdities of the intoxicated paragraph. An explanatory note was published, reading as follows: —

"CORRECTION.

"We owe it to our readers to say that, by a confusion of manuscripts, set up at a very late hour last evening, our leading article on the Austrian de-

fensive square in Italy was made utterly unintelligible. We have remedied the errors in this evening's edition of the *Times*."

But the evil had been done; and to this day men laugh when they speak of this remarkable production.

Inasmuch as the article in question is entitled to rank among the curiosities of literature,* and especially as it is a part of the history of the *Times* which is not likely to be forgotten, the Bacchic and the sober versions are here given in full:—

"THE DEFENSIVE SQUARE OF
AUSTRIAN ITALY.

The Morning Version.

"When the Austrians were beaten at Magenta, a sudden conviction seems to have seized upon their leaders, that if they could once put their forces in safety beyond the lines of the Chiese and the Mincio, they would be able to make head against the courage and skill of France. The extraordinary speed with which the French troops were moved across the Alps to the succor of Turin and of the Piedmontese provinces seems to have paralyzed for a moment the energy of the Savoyards, and the skilful movements by which the Sardinian troops were brought into relations with the village insurrections of the Lombard people combined to make the Austrian authorities understand the impossibility of holding their ground against a disorganized and revolutionary people. The Austrians, following up the strategic plans of Marshal Radetsky in 1848, abandoned with an unwise haste their first lines of defence upon the Mincio, and threw themselves beyond the river, in the empty hope of beating back the allied troops.

"The result of this mad enterprise has been their complete imprisonment within their famous strategic square.

"THE DEFENSIVE SQUARE OF
AUSTRIAN ITALY.

The Evening Version.

"When the Austrians were beaten at Magenta, a sudden conviction seems to have seized upon their leaders, that if they could once put their forces in safety beyond the lines of the Chiese and the Mincio, they would be able to make head against the courage and the skill of France. The extraordinary speed with which the French troops were moved across the Alps to the succor of Turin and of the Piedmontese provinces seems to have paralyzed for a moment the energy of their generals, and the skilful movements by which the Sardinian troops were brought into relations with the village insurrections of the Lombard people combined to make the Austrian authorities understand the impossibility of holding their ground against a disorganized and revolutionary people. The Austrians retreated accordingly, following up the strategic plans of Marshal Radetsky in 1848, but, after reaching their square, abandoned with an unwise haste their first lines of defence upon the Mincio, and threw themselves beyond the river, in the empty hope of beating back the allied troops.

"The result of this mad enterprise has been their complete imprison-

* Part of this chapter appeared in *Packard's Monthly* for December, 1869.

“The square is closed to the north by the last spur of the Alps on the shores of the Lago di Garda; to the west it is defended by the Mincio, which leaves the Lake of Garda at Peschiera, waters the plains of Mantua, and joins the Po at fifteen leagues’ distance from its springs at Governolo, after opening a real lake, on the banks of which lie the fortresses of Mantua; to the south the strategic square is defended by the line of the River Po, which flows beneath the walls of Cremona, and draws to itself all the torrents flowing from the Alps; to the east the boundary of the Austrian defences is formed by the Adige, which descends from the mountains of Switzerland, and flows on a parallel line with the Po, after passing by Trent, Roveredo, Verona, and Legnago. The strength of a position so fortified by nature and by art does not need to be developed. It borrows strategic importance from the numerous breaks of the ground, which — if we may be pardoned for the expression — seem but to have formed the successive steps in the natural defence of Austrian Italy.

“But if nature has done much for the ‘strategic square,’ art has done more.

“Austria has neglected nothing which might assure her dominion over the waters of the Danube. She has done all in her power *to favor the development of Europe, which is the pacific development of England.* She has dealt with edged tools — boldly, but not, we feel sure, in utter vanity.

“In 1848 Peschiera was captured by the Sardinians, under King Charles Albert; but there can be no doubt that the French bore away from the first fight of Magenta very questionable compliments. At this time the Sardinians, under the Duke of Genoa,

ment within their famous strategic square.

“The square is closed to the north by the last spur of the Alps on the shores of the Lago di Garda; to the west it is defended by the Mincio, which leaves the Lake of Garda at Peschiera, waters the plains of Mantua, and joins the Po at fifteen leagues’ distance from its springs at Governolo, after opening a real lake, on the banks of which lie the fortresses of Mantua; to the south the strategic square is defended by the line of the River Po, which flows beneath the walls of Cremona, and draws to itself all the torrents flowing from the Alps; to the east, the boundary of the Austrian defences is formed by the Adige, which descends from the mountains of Switzerland, and flows on a parallel line with the Po, after passing by Trent, Roveredo, Verona, and Legnago. The strength of a position so fortified by nature and by art does not need to be developed. It borrows strategic importance from the numerous breaks of the ground, which — if we may be pardoned for the expression — seem but to have formed the successive steps in the natural defence of Austrian Italy.

“But, if nature has done much for the ‘strategic square,’ art has done more.

“Austria has neglected nothing which might ensure communication with her dominions watered by the Danube. She has made a broad road in the direction of the Alps, to unite the regions of the Vorarlberg and the Tyrol with Lombardy by the pass of the Stelvio. This road passes through the Vatelina, runs around the Lake of Como, and ends at Bergamo. It may serve as well for the retreat of the beaten Austrians into the Tyrol, as for the advance of the victorious

were ready to defend the famous Quadrilateral. To-day the Quadrilateral has ceased to exist.

"The fortress of Peschiera lies on an isle near the scene of the late conflict.

"A broad road has been made by Austria, in the direction of the Alps, to unite the regions of the Vorarlberg and the Tyrol with Lombardy, by the pass of the Stelvio. This road passes through the Valtellina, runs around the Lake of Como, and ends at Bergamo. It may serve as well for the retreat of the beaten Austrians into the Tyrol as for the advance of the victorious Austrians upon Italy. Two railways pass also by this central point of the Austrian position. One of these railways unites Lombardy with Vienna, by circling around the crescent of the North Adriatic; the other, leaving Botzen, in the Tyrol, skirts the Lago di Garda, touches Trent, Roveredo and Verona, and by a branch road reaches Mantua, and thus unites the two main angles of the famous square. The New York *Herald*, in giving yesterday a pretended map of this square, carefully omitted the bridge-head of Legnago, and thus converted the square into a triangle. The strength of Peschiera and Legnago is out of all proportion to the besieging force. The main merit of Peschiera is that this fortress lies on an island, and was captured by the Duke of Genoa in 1848. At this time the Sardinians crossed the Mincio after several hours' hard fighting: and if we follow the windings of the Mincio, we shall find countless elbows formed in the elbows of the regular army, at places like Salianza, Molini, and Borghetto. These places make up the base of the allied army. The line of the Mincio is the base of the new campaign we are about to open.

"Almost at the southern end of

Austrians upon Italy. Two railways pass also by this central point of the Austrian position. One of these railways unites Lombardy with Vienna, by circling around the crescent of the North Adriatic; the other, leaving Botzen in the Tyrol, skirts the Lago di Garda, touches Trent, Roveredo, and Verona, and by a branch road reaches Mantua, and thus unites the two main angles of the famous square. The New York *Herald*, in giving yesterday a pretended map of this square, carefully omitted the bridge-head of Legnago, and thus converted the square into a triangle. The strength of Peschiera and Legnago is out of all proportion to that of Mantua and Verona; but both positions are important keys of the square.

"The main merit of Peschiera, which lies on an island in the Mincio, is that it commands the sluices by which the body of that stream can be suddenly swollen from the lake.

"The investment of Peschiera by the Sardinians, now complete, has destroyed the Quadrilateral for the time being. Nor for the first time. For Peschiera was taken by the Sardinians, under the Duke of Genoa, in 1848. At this time the Sardinians crossed the Mincio after several hours' hard fighting. If we follow the windings of this river, we shall find countless elbows formed in the right bank, favorable to the passage of troops, such as Salianza, Molini, and Borghetto. The allies probably passed at all these points, and are masters of the whole course of the Mincio to Goito. The line of the Mincio is the base of the new campaign now about to open.

"Almost at the southern end of the river Mincio lies the strong fortress of Mantua, the only Gibraltar of Austria in Italy guaranteed by the

the River Mincio lies the strong fortress of Mantua, the only Gibraltar of Austria in Italy, guaranteed by the treaties of 1815. Mantua, as we have said, lies on a lake of the River Mincio. In spite of the labors spent upon it, Mantua still holds the next rank to Verona. It is a post of danger for the army shut between its walls, rather than for the enemy without. After a battle of several hours' duration, the Sardinians, at Goito, gave way; and if we follow up the course of the Mincio, *we shall find innumerable elbows formed by the sympathy of youth.* Defended by Wurmsers, in 1797, Austria surrendered to Napoleon III. in 1859. Notwithstanding the toil spent by Austria on the spot, *we should have learned that we are protected by a foreign fleet suddenly coming up on our quest of citizenship. A canal cuts Mantua in two; but we may rely on the most cordial Cabinet Minister of the new power in England.*

"Mantua is protected in the centre by five detached forts: the Citadel, Pradella, Castle of Faith, St. George, and Migliaretto, which commands Cremona, Borgo Forte, and Governolo.

"A canal divides Mantua, and makes a small port in the lake, communicating by five fortified roadways with the land.

"At Roverbello are machines for flooding the whole region, and in the upper lake floats an Austrian squadron. The region between Mantua and the Po is impracticable for an army. *'Tis a marsh full of fevers. On this side the square seems impregnable. But how with the line from Mantua to Legnago?* Legnago is no stronger than Peschiera, but it has the double advantage of a bridge over the Adige, and of dikes ready to inundate the whole Adriatic region. The fourth face of the square links

treaties of 1815. Mantua, as we have said, lies on a lake of the River Mincio. In spite of the labors spent upon it, Mantua still holds the next rank to Verona. It is a post of danger for the army shut between its walls, rather than for the enemy without.

"A canal divides Mantua, and makes a small port in the lake, communicating by five fortified roadways with the land.

"The place is protected in the centre by five detached forts: the Citadel, Pradella, Castle of Faith, St. George, and Migliaretto, which commands Cremona, Borgo Forte, and Governolo.

"At Roverbello are machines for flooding the whole region, and in the upper lake floats an Austrian squadron. The region between Mantua and the Po is impracticable for an army. 'Tis a marsh full of fevers. On this side the square seems impregnable. Legnago is no stronger than Peschiera, but it has the double advantage of a bridge over the Adige and of dikes ready to inundate the whole Adriatic region. The fourth face of the square links Verona to Legnago. This is the best defensive line of Austria in Italy. At Verona the last sweeps of the Alps fall about the river; and seven fortresses on the crests of these hills command the whole region and all its approaches. Within and without, twenty several forts make this point the real heart of the Austrian dominion. But not only in the circle of its fortifications is Verona strong. The Adige there is swift and deep; it can only be passed at Cerpi and Bussolengo in the face of a thousand perils. As Colonel Charolais, to whom we are indebted for the very best description of this great square, very truly says, the destiny of Austria must be de-

Verona to Legnago. This is the best defensive line of Austria in Italy. At Verona the last features of the opposition lingered. The Adige is swift and deep at Verona; it can only be passed at Cerpi and Bussolengo in the face of a thousand perils. *Paris is strong in her circle of fortifications.*"

cided by a battle before Verona after the fall of Peschiera."

Four distinct subjects were evidently in the mind of the writer when he sat down to pen this remarkable effusion. These subjects were the defensive square, the military strength of Austria, the new Cabinet formed in England, and the massive fortifications with which Napoleon was then environing Paris. Unfortunately, although each of these topics was in itself interesting and important, they did not fuse well together, for the simple reason that champagne is not a chemical solvent. The defensive square happened to be in Italy, therefore "the most cordial Cabinet minister of England" had nothing whatever to do with it; the fortifications of Paris, albeit of great value to France, had no necessary connection with "the canal which cut Mantua in two;" and the meaning of the writer was so hopelessly obscured in the passage asserting "that we are protected by a foreign fleet suddenly coming up on our question of citizenship," that no seer could throw light upon it.

RAYMOND CHALLENGED TO FIGHT A DUEL.

IN December, 1856, Mr. Raymond received a challenge to mortal combat from the late Thomas Francis Meagher. He respectfully declined to be made a target for the indignant Meagher; but the story of this affair is worth a page of record. It is well told in the following extracts from the columns of the *Times*:—

From the Times of December 30, 1856. — Editorial.

"MR. MEAGHER'S PAROLE AND ESCAPE FROM AUSTRALIA.

"As a recent allusion in the *Times* to the circumstances under which Mr. T. F. Meagher made his escape from the penal imprisonment in Australia, to which he had been condemned for political offences, has excited a very general public interest in the matter, we republish this morning, from the Dub-

in *Nation*, the only detailed account of it, so far as we are aware, which has ever been given. It was written, it will be observed, by one of the parties by whom the arrangements for Meagher's escape were made, and who formed one of the 'body-guard' which attended upon him. It is likely, therefore, to be accurate, and quite as favorable for Mr. Meagher, as any statement of the affair which could be made.

"It seems, from this account, that, previous to accepting his 'ticket of leave,' Mr. Meagher was in close custody of the police, and that upon receiving the ticket he was allowed freedom of movement within a certain district, and intercourse with his friends, upon giving his *parole* of honor that 'he would not attempt to leave the Colony.' This *parole* was renewable every six months; and Meagher's expired on the 3d of January. On that day he wrote to the magistrate of the district to which he was restricted, stating that it was not his intention to renew it, and inviting the police to come to his house where he should remain, and arrest him. This letter, it is stated, was delivered to the magistrate at ten o'clock in the morning; and at about ten o'clock at night the constable of the district, with two or three policemen, presented themselves at Meagher's house with the warrant for his arrest. Mr. Meagher, however, was not within. He was at a little distance from the house consulting with some friends, who had collected for the purpose of preventing his arrest. Meagher's servant informed him that the police were in the house, whereupon Mr. Meagher mounted a 'noble steed which had been provided, and accompanied by his *four* guards,' one in advance, one on his right, one on his left, and one in the rear, rode up to the police, and when about a dozen yards distant, called out to the constable, declaring his name, and his intention of escaping, and informing that officer further that it was his duty to 'take him into custody if he could.' Having given this challenge, Mr. Meagher, surrounded by his guard, rode off unarrested and unmolested by the police. And that was the manner of his escape.

"The only account of the affair, as we have already stated, is given in the letter from which these facts are taken. If that be authentic, it shows conclusively, in the first place, that friends were collected, horses procured, routes selected, and all the arrangements for escape made, under the protection of the *parole*; and that their execution was all that was postponed until after its surrender. How far this was consistent with the honorable engagement not to '*attempt to escape*,' while holding the ticket of leave, we are not sufficiently skilled in the etiquette of such matters to decide. If these preparations form any *part* of that '*attempt*,' to that extent, it would seem, they must have been in violation of the pledge.

"The letter shows, in the second place, that Mr. Meagher, upon withdrawing his *parole* and surrendering his ticket-of-leave, did not submit himself again to the custody of the police at all. He presented himself to them, and called upon them to arrest him; but this was accompanied by a declaration of his purpose not to allow himself to be arrested, and under circumstances which showed that he was prepared and able to resist an attempt at arrest, with prospects of success. Unless there was an obligation expressed or implied in the *parole*, that he would, upon surrendering it, place himself in *statu quo*, resume the position he held before accepting it,—there may have been in *this* proceeding no violation of his *parole*. If there was in it any such engagement, then it was manifestly and openly disregarded.

“This seems to be the exact state of the case in regard to Mr. Meagher’s evasion of his political imprisonment. We rejoiced in common with others at his deliverance from such a captivity, and have never been inclined to criticize, with any undue severity, the manner in which it was accomplished. Indeed, we have never, until reading, for the first time yesterday, the letter from the *Nation*, which we reprint this morning, been acquainted, from any other source than vague rumor, with its details. We recur to the matter now, only because it has become, by Mr. Meagher’s own act, a subject of fresh interest, and one upon which he apparently invites the scrutiny and judgment of the public.”

From the Times of December 6, 1856.

“A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

“We have received a note from Mr. T. F. Meagher, inquiring whether, by an expression used in a recent paragraph in the *Times*, we intended to charge that he had, at any time, ‘broken his parole.’ Certainly not. We did not suppose that the language used conveyed any such meaning; or, indeed, expressed any opinion upon that point. Although the paragraph in which it occurred was written under the provocation of a very offensive personal article, in Mr. Meagher’s *Irish News*, it was not intended to transcend the ordinary limits and proprieties of newspaper controversy, or to cast any reproach upon the personal character of Mr. Meagher.”

A BOHEMIAN TRICK.

To the Bohemian mind, all labor seems fit for slaves. There should be gentlemanly leisure for those whom the gods endow with wit; nectar and ambrosia are their proper food; silken raiment and luxurious repose their right. So thinking, the old Bohemians in New York, who clung to their *quasi* connections with the newspapers, — the race has almost disappeared, — worked for a living only when their stomachs cried cupboard, or when long-suffering landladies became indignant or offensively personal. Mrs. Raddles has sent the Bohemian on many expeditions, when he would have remained supine but for the confiscation of the tumblers, and the stoppage of the hot water.

The general uncertainty which characterized the Bohemians’ efforts merged into something closely resembling dishonesty — for they were not particular as to the manner of supplying pressing want. Having a happy knack of turning their faculties to account, their busy brains readily devised some ingenious plan for replenishing an exhausted exchequer, or for restor-

ing a fading credit. A plan was no sooner conceived than it was put in execution, and the result was usually satisfactory to the inventor, however disagreeable it might have appeared to the victim.

An illustration of this Bohemian trickery was given, several years ago, in the office of the *New York Times*. One of the brightest, best-read, and most reckless of the Bohemians of the city, suddenly nipped by evil fortune, secluded himself for a day from the gaze of his fellows, and then appeared in the editorial room with a roll of manuscript. It was a Carrier's Address in verse, intended for the first of January, admirably written, full of local hits, crackling with fun. It was gladly accepted. "Could you let me have forty dollars?" asked the poet. In violation of a rule in force in newspaper offices, which prohibits prepayment for literary contributions, the money was given, and in the evening there was high revel at Pfaff's, — an underground saloon on Broadway much frequented by the Bohemians of the day. The New Year arrived; and the *Times* Carriers' Address was widely distributed and generally read. It was a creditable literary performance, — in fact, far superior to the average character of these annual infictions. But a stray copy was found by a reader of the *Times* in a western town; and this person, struck by lines in the poem which seemed familiar, made some investigations. It then appeared that the dishonest poet had "adopted" an old Address, changing the order of the verses, adding bits of local color, interjecting a few allusions to the principal events of the year, and then successfully passing it off as an original production.

PERSONAL ABUSE.

In an earlier chapter, some account has been given of the personalities of New York Journalism. While the habit of calling hard names has been partly mended by the general elevation of the tone of newspaper writing, there are still too many proofs of its existence. One such illustration, of the year 1861, is part of the incidental history of the *Times*. Although Mr. Raymond had announced the principle that per-

sonal attacks should never appear in the columns of his paper, he finally reached a point where he thought forbearance had ceased to be a virtue, — and he made the mistake of caricaturing Bennett.

On the 11th of December, 1861, two caricature pictures of James Gordon Bennett appeared on the first page of the *Times*. One of these pictures represented Bennett, in Scotch costume, and with two little horns budding from his head, busily employed in inflating a wind-bag labelled "*Herald*." Below it the following words were printed, in large letters, stretching across two columns of the paper.

"BROTHER BENNETT (PROFANELY STYLED 'THE SATANIC'), INFLATING HIS WELL-KNOWN FIRST-CLASS, A NO. 1 WIND-BAG, HERALD."

From the Herald, Nov. 2.

"Whether the *Tribune* or the *Times* has the larger circulation, we are unable to decide. According to recent accounts, they both of them distribute somewhere between twenty-five and thirty thousand daily.

"Of this we are not certain, but concerning the *Herald*, there can be no doubt. Its daily sale of papers averages from one hundred and five thousand to one hundred and thirty-five thousand.

From the Herald, Nov. 3.

"It remains doubtful whether the *Times* or *Tribune* will be discovered to be ahead, but in no case will it appear that both of them together have one-half as many subscribers as the *Herald*, which sells from one hundred and five thousand to one hundred and thirty-five thousand of its daily issue."

From the Herald, Thursday, Nov. 7.

"We have attained a daily issue as high as one hundred and thirty-five thousand. Next to the *Herald* comes the *Tribune* and the *Times*, but far in the rear, for we presume that neither the *Times* nor the *Tribune* can boast of an average beyond twenty-five thousand dailies."

From the Herald, Saturday, Nov. 9.

"In regard to our circulation, we did not say that it was one hundred and thirty-five thousand every day; but that it exceeded one hundred thousand every day."

"HOW THE AFORESAID FIRST-CLASS WIND-BAG WAS PUNCTURED BY THE FOLLOWING WAGERS OFFERED BY THE TIMES:—

\$2,500 that the <i>Herald's</i> daily issue is not	135,000
2,500 that it is not	105,000
2,500 that it is not	100,000
2,500 that it is not	75,000
2,500 that the <i>Times'</i> average daily issue is over	25,000

2,500 that it is over	30,000
2,500 that it is over	40,000
2,500 that it is over	50,000
2,500 that it is over	75,000"

[The conditions of this wager were that one-half the whole amount should be forthwith deposited in bank, and that the whole sum should be handed over by the winner to the families of volunteer soldiers.*]

The second part pictured Bennett in a recumbent posture, exhausted and dying; pins inserted into the bag had punctured it so badly that the wind had all escaped; and below were these words:—

“DISASTROUS RESULT!

“BROTHER BENNETT RESORTS TO THE CONSOLATIONS OF RELIGION.”

From the Herald, Dec. 5.

“Betting, even when fair, is against our religion, and we cannot consent to let him have the information he seeks in that way.”

From the Herald, Dec. 7.

“Mr. Mephistophiles Greeley and that little villain Raymond are greatly moved upon the subject of the relative circulation of the *Herald* and their own petty papers, and are affected to tears about the matter. We are sorry for them; but their attempts to inveigle us into a silly bet are absolutely in vain. The practice of betting is immoral. We cannot approve of it. It may suit Greeley and Raymond, who have exhibited very little morality in the conduct of their journals, but it will not do for us.”

This was undignified, but funny, — for the caricatures were designed with spirit, and the rebuke to the *Herald* was very well deserved. Nevertheless it was an absurd act of the proprietors of the *Times* to indulge in a performance suited only to the pages of some low comic weekly. Raymond himself was afterwards ashamed of it. It resulted in no service to the *Times*, and it did not injure the *Herald*; for no man gains by abusing his neighbor; and he who is abused inevitably receives a certain degré of sympathy. Fair ridicule is sometimes justifiable; but objurgation defeats its own end.

This incident is cited as a fragment of the history of the *Times*. That journal has so seldom published illustrations, that it is interesting to know the reasons why its conductors first violated their own rule.

* This was in the first year of the Civil War.

INCIDENTS OF THE CABLE EXCITEMENT.

IN August, 1858, the city of New York had one of its great periodical excitements. The occasion was the successful landing of the first Atlantic Telegraph Cable. The United States frigate Niagara, under command of Captain Hudson, having finished her part of that undertaking, arrived in the harbor of New York on the 18th of August, and the vessel and all that belonged to her at once became transfigured before the vision of the excitable populace. The best illustration of the intense fever of the moment is to be found in the columns of the *Times* of the following day. "The Niagara," said the *Times*, "moved slowly up the East River to the place where she now lies, opposite the Navy Yard. Her progress was a magnificent ovation. The piers on either side, the rigging of the vessels at anchor, the tops and windows of the houses, were alive with spectators, whose joyous huzzas swept over the water like distant music. The ferry-boats, crammed with passengers, many of whom were obliged to mount the upper decks, diverged from their respective courses, circumvented the majestic ship as she moved lazily against the ebbing tide, and saluted her by dipping their colors, — the people cheering all the time as if they were going mad. Every passing craft, from the mud-scow to the emigrant-ship, contributed its quota of admiring applause. As the night fell, the buildings facing the river were, here and there, illuminated, shining like big pieces cut out of the starlit sky, and set up on end. By and by a rocket would appear, darting up through the air, and bursting into a shower of blazing spray, whose reflection played over the rippling water as if of a shattered moonbeam. But these displays paled their ineffectual fires before that which Heaven provided. The lightning, which Franklin caught and Morse taught, burst out, and glowed and frolicked from behind the black clouds that rose pile on pile in the west, as if it were conscious of the new conquest in which it was to play so essential a part, and in achieving which the Niagara had rendered so important service. But at length the Niagara arrived at her anchorage ground, and was fastened to a buoy. She was

immediately surrounded by small boats, which came from the shore in flocks. Everything on board was bustle and confusion. The officers and crew, delighted with the prospect of so pleasant a termination to so arduous and tedious an absence, ran hither and thither in all the flurry excited by the prospect of approaching relaxation. Yet all was order. The discipline of the vessel was never for a moment disregarded."

Two days previously, the telegraphic announcement of the interchange of Cable messages between Queen Victoria and President Buchanan had been received with shouts of joy, and the *Times* printed it under a heading which occupied the space of half a column, reading as follows:—

"The Ocean Telegraph.
 Victory at Last!
 The First Message.
 England Greets America.
 Queen Victoria
 To
 President Buchanan.
 The President's Reply.
 Triumphant Completion
 of the
 Great Work of the Century.
 The Old World and the New United.
 Gloria in Excelsis!"

The world grows prosaic. In the eleven years that have since run by, the laying of deep-sea cables has become a common affair; and all of us now read, without an emotion of surprise, the news of what the Old World did one hour ago. The only marvel is, that such speed was not made in our fathers' time.

THE WAR CORRESPONDENTS.

THE spirit of newspaper enterprise which led the owners of the London *Times* to send Mr. William H. Russell to this country to observe the progress of the Civil War in 1861, was also operative in a similar direction among the conductors of American journals. In the early days of the war, the London

Times was regarded as an authority on all subjects; and its special correspondent was received, as soon as he had landed, with much courtesy, and abundant offers of assistance. Mr. Russell, however, came here to prepare wares for a Tory and Secessionist market, and he spiced his letters with condiments that were too hot for the average American palate. For a time, his letters were regularly copied into the New York papers, and from the latter into a majority of the local journals in all parts of the United States; but when Russell began to tell fibs, and the London *Times* to praise the Secessionists continually, the practice of copying fell off, and the London *Times* and its correspondent simultaneously became offensive.

Meanwhile, the "war correspondents" who had been sent out to the battle-fields to represent the newspapers of New York thrived and grew famous. They were true, loyal men, shrewd observers, who saw the events of the time with clear vision; who had been drilled in newspaper harness until they had become diligent and intelligent workers. Knowing exactly what was wanted, they furnished the earliest intelligence, often outstripping the couriers of the army, and giving the government itself tidings of great successes, or of greater defeats, hours or days before the reports of the officers in command had reached the head-quarters at Washington.* Often

* The extreme enterprise of some of the war correspondents often led them into indiscretions. The following curious letter from General Butler, written in 1864, possesses a sort of historical interest from its bearing upon such cases:—

"HEAD-QUARTERS DEPARTMENT VIRGINIA AND }
NORTH CAROLINA, IN THE FIELD, }
Sept. 25, 1864. }

"To Newspaper Correspondents connected with the Army of the James, and in the Department of Virginia and North Carolina.

"GENTLEMEN:—I need not say to you, probably, that I have never interfered with the quantity, kind, or quality of your communications in regard to the movements of the Army of the James, or in this Department. I have stated to some of you that I desired that you should speak only of acts done, and to say nothing of movements when in preparation or while in progress. Forty-eight (48) hours, at the farthest, brings to the enemy in printed form as well the speculations and prognostications of events about to happen, in which you may indulge, as the facts that have already happened which you narrate.

they encountered serious perils, and at different times some of them were captured by the enemy; but their courage was proof against all disaster, and the volumes in which they have since recorded their observations and adventures are valuable contributions to the history of the great conflict.

NEWSPAPER REPORTERS.

THE newspaper reporters form a singular class, whose peculiarities would furnish abundant material for a separate volume. One or two anecdotes concerning them are all for which space can here be given.

In the *Times*' office, twelve or thirteen years ago, there was the strongest force of reporters ever gathered together in the service of any single newspaper in New York. Carey, Under-

“From my knowledge of you and each of you, so far as you are known to me, I believe all sincerely loyal and patriotic, and that either of you would not willingly do anything which would aid the enemy; and yet unwittingly I have thought that you do so.

“Now, then, I desire that in any correspondence from this Department there shall be no prognostications, no assertions that you could give news if it were not contraband; no predictions that movements are about to be made that will surprise the enemy or anybody else. Indeed, gentlemen, allow me to commend to you, as a rule of action, the advice of Hamlet to his friend Horatio, when he desired to keep secret his acts and intentions:—

“That you, at such times seeing me, never shall,
With arms encumbered thus, or this head shake,
Or by pronouncing of some doubtful phrase,
As, *Well, well we know*—
Or, *We could an' if we would*;—
Or, *If we list to speak*; or, *There be an' if they might*:
Or some such ambiguous giving out, its note,
That you know ought of me;
This do you swear.”

“After any movement has been made and completed, then you can give such account of it, and of the officers and men engaged in it, as your good judgment and good taste may dictate; and for that purpose every facility of public or official documents in my possession will be put at your disposal.

“A word further of caution, and I hope I shall not have troubled you in vain. Descriptions of the movements of officers of high rank frequently give the enemy a clue that some movement is in progress, which a reasonable amount of sagacity will enable them to discover.

“I have the honor to be, gentlemen, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

“BENJ. F. BUTLER,
“Major-General Comd'g.”

hill, Roberts, Warburton, Welden, Canniff, Leech, Moylan, Smith, Roberts, Pepper, and half a dozen more, who belonged to the corps, were all excellent reporters. Roberts, Welden, and Canniff are dead; Carey and Warburton are now law-court reporters in New York, making their stenographic acquirements profitable; Smith has returned to England; the remainder are scattered. William H. Canniff was so complete a type of the pushing, energetic reporter, that one anecdote of his performances may properly be told, as a practical illustration of the manner in which news is obtained by the force of brazen impudence.

When the steamer Henry Clay was burned on the Hudson River, Canniff was sent to gather the particulars of the accident, and was especially charged to bring a full list of the names of the killed and wounded. He did so; but he exulted over his own skill in this fashion:—

“Do you see that name?” he inquired of the City Editor.—“Yes.”—“Well, that name gave me more trouble than all the rest. The man was lying on the shore, nearly dead. His wife was with him, and uninjured. I tried to get the man to talk, but he couldn’t. Then I asked his wife for his name and address; and I got them.” This proved to be a fact. That the agonized wife was plunged into the deepest sorrow by the mortal injury of her husband was no affair to concern the reporter. He was in quest of news; and no consideration found place in his mind, except that of getting the earliest and the fullest story. This is a hardening process, but a useful one. It is the way in which early tidings are obtained; and the ordinary newspaper reader would have to go behind the scenes to discover the curious methods of filling the columns which he reads with intense interest. Many such anecdotes as the one given might be related.

The class of reporters commonly known as the Jenkinses of the Press are a distinct collection; men gifted with vivid imaginations and possessed of a fluent style. The *Tribune’s* account of the burning of Barnum’s Museum, which was copied into nearly all the papers in the Union, was one of the best specimens of the peculiar kind of work performed by these

men. They have a faculty of spinning endless stories on exceedingly small foundations of fact; and this tendency was lately ridiculed in a clever fashion in the columns of the very journal which gave place to the Barnum romance. It is copied below, as a specimen which explains itself:—

“JENKINS RIDES THE WHIRLWIND AND DIRECTS THE STORM.

The news in plain English.

About eleven o'clock on Friday night a storm of wind and rain set in.

The news after the Dummy-and-Dilution paper had fixed it up.

FLOOD AND TEMPEST.

—
 HOW JUPITER PLUVIUS DESCENDED
 UPON THE COUNTRY — HOW THE
 STORM LASHED THE STREAMING
 PANES — HOW THE HOUSELESS
 POOR SHIVERED AND SUFFERED.

—
 The storm which beat down upon the city on Friday night was one of the severest tempests of wind and rain with which New York has been visited for many years. The first manifestation made by the rain had a FEROCITY about it which prognosticated business on the part of Jupiter Pluvius. AND THE PROGNOSTICATION WAS FULFILLED!! Shortly after eleven o'clock the aqueous drops began to come down. At first they were quite undemonstrative, but ere many minutes had elapsed they had SWELLED THEMSELVES INTO A VOLUME OF WET THAT DRENCHED THE WHOLE CITY; AND MADE MUSIC OUT OF EVERY PANE OF GLASS THAT ITS LIMPID FINGERS COULD REACH.

The wind being south-east, the tide in the harbor rose about six feet higher than usual.

—
 Effect of rain on Poverty — Washing — Swamping — Fear — Flood — Inundation — “OCEANIC DEMON, with no desire in his heart save one which sought to cause a general drowning of every human creature!!” [And about one-fourth column more of the same sort.]

One or two cellars on West Street were flooded to the depth of four or five inches.

Tidal Waters — Utter Confusion — Philanthropist — Benevolent tears — Waters rush down cellar with terrific force. [About half a column.]

Total length of the news, 10 lines.
 Total length of the Dummy-and-Dilution story, . . . 1 column."

Mr. George William Curtis has recently taken up the fight against the Jenkins class; * and his rebuke is worthy of circulation and preservation. He writes: —

“At last we have the *Magnum Opus* of Mr. Jenkins, and we ought to be content. The chief domestic event of the month, from the Easy-Chair’s point of view, was the arrival of Father Hyacinthe, whom, in a few airy and prelusive touches at the head of his work, Mr. Jenkins calls the ‘Preacher Monk,’ ‘The Great Carmelite Friar.’ Mr. Jenkins brings to his task not only his peculiar and renowned natural gifts, but certain official advantages. For Mr. Jenkins was the Committee of Reception, and with his customary shrewdness he resolved to get the start of all other historians by beginning a little before the beginning. He therefore opened his narration upon shipboard. But at the very outset a remarkably vicious word for his purpose obtruded itself into his story, and imperilled the success of his labors. ‘The evening,’ says Mr. Herodotus Jenkins, ‘was so delicious, the scene around me so calm and grand, I fell into a reverie which was now and then disturbed by the whistling of the wind through the rigging. I heard a step behind, and, looking round, saw a low-sized, thick-set man, with a head like an inverted pumpkin, in dark clothes, approaching the taffrail, with his head buried in his breast, and a pair of bright, black eyes shining and sparkling like diamonds.’

“It certainly shows great daring and conscious power to introduce your hero as low-sized and thick-set, with a head like an inverted pumpkin. But still more striking is Mr. Jenkins’s bold confidence in a comma; for if that little punctuating point had failed to come in at the precise place, we should have had ‘the preacher monk’ presented to us as a figure ‘with a head like an inverted pumpkin in dark clothes;’ and nothing but the experienced skill of a Jenkins could have carried such a description to a grave conclusion. The low-sized man leans over the taffrail beside Mr. Jenkins, who, although he has minutely described the stranger’s appearance, now remarks, ‘I did not take any notice of the stranger at first.’ But a voice in ‘full, melodious French’ is suddenly heard, whose ‘liquidity’ and other vocal virtues now has the effect upon Mr. Jenkins’s mind of the strawberry mark upon the left arm of a long-lost brother. There is a ‘flash of recollection’ by which this ‘grand voice’ is seen to have been heard before. The ‘inverted pumpkin’ bent toward Mr. Jenkins ‘with marked courtesy.’ Also, the stranger, with a ‘courteous gesture,’ pointed to ‘the brilliant sky above us,’ and then said to the excellent Jenkins, ‘My son, this night is a beautiful one, and worthy of the great and eternal attributes of God’s majesty.’ There could be no longer

* The Easy Chair of *Harper’s Magazine*, December, 1869.

any doubt even in the severely judicious mind of a Jenkins; and 'This, then, was Charles Loyson Hyacinthe, the wondrous Carmelite monk preacher.'

"When Mr. Jenkins heard him preach in the Madeleine in Paris five years before, he had seen him in 'froek, cowl, and sandalled shoon.' But now he beheld 'a gentlemanly little person [with an inverted pumpkin head *passim*], in the black clothing of an ordinary American Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, wearing the most unmistakable French kid boots, and a modern hat of fashionable construction.' This gentleman immediately proceeded to remark to Mr. Jenkins that 'The Gothic structure, with its groined roof and fret-work, its mural tablets and magnificent archways, may be forgotten after the vision has left them; but here the span of sky, and the deep, deep ocean beneath, silently flowing on and ever, like the stream of eternity, can alone palsy the thoughts of an unbeliever and silence the reckless jests of the hardened scoffer. My son, think of these things; look not so lightly upon Father Ocean; ponder and meditate; for our life is but a journey from Paris to Brussels; the terminus is reached; the passengers deposited at their resting-place, and then all is darkness and agony and bewilderment for those who have dreamed on their brief life-journey that the great All-Giver and Father of Mercies was but an accident of chance, a being to analyze and doubt of, as Voltaire did to his eternal destruction.' He stopped. 'I looked around,' remarks Mr. Jenkins, 'and I saw the form of the great preacher descending the companion-way into the saloon.'

"It is evident that, as hearing the 'liquidity' of the voice recalled the Madeleine to Mr. Jenkins, so the spectacle of that gentleman recalled the church so vividly to the Father that he immediately began to preach. Is this indeed the kind of familiar evening chat over the taffrail that gentlemen hear who go down to the sea in ships? Is this a specimen of the colloquy of the good Carmelite? Or must we say, in the words of a most worthy gentleman with a sad impediment in his speech, that 'Mum-Mum-Mum-Macaulay was a goo-goo-goo-good writer,' but that Macaulay must pale his ineffectual fires before Herodotus Jenkins?

"An Easy Chair, of course, can only wonder at the historian, even as the historian wondered at the wondrous monk. His report belongs to the more fervid parts of the literature of travel; and it is certainly very much more entertaining than many of the most popular novels of the moment. Its title should apparently be *The Man Who Preaches*. And if, as the reader peruses the report, he must needs fancy the modest clergyman, who is the hero, shrinking and wincing from such a glowing portraiture, yet he must remember that, as a Carmelite, he is devoted to self-renunciation and sacrifice. We have had a moonlight glimpse of the hero leaning over the taffrail and preaching a short sermon. Let us observe him as Mr. Jenkins describes him in a moment of silence: 'The figure of the Father was often noticeable on deck, studying his breviary between meals, and promenading on the smooth, polished, wooden surface. Father Hyacinthe had some qualms of sea-sickness, but he managed to overcome them after the first two days of the passage out from Brest.'

"Mr. Jenkins had plainly resolved that this history should be, as we have called it, his great work, — even surpassing his account of Mrs. Flummy's *recherché croquet matinée*, or Mrs. Dummy's last select and aristocratic *cauldle*

dansante. Evidently he took prodigious pains that his hero should be presented to the American world in a manner that should leave nothing to be said, and very little to be surmised. 'At the dining-table,'—continues this most veracious and charming of chroniclers,—'at the dining-table the great preacher ate sparingly of the plainest dishes, and seemed quite fond of celery and pickled onions; underdone roast beef and boiled mutton he also seemed to relish, and the dessert of raisins and other fruits was relished by him. He drank sherry in small quantities, and occasionally a glass of Medoc table-claret. A light breakfast of white hot French rolls and a cup of coffee served for his breakfast, and his lunch was nothing but a little soup and boiled potato.' Could an enlightened curiosity demand more? Alas! yes; for there are spots upon the sun. He relishes underdone beef and pickled onions. But does he take mustard with the former, and does he wipe his mouth with a napkin after the latter? Alas! Alps on Alps arise! If a napkin, does he handle it with both hands, and draw it from side to side of his mouth, as is the custom of his country, or does he mop the lips merely? And if he mops merely, does he use both hands, or one only? And if one, which one? And if the right one, does his little finger stick out ornamentally, or does it assist in grasping the linen? And is it real linen? Or cotton and linen mixed? And how often are the napkins changed? And are they carefully washed? And who does the washing? And how much is she paid a dozen? And is she married? And how many children has she? And are they going to take in washing too? Herodotus Jenkins, like Macaulay, is a goo-goo-good writer, but there are some things that even he has omitted.

"By an easy and natural transition the historian passes from pickled onions to the occasion of the Father's departure from his convent, and quotes the letter of one of his warm personal friends. 'I give it just as I saw it in manuscript,' characteristically says the author. By and by the voyage is ended, and the hubbub of arrival follows, and then the hero of the *magnum opus* 'came on the dock, unobtrusively dressed in a plain black suit, with a broad felt hat.' He is described as passing rapidly to a carriage, and the scene then shifts to the hotel at which he is to lodge. The hall of the Fifth Avenue Hotel at four o'clock in the afternoon is graphically portrayed. 'The grand hall on the first floor is but thinly populated, and presents a scene far less inspiring than that which strikes the eye after the shades of night have come down, and the lamps of Madison Square shed their genial light across Broadway.' Suddenly, at this hour, 'the gentlemanly clerks behind the hotel-desk' are taken by surprise. A carriage rumbles. It stops. What of it? It often happens. 'Tis at the side door. What then? What then, unconscious gentlemanly clerks? Why, in that carriage there is a seat, and upon that seat there is a man with French kid boots and an inverted pumpkin head, in dark clothes; and that man upon that seat is the wondrous Carmelite monk preacher. Hist! he comes. 'Although considerably fatigued by the voyage, the Rev. Father stepped up to the desk, and with a hand that did not tremble in the least enrolled on the register the name Fr. Hyacinthe. As soon as he had done this little piece of chirography, a number of gentlemen,' etc. But the enrolling and chirographical Father escaped the civilities of 'a number of gentlemen,' and was 'conducted upstairs to the apartments

that he will occupy during his sojourn in this city.' Other people may write their names and go to their rooms, but not those whom Mr. Jenkins attends. Mere mortals also upon the pages of other historians may wash their hands and faces. But the heroes of Jenkins are guilty of nothing monosyllabic. 'Father Hyacinthe, like all good Christians, had no sooner entered the room than he paid his respects to the apparatus that is devoted to ablutionary purposes. He turned on the Croton, and was in the middle of a thorough wash when an invitation was received for him to come down to dinner.' Whether the annalist observed these historical events from under the bed or through the keyhole he does not record; and, by a singular lapse of the sense of the fitness and symmetry of things, he does not even relate, O Muse! the wiping of the hands and face, nor stay to tell the number of the towels, nor whether they were fringed, or bordered in colors; nor their probable cost; nor whether a liberal discount was allowed for their being taken by the quantity; nor, indeed, any of those details which an intelligent reader intent upon the great religious protest of the Carmelite Father has a moral right to know. But before we lose sight of the hero, we hear, as it were, a reflected strain of the orator. 'The distinguished guest, although suffering from fatigue, praised the dinner very highly, and with that peculiar eloquence which is decidedly his own (and which I, Herodotus Jenkins, so well remember in the Madeleine Church in Paris), bestowed many compliments on the style of *cuisine*, which it was his pleasure to experience so soon after landing on the shores of the 'land of the free and the home of the brave.'

"What Dr. Johnson would have thought of Boswell's story of him we shall never know; but the good Father Hyacinthe was said, and doubtless with truth, to have been aghast when he saw his portrait by Jenkins. It may be supposed to have suggested to him that for a conspicuous man the United States are a whispering gallery walled with mirrors. Every motion is multiplied infinitely, and every word echoes and re-echoes without end. Mr. Jenkins, indeed, has, as he will doubtless be glad to hear, 'a great mission to perform,' not unlike that of the skull of the old feasts. 'Remember your mortality,' is said to the revellers. 'Mind your eye, and your tongue, and your pen,' says Herodotus Jenkins to every distinguished visitor and lion. If Father Hyacinthe makes any serious blunder while he remains in this country, it will certainly not be the fault of the historian. If he does not weigh every word and guard every look, it will not be because he does not know that he is minutely studied through a thousand lorgnettes. Meanwhile, as Mr. Jenkins is of a genial and humane temper, whose purpose is to please his fellow-creatures, he ought to be satisfied with the reflection that while Thucydides, and Sallust, and Gibbon, and Grote, and Macaulay, and Motley may be read through without a single smile, it is impossible to read Herodotus Jenkins without peals of laughter at every line. 'Small service is true service while it lasts.' Grimaldi, also, was a benefactor."

PRECISION IN JOURNALISM.

ONE curiosity of Journalism should perhaps find place here. It illustrates the other extreme, — the extreme which not only

prohibits the employment of the Jenkins reporter, but establishes the law that no phrase remotely savoring of slang shall ever appear in a newspaper article.

In the office of the New York *Evening Post* there is an "Index Expurgatorius," to which every assistant editor and reporter engaged in the service of that paper is bound to pay respect. It contains a catalogue of words that are never to be used; and among the number are several phrases which came up in the late War, and were generally adopted by the newspapers. The whole list reads as follows, the head-lines being the work of wags in the office:—

INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.

THE DISUSED WORDS OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE.

"No more of that, Hal, an' thou lovest me."

"Friend after friend departs;—
Who hath not lost a friend?"

"Though lost to sight, to memory dear."

[The words in the subjoined list are ignominiously expelled from good society.]

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Aspirant. | 17. "Hon." |
| 2. Authoress. | 18. Inaugurated,
(for "begun.") |
| 3. "Being" done, built, etc. | 19. Initiated,
(for "begun.") |
| 4. Bogus. | 20. In our midst. |
| 5. Bagging,
(for "capturing.") | 21. Ignore. |
| 6. Balance,
(for "remainder.") | 22. Jeopardize. |
| 7. Collided. | 23. Juvenile,
(for "boy.") |
| 8. Commenced,
(for "begun.") | 24. Jubilant,
(for "rejoicing.") |
| 9. Couple,
(for "two.") | 25. Lady,
(for "wife.") |
| 10. Débût. | 26. Lengthy. |
| 11. Donate and Donation. | 27. Loafer. |
| 12. Employée. | 28. Loan, or loaned,
(for "lend" or "lent.") |
| 13. "Esq." | 29. Located. |
| 14. Endorse,
(for "approve.") | 30. Measurably,
(for "in a measure.") |
| 15. Gents,
(for "gentlemen.") | 31. Ovation. |
| 16. Humbug. | |

32. Obituary,
(for "death.")
33. Parties,
(for "persons.")
34. Posted,
(for "informed.")
35. Poetess.
36. Portion,
(for "part.")
37. Predicate.
38. Progressing.
39. Pants,
(for "pantaloons.")
40. Quite,
(prefixed to "good," "large," etc.)
41. Realized,
(for "obtained.")
42. Reliable,
(for "trustworthy.")
43. Repudiate,
(for "reject," or "disown.")
44. Retire,
(for "withdraw.")
45. Rôle,
(for "part.")
46. Rowdies.
47. Roughs.
48. Secesh.
49. States,
(for "says.")
50. Taboo.
51. Transpire,
(for "occur.")
52. To progress.
53. Tapis.
54. Talented.
55. The deceased.
56. Vicinity,
(for "neighborhood.")
57. Wall Street slang generally:—
(“bulls, bears, long, short, flat,
corner, tight,” etc.)

CHAPTER XXIV.

A DIGRESSION CONCERNING NEWSPAPER BORES.

HOW EDITORS ARE BORED — THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OF BORES — THE POETS, AND WHAT MR. BRYANT SAID OF THEM — POLITICAL, INQUISITIVE, AND CLERICAL BORES — THE “STRONG-MINDED” WOMEN — THE PERSONS AFFLICTED BY BORES.

THE BORES require a classification more in detail than could have been properly given in the preceding chapter of “Anecdotes and Incidents.”

There is no living newspaper man who has not been compelled to endure the inflictions of a bore. The variety is large, but the courage and vitality of the race are visible throughout. Byron was not wrong when he wrote:—

“Society is now one polished horde,
Formed of two mighty tribes, the bores and bored.”

Poetical bores are male and female, and it is difficult to decide which sex is the more persistent, or the greater nuisance. It is true that the snubbing of a man by a man is comparatively an easy task; but what man can snub a woman and retain his self-respect? The manner of approach by the woman-poet is singularly embarrassing to any one but a brute. She floats in gracefully and gently. Editor rises to offer her a chair; his heart like lead, but his face a sunbeam. Poetess begins the conversation:—

“You are the editor of the *Daily Thunderer*?”

“I am, madam.”

“I have long read your paper, sir, with the greatest pleasure and instruction. Our family have taken it for many years, and we should feel quite lost without it. We always find

something interesting in it, and the literary selections are admirable! I see that you often publish poetry — my friends have paid me the compliment of saying that some of my poetical efforts are worthy of being printed — I have — I — have — written something here which I wish to submit to you for your decision — I should be very glad if you would accept it — my friends would be gratified to see it published — we have often read your paper with interest — my father, who advertises with you, likes the *Thunderer* very much — and — and will you be so good, sir, as to look over this — and I shall look for it to-morrow,” — and then a sweet smile, and a flash from a pair of pretty eyes, and, with an engaging air, Aramintha makes a sweeping salutation and departs.

The editor draws a long breath, and prints the poem, which is likely to be of the pattern of Mrs. Leo Hunter's effusion: —

“ Can I view thee, panting, lying
 On thy stomach, without sighing?
 Can I, unmoved, see thee dying
 On a log,
 Expiring frog?”

“ Say, have friends, in shape of boys,
 With wild halloo, and brutal noise,
 Hunted thee from marshy joys,
 With a dog,
 Expiring frog?”

That is one type. Here is another: —

Enter a wan man, eyes deeply sunken, hair thrown behind the ears in wild confusion, collar crumpled, coat seedy, and hat awry. He produces, defiantly, an epic; hands it, peremptorily, to the occupant of the tripod; insists that it shall be read then and there. He is blandly informed that “it must await its turn.” He glares savagely for a moment, lingers, turns upon his heel, and finally goes. The “poem” is cast into the waste-basket, and the next day is sold to a dealer at the rate of five cents a pound. The third day the author returns. Being informed that his manuscript is rejected, he demands its return. “Impossible, sir!” is the reply; “we never return

manuscripts; you should keep a copy if you wish to preserve what you write." Poet flames out at this, calls the editor hard names, — such as "no gentleman" and "blackguard," — and the upshot is that the disconsolate bard finds himself suddenly excluded from the editorial sanctum.

These are extreme types — strong contrasts. Not all the men are brutal; on the contrary, very many are gentle, lovable, and brilliant, and their contributions are gratefully accepted and often paid for. Nor, on the other hand, are all the poetesses angelic.

Besides these specimens might be mentioned the drunken poet, who borrows "five dollars on account;" the mad poet, who has the lunacies of poor McDonald Clarke, without Clarke's genius; the typographical poet, who continually pesters editors to print his apostrophes to the printing-press, Franklin, and the steam-engine. All these are pure nuisances, — usually unmitigated humbugs; but are likely to be personally good-natured fellows, and so comparatively endurable. Nevertheless, they are bores, professionally speaking.

The Nestor of American poets, afflicted beyond endurance by the swarm of rhymesters, who, as he expressed it, "flung themselves in a body" upon his journal, once gave significant expression to his judgment of this class of bores. Of all the editors of New York, William Cullen Bryant is the finest scholar, the best poet, the man most tender of the feelings of the poetaster. But even his patience finally snapped off short, under the peculiarly aggravating circumstances of an avalanche of rhymes which had no reason, and epics without heroes; and some years ago the following address appeared in the columns of the *Evening Post*: —

" TO POETS AND POETESSES.

" We desire it to be understood by those who amuse themselves with writing verses, and who take, as one of them confesses to us, 'a real pleasure at seeing their words in print,' that there is very little we can do to accommodate them. Probably no one among them all has any idea of the number of his competitors for that fame, such as it is, which is acquired through the newspapers. There is nothing more common in our country than a certain facility

In rhyming. Almost everybody can make verses who can count. A few examples of general notoriety acquired by poets who have produced what the most of readers admire, we fear does the mischief. Their example seduces thousands of men and women, mostly young persons, some of mature age, whose case may therefore be considered as hopeless, and even a few aged people, who, having commenced poets after they have retired from other occupations, go rhyming down the hill of life.

“But we do not exactly see why this tuneful tribe should fling themselves in a body upon the *Evening Post*. The plain truth is that we receive more poetry, offered for publication in these columns, than we are able to read, and are obliged in such cases to content ourselves with the introductory stanza. Some of them, if a little long, we consider ourselves as under no necessity of reading a word of, since they cannot be admitted. We plead guilty, however, to the charge of having sometimes, either through a careless reading of the manuscript, or a mistaken good nature, allowed to appear in our columns verses which should have been thrown into the fire, and it is fortunate for us that a daily newspaper is not held by its readers to so strict an accountability in this respect as a literary weekly or a magazine. We hope our readers will bear with us, should we happen sometimes to fall into the same error hereafter. But while we ask this indulgence from them, we must desire that numerous class who favor us with their contributions in verse, not to be disappointed if they never hear of them again. Life is too short to pass much of it in looking over manuscript poetry, with the chance of only finding it indifferent in nine cases out of ten, and we have other uses for our columns than publishing it.”

The “tuneful tribe” took the hint, and for a considerable time there was a perceptible falling-off in the number of poetical contributions received at the office of the *Evening Post*. But it was only a lull in the tempest. The rhymesters, recovering their wind, again climbed Parnassus, and from aerial heights launched fresh missives upon the head of the venerated poet. He bowed gracefully to the storm.

The Political Bore is the exact opposite of the Poetical. The politician believes, or professes to believe, that all men have their price; that voters, office-holders, judges, jurors, can all be bought; that men in place are like sheep in the shambles, to be weighed, and measured, and felt of. In the growing corruption of our American political system, which gives opportunity for mean men to rule, for scheming villains to buy, for sanctimonious hypocrites to cajole, the professional politician of our cities and large towns is not wrong in his general estimate. He takes the world as he finds it, and gets his profit from it. But

all this only makes the Political Bore more a bore to right thinking men.

The Inquisitive Bore wears spectacles, is middle-aged, and usually has too little time left after peering into others' business to attend to his own and make a living at it. Insinuating in manner, but fell in purpose, this species approaches the newspaper editor with an air of unconcern, passes a comment upon the topic of the hour, or that unfailing subject, the weather, seizes his victim by the button if he shows a disposition to escape, and holds on.

The Clerical Bore walks gravely into the editorial sanctum, and tells the editor, in round, full tones, "How much pleased I was with your admirable article of yesterday;" and then solemnly sinks into the softest seat to talk. Comparatively few of the clergy do this; and those who do are generally from New England. Their solemnity is laughable in the eyes of the irreverent newspaper man, who learns to detect Chadband and Pecksniff at a glance. But there is one type of the bore-clerical who is so good and so vain that the afflicted editor has patience with his foibles, for the sake of his undeniable virtues. This is the middle-aged clergyman of the city parish, who is remarkable in the pulpit for emphasizing all the conjunctions and prepositions, and in the editorial room for writing puffs for himself, over which he laughs good-naturedly as he hands them to the editor to be printed, saying: "This sort of thing, you know, pleases the members of my congregation, and they don't know where it comes from!"

The "Strong-minded" Woman is the worst of all the modern bores, — worse than the poets of her own sex, and unsurpassed even by the ward politician. Charles Dickens somewhere draws a portrait of an ancient maiden whose disposition was neither sweet nor sour, but of whom it was said that, like the huckster-woman's apples, she was "a pleasant tart." A "strong-minded" woman, the defender of the doctrine of "woman's rights," is not often absolutely acid, nor is she ever completely sweet; but, under the most favorable circumstances, she is a bore. Some members of this class are tall and angular, —

determined Pipchins, in steel spectacles and black bombazine; others are fat, good-natured, and generally well dressed; others again are young and pretty, and so make havoc. But they are all bores together. Worst of all, they believe in the power of the Press, haunt newspaper offices, and pester newspaper men. Nor are they content with this; for they get weak moneyed men to start newspapers for them; and they get themselves organized into clubs, and get their speeches reported in the newspapers, and make themselves notorious — while their houses run to decay, their children go unkempt, and the wretched male sex, in the places called homes, get the treatment of dogs in a kennel. Of such, the poet says: —

“Round her strew’d room—a frippery chaos lies,
 A chequered wreck of notable and wise;
 Bills, books, caps, couplets, combs, a varied mass,
 Oppress the toilet and obscure the glass;
 Unfinished here an epigram is laid,
 And there a mantua-maker’s bill unpaid.”

The Philanthropic Bore is known to every editor. Sometimes he espouses the cause of the Indian; sometimes that of the street-boy; Midnight Missions are established by him, and he sends flannel jackets to little West Indian negroes; or he cares for orphan children at the rate of ten thousand dollars a year for each poor little ragged vagabond — and so the professional philanthropist makes a good living for himself by working upon the sympathies or appealing to the Christian feelings of persons who are easily moved by tales of woe.

The persons afflicted by these classes of bores are not exclusively newspaper men. Other literary characters have their own share of suffering, and the victims might be ranked in their proper order thus: —

1. Editors of newspapers.
2. Conductors of magazines.

3. Readers for publishing houses.
4. People who know editors, magazine conductors or publishers' readers.
5. People who know people who know all the foregoing.

CHAPTER XXV.

A HISTORY OF NEWSPAPER HOAXES.

FAMOUS DECEPTIONS—THE “MOON HOAX” OF 1835—THE POLK CAMPAIGN AND THE “ROORBACK”—THE LINCOLN PROCLAMATION HOAX.

No account of the history of Journalism in New York would be complete without a record of the famous hoaxes which have appeared in the public prints. Foremost among these is the “Moon Hoax,” which was first published in Beach’s *Sun* in August and September, 1835.

The author of the “Moon Hoax” was Richard Adams Locke, then a resident of the city of Brooklyn. In a moment of riotous fancy, he conceived the idea of preparing a grand deception; and he did it very effectually. In August, 1835, there appeared in the columns of the New York *Sun* a pretended extract from the pages of a “Supplement to the Edinburgh *Journal of Science*,” under the title of “Great Astronomical Discoveries lately made by Sir John Herschel, LL.D., F.R.S., etc., at the Cape of Good Hope,”—in all of which there was not one word of truth; but the air of perfect honesty and of profound scientific research with which the deception was put forward served to puzzle readers who were not sufficiently learned to detect the imposture. As a piece of literary work, it was admirable. Several numbers of the *Sun* were occupied with the successive portions of the hoax, and the copies were all eagerly bought up.

A generation has since passed away, and to the younger class of readers the story of the “Moon Hoax” is fresh. For many years, Locke’s essay has been out of print, and stray copies of the *Sun* containing it command high prices at the rare intervals when they appear upon the market. The whole story is therefore reproduced in the following pages:—

“GREAT ASTRONOMICAL DISCOVERIES LATELY MADE BY SIR JOHN HERSCHEL, LL.D., F.R.S., ETC., AT THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

“*From the Supplement to the Edinburgh Journal of Science.*”

“In this unusual addition to our Journal, we have the happiness of making known to the British public, and thence to the whole civilized world, recent discoveries in Astronomy which will build an imperishable monument to the age in which we live, and confer upon the present generation of the human race a proud distinction through all future time. It has been poetically said, that the stars of heaven are the hereditary regalia of man, as the intellectual sovereign of the animal creation. He may now fold the Zodiac around him with a loftier consciousness of his mental supremacy.

“It is impossible to contemplate any great Astronomical discovery, without feelings closely allied to a sensation of awe, and nearly akin to those with which a departed spirit may be supposed to discover the realities of a future state. Bound by the irrevocable laws of nature to the globe on which we live, creatures ‘close shut up in infinite expanse,’ it seems like acquiring a fearful supernatural power when any remote mysterious works of the Creator yield tribute to our curiosity. It seems almost a presumptuous usurpation of powers denied us by the divine will, when man, in the pride and confidence of his skill, steps forth, far beyond the apparently natural boundary of his privileges, and demands the secrets and familiar fellowship of other worlds. We are assured that when the immortal philosopher to whom mankind is indebted for the thrilling wonders now first made known, had at length adjusted his new and stupendous apparatus with a certainty of success, he solemnly paused several hours before he commenced his observations, that he might prepare his own mind for discoveries which he knew would fill the minds of myriads of his fellowmen with astonishment, and secure his name a bright, if not transcendent, conjunction with that of his venerable father, to all posterity. And well might he pause! From the hour the first human pair opened their eyes to the glories of the blue firmament above them, there has been no accession to human

knowledge at all comparable in sublime interest to that which he has been the honored agent in supplying ; and we are taught to believe that, when a work, already preparing for the press, in which his discoveries are embodied in detail, shall be laid before the public, they will be found of incomparable importance to some of the grandest operations of civilized life. Well might he pause ! He was about to become the sole depository of wondrous secrets which had been hid from the eyes of all men that had lived since the birth of time. He was about to crown himself with a diadem of knowledge which would give him a conscious pre-eminence above every individual of his species who then lived, or who had lived in the generations that are passed away. He paused ere he broke the seal of the casket which contained it.

“To render our enthusiasm intelligible, we will state at once that by means of a telescope of vast dimensions and an entirely new principle, the younger Herschel, at his observatory in the Southern Hemisphere, has already made the most extraordinary discoveries in every planet of our solar system ; has discovered planets in other solar systems ; has obtained a distinct view of objects in the moon, fully equal to that which the unaided eye commands of terrestrial objects at the distance of a hundred yards ; has affirmatively settled the question whether this satellite be inhabited, and by what order of beings ; has firmly established a new theory of cometary phenomena ; and has solved or corrected nearly every leading problem of mathematical astronomy.

“For our early and almost exclusive information concerning these facts, we are indebted to the devoted friendship of Dr. Andrew Grant, the pupil of the elder, and for several years past the inseparable coadjutor of the younger Herschel. The amanuensis of the latter at the Cape of Good Hope, and the indefatigable superintendent of his telescope during the whole period of its construction and operation, Dr. Grant has been enabled to supply us with intelligence equal, in general interest at least, to that which Dr. Herschel himself has transmitted to the Royal Society. Indeed, our correspondent assures us that the voluminous documents now before a committee of that in-

stitution contain little more than details and mathematical illustrations of the facts communicated to us in his own ample correspondence. For permission to indulge his friendship in communicating this invaluable information to us, Dr. Grant and ourselves are indebted to the magnanimity of Dr. Herschel, who, far above all mercenary considerations, has thus signally honored and rewarded his fellow-laborer in the field of science. The engravings of lunar animals and other objects, and of the phases of the several planets, are accurate copies of drawings taken in the observatory by Herbert Home, Esq., who accompanied the last powerful series of reflectors from London to the Cape, and superintended their erection; and he has thus recorded the proofs of their triumphant success. The engraving of the belts of Jupiter is a reduced copy of an imperial folio drawing by Dr. Herschel himself, and contains the results of his latest observation of that planet. The segment of the inner ring of Saturn is from a large drawing by Dr. Grant.

"We first avail ourselves of the documents which contain a description and history of the instrument by which these stupendous discoveries have been made. A knowledge of the one is essential to the credibility of the other.

"THE YOUNGER HERSCHEL'S TELESCOPE.

"It is well known that the great reflecting telescope of the late elder Herschel, with an object-glass four feet in diameter, and a tube forty feet in length, possesses a magnifying power of more than six thousand times. But a small portion of this power was ever advantageously applied to the nearer astronomical objects; for the deficiency of light from objects so highly magnified, rendered them less distinct than when viewed with a power of a third or fourth of this extent. Accordingly the powers which he generally applied when observing the moon or planets, and with which he made his most interesting discoveries, ranged from two hundred and twenty, four hundred and sixty, seven hundred and fifty, and nine hundred times; although, when inspecting the double and treble fixed stars, and the more distant nebulae, he frequently applied the full capacity of his instrument. The law of optics, that an object be-

comes dim in proportion as it is magnified, seemed, from its exemplification in this powerful telescope, to form an insuperable boundary to further discoveries in our solar system. Several years, however, prior to the death of this venerable astronomer, he conceived it practicable to construct an improved series of parabolic and spherical reflectors, which, by uniting all the meritorious points in the Gregorian and Newtonian instruments, with the highly interesting achromatic discovery of Dolland, would, to a great degree, remove the formidable obstruction. His plan evinced the most profound research in optical science, and the most dexterous ingenuity in mechanical contrivance; but accumulating infirmities, and eventually death, prevented its experimental application. His son, the present Sir John Herschel, who had been nursed and cradled in the observatory, and a practical astronomer from his boyhood, was so fully convinced of the value of the theory, that he determined upon testing it, at whatever cost. Within two years of his father's death he completed his new apparatus, and adapted it to the old telescope with nearly perfect success. He found that the magnifying power of six thousand times, when applied to the moon, which was the severest criterion that could be selected, produced, under these new reflectors, a focal object of exquisite distinctness, free from every achromatic obscurity, and containing the highest degree of light which the great speculum could collect from that luminary.

"The enlargement of the angle of vision, which was thus acquired, is ascertained by dividing the moon's distance from the observatory by the magnifying power of the instrument; and the former being two hundred and forty thousand miles, and the latter six thousand times, leaves a quotient of forty miles as the apparent distance of that planet from the eye of the observer. Now, it is well known that no terrestrial objects can be seen at a greater distance than this, with the naked eye, even from the most favorable elevations. The rotundity of the earth prevents a more distant view than this with the most acute natural vision, and from the highest eminences; and, generally, objects seen at this distance are themselves elevated on mountainous ridges. It is not pretended, moreover, that

this forty miles telescopic view of the moon presented its objects with equal distinctness, though it did in equal size to those of this earth, so remotely stationed.

"The elder Herschel had nevertheless demonstrated, that, with a power of one thousand times, he could discern objects in this satellite of not more than one hundred and twenty-two yards in diameter. If, therefore, the full capability of the instrument had been elicited by the new apparatus of reflectors constructed by his son, it would follow, in mathematical ratio, that objects could be discerned of not more than twenty-two yards in diameter. Yet in either case they would be seen as mere feeble, shapeless points, with no greater conspicuity than they would exhibit upon earth to the unaided eye at the distance of forty miles. But although the rotundity of the earth presented no obstruction to a view of these astronomical objects, we believe Sir John Herschel never insisted that he had carried out these extreme powers of the telescope in so full a ratio. The deficiency of light, though greatly economized and concentrated, still maintained some inverse proportion to the magnitude of the focal image. The advance he had made in the knowledge of this planet, though magnificent and sublime, was thus but partial and unsatisfactory. He was, it is true, enabled to confirm some discoveries of former observers, and to confute those of others. The existence of volcanoes discovered by his father and by Schroeter of Berlin, and the changes observed by the latter in the volcano in the *Mare Crisium*, or Lucid Lake, were corroborated and illustrated, as was also the prevalence of far more extensive volcanic phenomena. The disproportionate height attributed to the lunar mountains was corrected from careful admeasurement; whilst the celebrated conical hills, encircling valleys of vast diameter, and surrounding the lofty central hills, were distinctly perceived. The formation which Professor Fraunhofer uncharitably conjectured to be a lunar fortification, he ascertained to be a tabular buttress of a remarkably pyramidal mountain; lines which had been whimsically pronounced roads and canals, he found to be keen ridges of singularly regular rows of hills; and that which Schroeter imagined to be a great city in the

neighborhood of *Marius*, he determined to be a valley of disjointed rocks scattered in fragments, which averaged at least a thousand yards in diameter. Thus the general geography of the planet, in its grand outlines of cape, continent, mountain, ocean, and island, was surveyed with greater particularity and accuracy than by any previous observer; and the striking dissimilarity of many of its local features to any existing on our own globe was clearly demonstrated. The best enlarged maps of that luminary which have been published were constructed from this survey; and neither the astronomer nor the public ventured to hope for any great accession to their developments. The utmost power of the largest telescope in the world had been exerted in a new and felicitous manner to obtain them, and there was no reasonable expectation that a larger one would ever be constructed, or that it could be advantageously used if it were. A law of nature, and the finitude of human skill, seemed united in inflexible opposition to any further improvement in telescopic science, as applicable to the known planets and satellites of the solar system. For unless the sun could be prevailed upon to extend a more liberal allowance of light to these bodies, and they be induced to transfer it, for the generous gratification of our curiosity, what adequate substitute could be obtained? Telescopes do not create light; they cannot even transmit unimpaired that which they receive. That anything further could be derived from human skill in the construction of instruments, the labors of his illustrious predecessors, and his own, left the son of Herschel no reason to hope. Huygens, Fontana, Gregory, Newton, Hadley, Bird, Short, Dolland, Herschel, and many others, all practical opticians, had resorted to every material in any wise adapted to the composition either of lenses or reflectors, and had exhausted every law of vision which study had developed and demonstrated. In the construction of his last amazing specula, Sir John Herschel had selected the most approved amalgams that the advanced stage of metallic chemistry had combined; and had watched their growing brightness under the hands of the artificer with more anxious hope than ever lover watched the eye of his mistress; and he had nothing further to expect

than they had accomplished. He had the satisfaction to know that if he could leap astride a cannon-ball, and travel upon its wings of fury for the respectable period of several millions of years, he would not obtain a more enlarged view of the distant stars than he could now possess in a few minutes of time; and that it would require an ultra-railroad speed of fifty miles an hour, for nearly the livelong year, to secure him a more favorable inspection of the gentle luminary of night. The interesting question, however, whether this light of the solemn forest, of the treeless desert, and of the deep blue ocean as it rolls; whether this object of the lonely turret, of the uplifted eye on the deserted battle-field, and of all the pilgrims of love and hope, of misery and despair, that have journeyed over the hills and valleys of this earth, through all the eras of its unwritten history to those of its present voluminous record; the exciting question, whether this 'observed' of all the sons of men, from the days of Eden to those of Edinburgh, be inhabited by beings like ourselves, of consciousness and curiosity, was left for solution to the benevolent index of natural analogy, or to the severe tradition that it is tenanted only by the hoary solitaire whom the criminal code of the nursery had banished thither for collecting fuel on the Sabbath day.

"The limits of discovery in the planetary bodies, and in this one especially, thus seemed to be immutably fixed; and no expectation was elevated for a period of several years. But, about three years ago, in the course of a conversational discussion with Sir David Brewster upon the merits of some ingenious suggestions by the latter, in his article on optics in the 'Edinburgh Encyclopedia' (p. 644), for improvements in the Newtonian Reflectors, Sir John Herschel adverted to the convenient simplicity of the old astronomical telescopes that were without tubes, and the object-glass of which, placed upon a high pole, threw its focal image to a distance of one hundred and fifty, and even two hundred feet. Dr. Brewster readily admitted that a tube was not necessary, provided the focal image were conveyed into a dark apartment, and there properly received by reflectors. Sir John then said that, if his father's great telescope, the tube alone of which, though formed

of the lightest suitable materials, weighed three thousand pounds, possessed an easy and steady mobility with its heavy observatory attached, an observatory movable without the incumbrance of such a tube was obviously practical. This also was admitted, and the conversation became directed to that all-invincible enemy, — the paucity of light in powerful magnifiers. After a few moments' silent thought, Sir John diffidently inquired whether it would not be possible to effect *a transfusion of artificial light through the focal object of vision!* Sir David, somewhat startled at the originality of the idea, paused awhile, and then hesitatingly referred to the refrangibility of rays, and the angle of incidence. Sir John, grown more confident, adduced the example of the Newtonian Reflector, in which the refrangibility was corrected by the second speculum, and the angle of incidence restored by the third. 'And,' continued he, 'why cannot the illuminated microscope, say the hydro-oxygen, be applied to render distinct, and, if necessary, even to magnify, the focal object?' Sir David sprung from his chair in an ecstasy of conviction, and, leaping half way to the ceiling, exclaimed, 'Thou art the man!' Each philosopher anticipated the other in presenting the prompt illustration that if the rays of the hydro-oxygen microscope, passed through a drop of water containing the larvæ of a gnat, and other objects invisible to the naked eye, rendered them not only keenly but firmly magnified to dimensions of many feet; so could the same artificial light, passed through the faintest focal object of a telescope, both distinctify (to coin a new word for an extraordinary occasion) and magnify its feeblest component members. The only apparent desideratum was a recipient for the focal image which should transfer it, without refracting it, to the surface on which it was to be viewed under the revivifying light of the microscopic reflectors. In the various experiments made during the few following weeks, the co-operative philosophers decided that a medium of the purest plate glass (which it is said they obtained, by consent, be it observed, from the shop window of Mons. Desanges, the jeweller to his ex-majesty Charles X., in High Street) was the most eligible they could discover. It answered perfectly with a telescope which mag-

nified one hundred times, and a microscope of about thrice that power.

"Sir John Herschel then conceived the stupendous fabric of his present telescope. The power of his father's instrument would still leave him distant from his favorite planet nearly forty miles, and he resolved to attempt a greater magnifier. Money, the wings of science as the sinews of war, seemed the only requisite, and even the acquisition of this, which is often more difficult than the task of Sisyphus, he determined to achieve. Fully sanctioned by the high optical authority of Sir David Brewster, he laid his plan before the Royal Society, and particularly directed to it the attention of His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, the ever munificent patron of science and the arts. It was immediately and enthusiastically approved by the committee chosen to investigate it, and the chairman, who was the Royal President, subscribed his name for a contribution of ten thousand pounds, with a promise that he would zealously submit the proposed instrument as a fit object for the patronage of the privy purse. He did so without delay, and his Majesty, on being informed that the estimated expense was seventy thousand pounds, naively inquired if the costly instrument would conduce to any improvement in *navigation*? On being informed that it undoubtedly would, the sailor king promised a *carte blanche* for the amount which might be required.

"Sir John Herschel had submitted his plans and calculations in adaptation to an object-glass of twenty-four feet in diameter, — just six times the size of his venerable father's. For casting this ponderous mass, he selected the large glass-house of Messrs. Hartly and Grant (the brother of our invaluable friend Dr. Grant), at Dumbarton. The material chosen was an amalgamation of two parts of the best crown with one of flint glass, the use of which, in separate lenses, constituted the great achromatic discovery of Dolland. It had been found, however, by accurate experiments, that the amalgam would as completely triumph over every impediment, both from refrangibility and discoloration, as the separate lenses. Five furnaces of the metal, carefully collected from productions of the manufactory,

in both the kinds of glass, and known to be respectively of nearly perfect homogeneous quality, were united, by one grand conductor, to the mould; and on the third of January, 1833, the first cast was effected. After cooling eight days, the mould was opened, and the glass found to be greatly flawed within eighteen inches of the centre. Notwithstanding this failure, a new glass was more carefully cast on the twenty-seventh of the same month, which, on being opened during the first week of February, was found to be immaculately perfect, with the exception of two slight flaws so near the line of its circumference that they would be covered by the copper ring in which it was designed to be enclosed.

“The weight of this prodigious lens was fourteen thousand eight hundred and twenty-six pounds, or nearly seven tons after being polished; and its estimated magnifying power forty-two thousand times. It was therefore presumed to be capable of representing objects in our lunar satellite of little more than eighteen inches in diameter, provided its focal image of them could be rendered distinct by the transfusion of artificial light. It was not, however, upon the mere illuminating power of the hydro-oxygen microscope, as applied to the focal pictures of this lens, that the younger Herschel depended for the realization of his ambitious theories and hopes. He calculated largely upon the almost illimitable applicability of this instrument as a second magnifier, which would supersede the use, and infinitely transcend the powers of the highest magnifiers in reflecting telescopes.

“So sanguinely indeed did he calculate upon the advantages of this splendid alliance, that he expressed confidence in his ultimate ability to study even the entomology of the moon, in case she contained insects upon her surface. Having witnessed the completion of this great lens, and its safe transportation to the metropolis, his next care was the construction of a suitable microscope, and of the mechanical framework, for the horizontal and vertical action of the whole. His plans in every branch of his undertaking having been intensely studied, even to their minutest details, were easily and rapidly executed. He awaited

only the appointed period at which he was to convey his magnificent apparatus to its destination.

“A correspondence had for some time passed between the Boards of England, France, and Austria, with a view to improvements in the tables of longitude in the southern hemisphere, which are found to be much less accurate than those of the northern. The high opinion entertained by the British Board of Longitude of the principles of the new telescope, and of the profound skill of its inventor, determined the government to solicit his services in observing the transit of Mercury over the sun’s disk, which will take place on the seventh of November in the present year; and which, as it will occur at 7h. 47m. 55s. night, conjunction, mean time, and at 8h. 12m. 22s. middle, true time, will be invisible to nearly all the northern hemisphere. The place at which the transits of Mercury and of Venus have generally been observed by the astronomers of Europe, when occurring under these circumstances, is the Cape of Good Hope; and no transit of Venus having occurred since the year 1769, and none being to occur before 1874, the accurate observation of the transits of Mercury, which occur more frequently, has been found of great importance both to astronomy and navigation. To the latter useful art, indeed, the transits of Mercury are nearly as important as those of Venus; for although those of the latter planet have the peculiar advantage of determining exactly the great solar parallax, and thence the distances of all the planets from the sun, yet the transits of Mercury, by exactly determining the place of its own node, independently of the parallax of the great orb, determine the parallax of the earth and moon; and are therefore especially valuable in lunar observations of longitude. The Cape of Good Hope has been found preferable, in these observations, to any other station in the hemisphere. The expedition which went to Peru, about the middle of the last century, to ascertain, in conjunction with another in Lapland, the true figure of the earth, found the attraction of the mountainous regions so strong as to cause the plumb-line of one of their large instruments to deflect seven or eight seconds from the true perpendicular; whilst the elevated plains at the Cape unite all the

advantages of a lucid atmosphere with an entire freedom from mountainous obstruction. Sir John Herschel, therefore, not only accepted the appointment with high satisfaction, but requested that it might commence at least a year before the period of the transit, to afford him time to bring his ponderous and complicated machinery into perfect adjustment, and to extend his knowledge of the southern constellations.

"His wish was immediately assented to, and his arrangements being completed, he sailed from London on the fourth of September, 1834, in company with Dr. Andrew Grant, Lieutenant Drummond, of the Royal Engineers, F.R.A.S., and a large party of the best English mechanics. They arrived, after an expeditious and agreeable passage, and immediately proceeded to transport the lens, and the frame of the large observatory, to its destined site, which was a piece of table-land of great extent and elevation, about thirty-five miles to the north-east of Cape-town; and which is said to be the very spot on which De la Caille, in 1750, constructed his invaluable solar tables, when he measured a degree of the meridian, and made a great advance to exactitude in computing the solar parallax from that of Mars and the Moon. Sir John accomplished the ascent to the plains by means of two relief teams of oxen, of eighteen each, in about four days; and, aided by several companies of Dutch Boors, proceeded at once to the erection of his gigantic fabric.

"The ground plan of the structure is in some respects similar to that of the Herschel telescope in England, except that instead of circular foundations of brickwork, it consists of parallel circles of railroad iron, upon wooden framework; so constructed that the turn-outs, or rather turn-ins, from the largest circle, will conduct the observatory, which moves upon them, to the innermost circle, which is the basis of the lens-works, and to each of the circles that intervene. The diameter of the smallest circle is twenty-eight feet; that of the largest our correspondent has singularly forgotten to state, though it may be in some measure computed from the angle of incidence projected by the lens, and the space occupied by the observatory. The latter is a wooden building fifty feet square and as many high, with a flat roof and gutters of thin copper. Through

the side proximate to the lens is an aperture four feet in diameter to receive its rays, and through the roof another, for the same purpose in meridional observations. The lens, which is enclosed in a frame of wood, and braced to its corners by bars of copper, is suspended upon an axis between two pillars, which are nearly as high as those which supported the celebrated quadrant of Uleg Beg, being one hundred and fifty feet. These are united at the top and bottom by cross-pieces, and strengthened by a number of diagonal braces; and between them is a double capstan for hoisting the lens from its horizontal line with the observatory to the height required by its focal distance when turned to the meridian; and for elevating it to any intermediate degree of altitude that may be needed. This last operation is beautifully regulated by an immense double sextant, which is connected and moves with the axis of the lens, and is regularly divided into degrees, minutes, and seconds; and the horizontal circles of the observatory being also divided into three hundred and sixty degrees, and minutely subdivided, the whole instrument has the powers and regularity of the most improved theodolite. Having no tube, it is connected with the observatory by two horizontal levers, which pass underneath the floor of that building from the circular basis of the pillars; thus keeping the lens always square with the observatory, and securing to both a uniform and simple movement. By means of these levers, too, a rack and windlass, the observatory is brought to any degree of approximation to the pillars that the altitude of an observation may require; and although, when at its nearest station, it cannot command an observation with the great lens within about fifteen degrees of the meridian, it is supplied with an excellent telescope of vast power, constructed by the elder Herschel, by which every high degree can be surveyed. The field of view, therefore, whether exhibited on the floor or on the wall of the apartment, has a diameter of nearly fifty feet, and, being circular, it has therefore an area of nearly one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five feet. The place of all the horizontal movements having been accurately levelled by Lieut. Drummond, with the improved level of his invention which bears his name, and the wheels both of the observatory

and of the lens-works being facilitated by friction-rollers in patent axle-boxes filled with oil, the strength of one man applied to the extremity of the levers is sufficient to propel the whole structure upon either of the railroad circles; and that of two men applied to the windlass is fully adequate to bring the observatory to the basis of the pillars. Both of these movements, however, are now effected by a locomotive apparatus commanded within the apartment by a single person, and showing, by means of an ingenious index, every inch of progression or retrogression.

"We have not thus particularly described the telescope of the younger Herschel, because we consider it the most magnificent specimen of philosophical mechanism of the present or any previous age, but because we deemed an explicit description of its principles and powers an almost indispensable introduction to a statement of the sublime expansion of human knowledge which it has achieved. It was not fully completed until the latter part of December, when the series of large reflectors for the microscope arrived from England; and it was brought into operation during the first week of the ensuing month and year. But the secrecy which had been maintained with regard to its novelty, its manufacture, and its destination was not less rigidly preserved for several months respecting the grandeur of its success. Whether the British Government were skeptical concerning the promised splendor of its discoveries, or wished them to be scrupulously veiled until they had accumulated a full-orbed glory for the nation and reign in which they originated, is a question which we can only conjecturally solve. But certain it is that the astronomer's royal patrons enjoined a masonic taciturnity upon him and his friends until he should have officially communicated the results of his great experiment. Accordingly, the world heard nothing of him or his expedition until it was announced a few months since, in the scientific journals of Germany, that Sir John Herschel, at the Cape of Good Hope, had written to the astronomer-royal of Vienna, to inform him that the portentous comet predicted for the year 1835, which was to approach so near this trembling globe that we might hear the roaring of its fires, had turned

upon another scent, and would not even shake a hair of its tail upon our hunting-grounds. At a loss to conceive by what extra authority he had made so bold a declaration, the men of science in Europe, who were not acquainted with his secret, regarded his 'postponement,' as his discovery was termed, with incredulous contumely, and continued to terrorize upon the strength of former predictions.

"NEW LUNAR DISCOVERIES.

"Until the tenth of January, the observations were chiefly directed to the stars in the southern signs, in which, without the aid of the hydro-oxygen reflectors, a countless number of new stars and nebulae were discovered. But we shall defer our correspondent's account of these to future pages, for the purpose of no longer withholding from our readers the more generally and highly interesting discoveries which were made in the lunar world. And for this purpose, too, we shall defer Dr. Grant's elaborate mathematical details of the corrections which Sir John Herschel has made in the best tables of the moon's tropical, sidereal, and synodic revolutions, and of those phenomena of syzygies on which a great part of the established lunar theory depends.

"It was about half-past nine o'clock on the night of the tenth, the moon having then advanced within four days of her mean libration, that the astronomer adjusted his instruments for the inspection of her eastern limb. The whole immense power of his telescope was applied, and to its focal image about one-half of the power of his microscope. On removing the screen of the latter, the field of view was covered throughout its entire area with a beautifully distinct, and even vivid representation of *basaltic rock*. Its color was a greenish-brown, and the width of the columns, as defined by their interstices on the canvas, was invariably twenty-eight inches. No fracture whatever appeared in the mass first presented, but in a few seconds a shelving pile appeared of five or six columns' width, which showed their figure to be hexagonal, and their articulations similar to those of the basaltic formation at Staffa. This precipitous shelf was profusely covered with a dark-red

flower, 'precisely similar,' says Dr. Grant, 'to the *Papaver Rhœas*, or rose-poppy of our sublunary corn-fields; and this was the first organic production of nature, in a foreign world, ever revealed to the eyes of men.'

"The rapidity of the moon's ascension, or rather of the earth's diurnal rotation, being nearly equal to five hundred yards in a second, would have effectually prevented the inspection, or even the discovery, of objects so minute as these, but for the admirable mechanism which constantly regulates, under the guidance of the sextant, the required altitude of the lens. But its operation was found to be so consummately perfect, that the observers could detain the object upon the field of view for any period they might desire. The specimen of lunar vegetation, however, which they had already seen, had decided a question of too exciting an interest to induce them to retard its exit. It had demonstrated that the moon has an atmosphere constituted similarly to our own, and capable of sustaining organized, and therefore, most probably, animal life. The basaltic rocks continued to pass over the inclined canvas plane, through three successive diameters, when a verdant declivity of great beauty appeared, which occupied two more. This was preceded by another mass of nearly the former height, at the base of which they were at length delighted to perceive that novelty, a lunar forest. 'The trees,' says Dr. Grant, 'for a period of ten minutes, were of one unvaried kind, and unlike any I have seen, except the largest kind of yews in the English church-yards, which they in some respects resemble. These were followed by a level green plain, which, as measured by the painted circle on our canvas of forty-nine feet, must have been more than half a mile in breadth; and then appeared as fine a forest of firs, unequivocal firs, as I have ever seen cherished in the bosom of my native mountains. Wearied with the long continuance of these, we greatly reduced the magnifying powers of the microscope, without eclipsing either of the reflectors, and immediately perceived that we had been insensibly descending, as it were, a mountainous district of a highly diversified and romantic character, and that we were on the verge of a lake, or inland sea; but of what relative locality or

extent, we were yet too greatly magnified to determine. On introducing the feeblest achromatic lens we possessed, we found that the water, whose boundary we had just discovered, answered in general outline to the Mare Nubium of Riccoli, by which we detected that, instead of commencing, as we supposed, on the eastern longitude of the planet, some delay in the elevation of the great lens had thrown us nearly upon the axis of her equator. However, as she was a free country, and we not, as yet, attached to any particular province, and, moreover, since we could at any moment occupy our intended position, we again slid in our magic lenses to survey the shores of the Mare Nubium. Why Riccoli so termed it, unless in ridicule of Cleomedes, I know not; for fairer shores never angels coasted on a tour of pleasure. A beach of brilliant white sand, girt with wild, castellated rocks, apparently of green marble, varied at chasms, occurring every two or three hundred feet, with grotesque blocks of chalk or gypsum, and feathered and festooned at the summit with the clustering foliage of unknown trees, moved along the bright wall of our apartment until we were speechless with admiration. The water, wherever we obtained a view of it, was nearly as blue as that of the deep ocean, and broke in large, white billows upon the strand. The action of very high tides was quite manifest upon the face of the cliffs for more than a hundred miles; yet diversified as the scenery was during this and a much greater distance, we perceived no trace of animal existence, notwithstanding we could command at will a perspective or a foreground view of the whole. Mr. Holmes, indeed, pronounced some white objects of a circular form, which we saw at some distance in the interior of a cavern, to be bona fide specimens of a large *cornu ammonis*; but to me they appeared merely large pebbles, which had been chafed and rolled there by the tides. Our chase of animal life was not yet to be rewarded.

“Having continued this close inspection nearly two hours, during which we passed over a wide tract of country, chiefly of a rugged and apparently volcanic character; and having seen few additional varieties of vegetation, except some species

of lichen, which grew everywhere in great abundance, Dr. Herschel proposed that we should take out all our lenses, give a rapid speed to the panorama, and search for some of the principal valleys known to astronomers, as the most likely method to reward our first night's observation with the discovery of animated beings. The lenses being removed, and the effulgence of our unutterably glorious reflectors left undiminished, we found, in accordance with our calculations, that our field of view comprehended about twenty-five miles of the lunar surface, with the distinctness both of outline and detail, which could be procured of a terrestrial object at the distance of two and a half miles; an optical phenomenon which you will find demonstrated in Note five. This afforded us the best landscape views we had hitherto obtained, and, although the accelerated motion was rather too great, we enjoyed them with rapture. Several of those famous valleys, which are bounded by lofty hills of so perfectly conical a form as to render them less like works of nature than of art, passed the canvas before we had time to check their flight; but presently a train of scenery met our eye, of features so entirely novel, that Dr. Herschel signalled for the lowest convenient gradation of movement. It was a lofty chain of obelisk-shaped, or very slender pyramids, standing in irregular groups, each composed of about thirty or forty spires, every one of which was perfectly square, and as accurately truncated as the finest specimens of Cornish crystal. They were of a faint lilac hue, and very resplendent. I now thought that we had suddenly fallen on productions of art; but Dr. Herschel shrewdly remarked, that if the Lunarians could build thirty or forty miles of such monuments as these, we should ere now have discovered others of a less equivocal character. He pronounced them quartz formations, of probably the wine-colored amethyst species, and promised us, from these and other proofs which he had obtained of the powerful action of laws of crystallization in this planet, a rich field of mineralogical study. On introducing a lens, his conjecture was fully confirmed; they were monstrous amethysts, of a diluted claret color, glowing in the intensest light of the sun! They varied in height from sixty to ninety

feet, though we saw several of a still more incredible altitude. They were observed in a succession of valleys divided by longitudinal lines of round-breasted hills, covered with verdure, and nobly undulated; but what is most remarkable, the valleys which contained these stupendous crystals were invariably barren, and covered with stones of a ferruginous hue, which were probably iron pyrites. We found that some of these curiosities were situated in a district elevated half a mile above the valley of the Mare Fœcunditatis, of Mayer and Riccioli, the shores of which soon hove in view. But never was a name more inappropriately bestowed. From 'Dan to Beersheba' all was barren, barren, — the sea-board was entirely composed of chalk and flint, and not a vestige of vegetation could be discovered with our strongest glasses. The whole breadth of the northern extremity of this sea, which was about three hundred miles, having crossed our plane, we entered upon a wild, mountainous region abounding with more extensive forests of larger trees than we had before seen, the species of which I have no good analogy to describe. In general contour they resembled our forest oak; but they were much more superb in foliage, having broad, glossy leaves like that of the laurel, and tresses of yellow flowers which hung, in the open glades, from the branches to the ground. These mountains passed, we arrived at a region which filled us with utter astonishment. It was an oval valley, surrounded, except at a narrow opening towards the south, by hills red as the purest vermilion, and evidently crystallized; for wherever a precipitous chasm appeared — and these chasms were very frequent, and of immense depth — the perpendicular sections presented conglomerated masses of polygon crystals, evenly fitted to each other, and arranged in deep strata, which grew darker in color as they descended to the foundations of the precipices. Innumerable cascades were bursting forth from the breasts of every one of these cliffs, and some so near their summits, and with such great force, as to form arches many yards in diameter. I never was so vividly reminded of Byron's simile, 'the tale of the white horse in the Revelation.' At the foot of this boundary of hills was a perfect zone of woods surrounding the whole valley, which was

about eighteen or twenty miles wide, at its greatest breadth, and about thirty in length. Small collections of trees, of every imaginable kind, were scattered about the whole of the luxuriant area; and here our magnifiers blessed our panting hopes with specimens of conscious existence. In the shade of the woods on the south-eastern side, we beheld continuous herds of brown quadrupeds, having all the external characteristics of the bison, but more diminutive than any species of the *bos* genus in our natural history. Its tail is like that of our *bos grunniens*; but in its semi-circular horns, the hump on its shoulders, and the depth of its dewlap, and the length of its shaggy hair, it closely resembled the species to which I first compared it. It had, however, one widely distinctive feature, which we afterwards found common to nearly every lunar quadruped we have discovered; namely, a remarkable fleshy appendage over the eyes, crossing the whole breadth of the forehead and united to the ears. We could most distinctly perceive this hairy veil, which was shaped like the upper front outline of a cap known to the ladies as Mary Queen of Scots' cap, lifted and lowered by means of the ears. It immediately occurred to the acute mind of Dr. Herschel, that this was a providential contrivance to protect the eyes of the animal from the great extremes of light and darkness to which all the inhabitants of our side of the moon are periodically subjected.

"The next animal perceived would be classed on earth as a monster. It was of a bluish lead color, about the size of a goat, with a head and beard like him, and a *single horn*, slightly inclined forward from the perpendicular. The female was destitute of the horn and beard, but had a much longer tail. It was gregarious, and chiefly abounded on the acclivitous glades of the woods. In elegance of symmetry it rivalled the antelope, and like him it seemed an agile, sprightly creature, running with great speed, and springing from the green turf with all the unaccountable antics of a young lamb or kitten. This beautiful creature afforded us the most exquisite amusement. The mimicry of its movements upon our white painted canvas was as faithful and luminous as that of animals within a few yards of the camera obscura, when seen pictured

upon its tympan. Frequently when attempting to put our fingers upon its beard, it would suddenly bound away into oblivion, as if conscious of our earthly impertinence; but then others would appear, whom we could not prevent nibbling the herbage, say or do what we would to them.

"On examining the centre of this delightful valley, we found a large, branching river, abounding with lovely islands, and water-birds of numerous kinds. A species of gray pelican was the most numerous; but a black and white crane, with unreasonably long legs and bill, was also quite common. We watched their pisciverous experiments a long time, in hopes of catching sight of a lunar fish; but although we were not gratified in this respect, we could easily guess the purpose with which they plunged their long necks so deeply beneath the water. Near the upper extremity of one of these islands we obtained a glimpse of a strange, amphibious creature, of a spherical form, which rolled with great velocity across the pebbly beach, and was lost sight of in the strong current which set off from this angle of the island. We were compelled, however, to leave this prolific valley unexplored, on account of clouds which were evidently accumulating in the lunar atmosphere, our own being perfectly translucent. But this was itself an interesting discovery, for more distant observers had questioned or denied the existence of any humid atmosphere in this planet.

"The moon being now low on her descent, Dr. Herschel inferred that the increasing refrangibility of her rays would prevent any satisfactory protraction of our labors, and our minds being actually fatigued with the excitement of the high enjoyments we had partaken, we mutually agreed to call in the assistants at the lens, and reward their vigilant attention with congratulatory bumpers of the best 'East India Particular.' It was not, however, without regret that we left the splendid valley of the red mountains, which, in compliment to the arms of our royal patron, we denominated 'the Valley of the Unicorn;' and it may be found in Blunt's map, about midway between the Mare Fœcunditatis and the Mare Nectaris.

"The nights of the eleventh and twelfth being cloudy, were

unfavorable to observation ; but on those of the thirteenth and fourteenth further animal discoveries were made of the most exciting interest to every human being. We give them in the graphic language of our accomplished correspondent : —

“The astonishing and beautiful discoveries which we had made during our first night’s observation, and the brilliant promise which they gave of the future, rendered every moonlight hour too precious to reconcile us to the deprivation occasioned by these two cloudy evenings ; and they were borne with strictly philosophical patience, notwithstanding that our attention was closely occupied in superintending the erection of additional props and braces to the twenty-four feet lens, which we found had somewhat vibrated in a high wind that arose on the morning of the eleventh. The night of the thirteenth (January) was one of pearly purity and loveliness. The moon ascended the firmament in gorgeous splendor, and the stars, retiring around her, left her the unrivalled queen of the hemisphere. This being the last night but one, in the present month, during which we should have an opportunity of inspecting her western limb, on account of the libration in longitude which would thence immediately ensue, Dr. Herschel informed us that he should direct our researches to the parts numbered 2, 11, 26, and 20 in Blunt’s map, and which are respectively known in the modern catalogue by the names of Endymion, Cleomedes, Langrenus, and Petavius. To the careful inspection of these, and the regions between them and the extreme western rim, he proposed to devote the whole of this highly favorable night. Taking then our twenty-five miles’ breadth of her surface upon the field of view, and reducing it to a slow movement, we soon found the first very singularly shaped object of our inquiry. It is a highly mountainous district, the loftier chains of which form three narrow ovals, two of which approach each other in slender points, and are united by one mass of hills of great length and elevation ; thus presenting a figure similar to that of a long skein of thread, the bows of which have been gradually spread open from their connecting knot. The third oval looks also like a skein, and lies as if carelessly dropped from nature’s hand in connection with the

other; but that which might fancifully be supposed as having formed the second bow of this second skein is cut open, and lies in scattered threads of smaller hills which cover a great extent of level territory. The ground plan of these mountains is so remarkable that it has been accurately represented in almost every lineal map of the moon that has been drawn; and in Blunt's, which is the best, it agrees exactly with my description. Within the grasp, as it were, of the broken bow of hills last mentioned, stands an oval-shaped mountain, enclosing a valley of an immense area, and having on its western ridge a volcano in a state of terrific eruption. To the north-east of this, across the broken, or what Mr. Holmes called "the vagabond mountains," are three other detached oblong formations, the largest and last of which is marked F in the catalogue, and fancifully denominated the Mare Mortuum, or more commonly the "Lake of Death." Induced by a curiosity to divine the reason of so sombre a title, rather than by any more philosophical motive, we here first applied our hydro-oxygen magnifiers to the focal image of the great lens. Our twenty-five miles' portion of this great mountain circus had comprehended the whole of its area, and of course the two conical hills which rise in it about five miles from each other; but although this breadth of view had heretofore generally presented its objects as if seen within a terrestrial distance of two and a half miles, we were, in this instance, unable to discern these central hills with any such degree of distinctness. There did not appear to be any mist or smoke around them, as in the case of the volcano which we had left in the south-west, and yet they were comparatively indistinct upon the canvas. On sliding in the gas-light lens the mystery was immediately solved. They were old craters of extinct volcanoes, from which still issued a heated though transparent exhalation, that kept them in an apparently oscillatory or trembling motion, most unfavorable to examination. The craters of both these hills, as nearly as we could judge under this obstruction, were about fifteen fathoms deep, devoid of any appearance of fire, and of nearly a yellowish-white color throughout. The diameter of each was about nine diameters of our painted circle, or nearly four hundred and fifty feet; and

the width of the rim surrounding them about one thousand feet; yet; notwithstanding their narrow mouths, these two chimneys of the subterranean deep had evidently filled the whole area of the valley in which they stood with the lava and ashes with which it was encumbered, and even added to the height, if not indeed caused the existence, of the oval chain of mountains which surrounded it. These mountains, as subsequently measured from the level of some large lakes around them, averaged the height of two thousand eight hundred feet; and Dr. Herschel conjectured from this and the vast extent of their abutments, which ran for many miles into the country around them, that these volcanoes must have been in full activity for a million of years. Lieut. Drummond, however, rather supposed that the whole area of this oval valley was but the exhausted crater of one vast volcano, which, in expiring, had left only these two imbecile representatives of its power. I believe Dr. Herschel himself afterwards adopted this probable theory, which is indeed confirmed by the universal geology of the planet. There is scarcely a hundred miles of her surface, not even excepting her largest seas and lakes, in which circular or oval mountainous ridges may not be easily found; and many, very many of these having numerous enclosed hills in full volcanic operation, which are now much lower than the surrounding circles, it admits of no doubt that each of these great formations is the remains of one vast mountain which has burnt itself out, and left only these wide foundations of its ancient grandeur. A direct proof of this is afforded in a tremendous volcano, now in its prime, which I shall hereafter notice. What gave the name of "The Lake of Death" to the annular mountain I have just described, was, I suppose, the dark appearance of the valley which it encloses, and which, to a more distant view than we obtained, certainly exhibits the general aspect of the waters on this planet. The surrounding country is fertile to excess; between this circle and No. 2 (Endymion), which we proposed first to examine, we counted not less than twelve luxuriant forests, divided by open plains, which waved in an ocean of verdure, and were probably prairies like those of North America. In three of these we discovered numerous herds of quadrupeds similar to

our friends the bisons in the Valley of the Unicorn, but of much larger size; and scarcely a piece of woodland occurred in our panorama which did not dazzle our vision with flocks of white or red birds upon the wing.

“At length we carefully explored the Endymion. We found each of the three ovals volcanic and sterile within; but, without, most rich, throughout the level regions around them, in every imaginable production of a bounteous soil. Dr. Herschel has classified not less than thirty-eight species of forest trees, and nearly twice this number of plants, found in this tract alone, which are widely different to those found in more equatorial latitudes. Of animals, he classified nine species of mammalia, and five of ovipara. Among the former are a small kind of reindeer, the elk, the moose, the horned bear, and the biped beaver. The last resembles the beaver of the earth in every other respect than in its destitution of a tail, and its invariable habit of walking upon only two feet. It carries its young in its arms like a human being, and moves with an easy, gliding motion. Its huts are constructed better and higher than those of many tribes of human savages, and from the appearance of smoke in nearly all of them, there is no doubt of its being acquainted with the use of fire. Still its head and body differ only in the points stated from that of the beaver, and it was never seen except on the borders of lakes and rivers, in which it has been observed to immerse for a period of several seconds.

“Thirty degrees farther south, is No. 11, or Cleomedes, an immense annular mountain, containing three distinct craters, which have been so long extinguished that the whole valley around them, which is eleven miles in extent, is densely crowded with woods nearly to the summits of the hills. Not a rod of vacant land, except the tops of these craters, could be descried, and no living creature, except a large white bird resembling the stork. At the southern extremity of this valley is a natural archway or cavern, two hundred feet high, and one hundred wide, through which runs a river which discharges itself over a precipice of gray rock eighty feet in depth, and then forms a branching stream through a beautiful champaign

district for many miles. Within twenty miles of this cataract is the largest lake, or rather inland sea, that has been found throughout the seven and a half millions of square miles which this illuminated side of the moon contains. Its width, from east to west, is one hundred and ninety-eight miles, and from north to south, two hundred and sixty-six miles. Its shape, to the northward, is not unlike that of the Bay of Bengal, and it is studded with small islands, most of which are volcanic. Two of these, on the eastern side, are now violently eruptive; but our lowest magnifying power was too great to examine them with convenience, on account of the cloud of smoke and ashes which beclouded our field of view. As seen by Lieutenant Drummond, through our reflecting telescope of two thousand times, they exhibited great brilliancy. In a bay, on the western side of this sea, is an island fifty-five miles long, of a crescent form, crowded through its entire sweep with the most superb and wonderful natural beauties, both of vegetation and geology. Its hills are pinnacled with tall quartz crystals, of so rich a yellow and orange hue that we at first supposed them to be pointed flames of fire; and they spring up thus from smooth, round brows of hills which are covered as with a velvet mantle. Even in the enchanting little valleys of this winding island we could often see these splendid natural spires, mounting in the midst of deep-green woods, like church-steeple in the vales of Westmoreland. We here first noticed the lunar palm-tree, which differs from that of our tropical latitudes only in the peculiarity of very large crimson flowers, instead of the spadix protruded from the common calyx. We, however, perceived no fruit on any specimens we saw, — a circumstance which we attempted to account for from the great (theoretical) extremes in the lunar climate. On a curious kind of tree-melon we nevertheless saw fruit in great abundance, and in every stage of inception and maturity. The general color of these woods was a dark-green, though not without occasional admixtures of every tint of our forest seasons. The hectic flush of autumn was often seen kindled upon the cheek of earliest spring; and the gay drapery of summer in some places surrounded trees leafless as the victims of win-

ter. It seemed as if all the seasons here united hands in a circle of perpetual harmony. Of animals we saw only an elegant striped quadruped, about three feet high, like a miniature zebra, which was always in small herds on the green sward of the hills; and two or three kinds of long-tailed birds, which we judged to be golden and blue pheasants. On the shores, however, we saw countless multitudes of univalve shellfish, and among them some huge flat ones, which all three of my associates declared to be *cornu ammonæ*; and I confess I was here compelled to abandon my sceptical substitution of pebbles. The cliffs all along these shores were deeply undermined by tides; they were very cavernous, and yellow, crystal stalactites larger than a man's thigh were shooting forth on all sides. Indeed, every rood of this island appeared to be crystallized; masses of fallen crystals were found on every beach we explored, and beamed from every fractured headland. It was more like a creation of an oriental fancy than a distant variety of nature brought by the powers of science to ocular demonstration. The striking dissimilitude of this island to every other we had found on these waters, and its near proximity to the main land, led us to suppose that it must at some time have been a part of it; more especially as its crescent bay embraced the first of a chain of smaller ones which ran directly thither. The first one was a pure quartz rock, about three miles in circumference, towering in naked majesty from the blue deep, without either shore or shelter. But it glowed in the sun almost like a sapphire, as did all the lesser ones of whom it seemed the king. Our theory was speedily confirmed; for all the shore of the main land was battlemented and spired with these unobtainable jewels of nature; and as we brought our field of view to include the utmost rim of the illuminated boundary of the planet, we could still see them blazing in crowded battalions as it were, through a region of hundreds of miles. In fact, we could not conjecture where this gorgeous land of enchantment terminated; for as the rotary motion of the planet bore these mountain summits from our view, we became further remote from their western boundary.

“ We were admonished by this to lose no time in seeking the next proposed object of our search, the Langrenus, or No. 26, which is almost within the verge of the libration in longitude, and of which, for this reason, Dr. Herschel entertained some singular expectations.

“ After a short delay in advancing the observatory upon the levers, and in regulating the lens, we found our object and surveyed it. It was a dark, narrow lake, seventy miles long, bounded, on the east, north, and west, by red mountains of the same character as those surrounding the Valley of the Unicorn, from which it is distant to the south-west about one hundred and sixty miles. This lake, like that valley, opens to the south upon a plain not more than ten miles wide, which is here encircled by a truly magnificent amphitheatre of the loftiest order of lunar hills. For a semicircle of six miles these hills are riven, from their brow to their base, as perpendicularly as the outer walls of the Colosseum at Rome; but here exhibiting the sublime altitude of at least two thousand feet, in one smooth, unbroken surface. How nature disposed of the huge mass which she thus prodigally carved out, I know not; but certain it is that there are no fragments of it left upon the plain, which is a declivity without a single prominence except a billowy tract of woodland that runs in many a wild vagary of breadth and course to the margin of the lake. The tremendous height and expansion of this perpendicular mountain, with its bright crimson front contrasted with the fringe of forest on its brow, and the verdure of the open plain beneath, filled our canvas with a landscape unsurpassed in unique grandeur by any we had beheld. Our twenty-five miles' perspective included this remarkable mountain, the plain, a part of the lake, and the last graduated summits of the range of hills by which the latter is nearly surrounded. We ardently wished that all the world could view a scene so strangely grand, and our pulse beat high with the hope of one day exhibiting it to our countrymen in some part of our native land. But we were at length compelled to destroy our picture, as a whole, for the purpose of magnifying its parts for scientific inspection. Our plain was of course immediately covered with the ruby front of this

mighty amphitheatre, its tall figures, leaping cascades, and rugged caverns. As its almost interminable sweep was measured off upon the canvas, we frequently saw long lines of some yellow metal hanging from the crevices of the horizontal strata in wild network, or straight pendant branches. We of course concluded that this was virgin gold, and we had no assay-master to prove to the contrary. On searching the plain, over which we had observed the woods roving in all the shapes of clouds in the sky, we were again delighted with the discovery of animals. The first observed was a quadruped with an amazingly long neck, head like a sheep, bearing two long spiral horns, white as polished ivory, and standing in perpendicular parallel to each other. Its body was like that of the deer, but its fore-legs were most disproportionally long, and its tail, which was very bushy and of a snowy whiteness, curled high over its rump, and hung two or three feet by its side. Its colors were bright bay and white in brindled patches, clearly defined, but of no regular form. It was found only in pairs, in spaces between the woods, and we had no opportunity of witnessing its speed or habits. But a few minutes only elapsed before three specimens of another animal appeared, so well known to us all that we fairly laughed at the recognition of so familiar an acquaintance in so distant a land. They were neither more nor less than three good large sheep, which would not have disgraced the farms of Leicestershire, or the shambles of Leadenhall market. With the utmost scrutiny, we could find no mark of distinction between these and those of our native soil; they had not even the appendage over the eyes, which I have described as common to lunar quadrupeds. Presently they appeared in great numbers, and, on reducing the lenses, we found them in flocks over a great part of the valley. I need not say how desirous we were of finding shepherds to these flocks, and even a man with blue apron and rolled-up sleeves would have been a welcome sight to us, if not to the sheep; but they fed in peace, lords of their own pastures, without either protector or destroyer in human shape.

“We at length approached the level opening to the lake, where the valley narrows to a mile in width, and displays

scenery on both sides picturesque and romantic beyond the powers of a prose description. Imagination, borne on the wings of poetry, could alone gather similes to portray the wild sublimity of this landscape, where dark behemoth crags stood over the brows of lofty precipices, as if a rampart in the sky, and forests seemed suspended in mid-air. On the eastern side there was one soaring crag, crested with trees, which hung over in a curve like three-fourths of a Gothic arch, and, being of a rich crimson color, its effect was most strange upon minds unaccustomed to the association of such grandeur with such beauty.

“But whilst gazing upon them in a perspective of about half a mile, we were thrilled with astonishment to perceive four successive flocks of large winged creatures, wholly unlike any kind of birds, descend with a slow, even motion from the cliffs on the western side, and alight upon the plain. They were first noticed by Dr. Herschel, who exclaimed, “Now, gentlemen, my theories against your proofs, which you have often found a pretty even bet, we have here something worth looking at. I was confident that if ever we found beings in human shape, it would be in this longitude, and that they would be provided by their Creator with some extraordinary powers of locomotion. First, exchange for my number D.” This lens being soon introduced, gave us a fine half-mile distance, and we counted three parties of these creatures, of twelve, nine, and fifteen in each, walking erect towards a small wood near the base of the eastern precipices. Certainly they *were* like human beings, for their wings had now disappeared, and their attitude in walking was both erect and dignified. Having observed them at this distance for some minutes, we introduced lens H z, which brought them to the apparent proximity of eighty yards, — the highest clear magnitude we possessed until the latter end of March, when we effected an improvement in the gas-burners. About half of the first party had passed beyond our canvas; but of all the others we had a perfectly distinct and deliberate view. They averaged four feet in height, were covered, except on the face, with short and glossy copper-colored hair, and had wings composed of a thin membrane, without

hair, lying snugly upon their backs, from the top of the shoulders to the calves of their legs. The face, which was of a yellowish flesh-color, was a slight improvement upon that of the large orang-outang, being more open and intelligent in its expression, and having a much greater expansion of forehead. The mouth, however, was very prominent, though somewhat relieved by a thick beard upon the lower jaw, and by lips far more human than those of any species of the simia genus. In general symmetry of body and limbs they were infinitely superior to the orang-outang; so much so, that, but for their long wings, Lieut. Drummond said they would look as well on a parade ground as some of the old cockney militia! The hair on the head was a darker color than that of the body, closely curled, but apparently not woolly, and arranged in two curious semicircles over the temples of the forehead. Their feet could only be seen as they were alternately lifted in walking; but, from what we could see of them in so transient a view, they appeared thin, and very protuberant at the heel.

“Whilst passing across the canvas, and whenever we afterwards saw them, these creatures were evidently engaged in conversation; their gesticulation, more particularly the varied action of their hands and arms, appeared impassioned and emphatic. We hence inferred that they were rational beings, and, although not perhaps of so high an order as others which we discovered the next month on the shores of the Bay of Rainbows, that they were capable of producing works of art and contrivance. The next view we obtained of them was still more favorable. It was on the borders of a little lake, or expanded stream, which we then for the first time perceived running down the valley to a large lake, and having on its eastern margin a small wood.

“Some of these creatures had crossed this water, and were lying like spread eagles on the skirts of the wood. We could then perceive that they possessed wings of great expansion, and were similar in structure to those of the bat, being a semi-transparent membrane expanded in curvilinear divisions by means of straight radii, united at the back by the dorsal integuments. But what astonished us very much was the circum-

stance of this membrane being continued, from the shoulders to the legs, united all the way down, though gradually decreasing in width. The wings seemed completely under the command of volition, for those of the creatures whom we saw bathing in the water spread them instantly to their full width, waved them as ducks do theirs to shake off the water, and then as instantly closed them again in a compact form. Our further observation of the habits of these creatures, who were of both sexes, led to results so very remarkable, that I prefer they should first be laid before the public in Dr. Herschel's own work, where I have reason to know they are fully and faithfully stated, however incredulously they may be received.

. The three families then almost simultaneously spread their wings, and were lost in the dark confines of the canvas before we had time to breathe from our paralyzing astonishment. We scientifically denominated them the *Vespertilio-homo*, or man-bat; and they are doubtless innocent and happy creatures, notwithstanding that some of their amusements would but ill comport with our terrestrial notions of decorum. The valley itself we called the Ruby Colosseum, in compliment to its stupendous southern boundary, the six-mile sweep of precipices two thousand feet high. And the night, or rather morning, being far advanced, we postponed our tour to Petavius (No. 20) until another opportunity.'

"We have, of course, faithfully obeyed Dr. Grant's private injunction to omit those highly curious passages in his correspondence which he wished us to suppress, although we do not perceive the force of the reason assigned for it. It is true, the omitted paragraphs contain facts which would be wholly incredible to readers who do not carefully examine the principles and capacity of the instrument with which these marvellous discoveries have been made; but so will nearly all of those which he has kindly permitted us to publish; and it was for this reason that we considered the explicit description which we have given of the telescope so important a preliminary. From these, however, and other prohibited passages, which will be published by Dr. Herschel, with the certificates of the civil and military authorities of the colony, and of several

Episcopal, Wesleyan, and other ministers, who, in the month of March last, were permitted, under stipulation of temporary secrecy, to visit the observatory, and become eye-witnesses of the wonders which they were requested to attest, we are confident his forthcoming volumes will be at once the most sublime in science, and the most intense in general interest, that ever issued from the press.

“The night of the fourteenth displayed the moon in her mean libration, or full; but the somewhat humid state of the atmosphere being for several hours less favorable to a minute inspection than to a general survey of her surface, they were chiefly devoted to the latter purpose. But shortly after midnight the last veil of mist was dissipated, and the sky being as lucid as on the former evenings, the attention of the astronomers was arrested by the remarkable outlines of the spot marked Tycho, No. 18, in Blunt’s lunar chart; and in this region they added treasures to human knowledge which angels might well desire to win. Many parts of the following extract will remain forever in the chronicles of time:—

“‘The surface of the moon, when viewed in her mean libration, even with telescopes of very limited power, exhibits three oceans, of vast breadth and circumference, independently of seven large collections of water, which may be denominated seas. Of inferior waters, discoverable by the higher classes of instruments, and usually called lakes, the number is so great that no attempt has yet been made to count them. Indeed, such a task would be almost equal to that of enumerating the annular mountains which are found upon every part of her surface, whether composed of land or water. The largest of the three oceans occupies a considerable portion of the hemisphere between the line of her northern axis and that of her eastern equator, and even extends many degrees south of the latter. Throughout its eastern boundary it so closely approaches that of the lunar sphere, as to leave in many places merely a fringe of illuminated mountains, which are here, therefore, strongly contra-distinguished from the dark and shadowy aspect of the great deep. But peninsulas, promontories, capes, and islands, and a thousand other terrestrial figures, for which we can find

no names in the poverty of *our* geographical nomenclature, are found expanding, sallying forth, or glowing in insular independence, through all the "billowy boundlessness" of this magnificent ocean. One of the most remarkable of these is a promontory, without a name, I believe, in the lunar charts, which starts from an island district denominated Copernicus, by the old astronomers, and abounding, as we eventually discovered, with great natural curiosities. This promontory is indeed most singular. Its northern extremity is shaped much like an imperial crown, having a swelling bow, divided and tied down in its centre by a band of hills, which is united with its forehead band or base. The two open spaces formed by this division are two lakes, each eighty miles wide; and at the foot of these, divided from them by the band of hills last mentioned, is another lake, larger than the two put together, and nearly perfectly square. This one is followed, after another hilly division, by a lake of an irregular form; and this one yet again, by two narrow ones, divided longitudinally, which are attenuated northward to the main land. Thus this skeleton promontory of mountain ridges runs three hundred and ninety-six miles into the ocean, with six capacious lakes enclosed within its stony ribs. Blunt's excellent lunar chart gives this great work of nature with wonderful fidelity, and I think you might accompany my description with an engraving from it, much to your readers' satisfaction. (See Plate 4.)

"Next to this, the most remarkable formation in this ocean is a strikingly brilliant annular mountain of immense altitude and circumference, standing three hundred and thirty miles E.S.E., commonly known as Aristarchus (No. 12), and marked in the chart as a large mountain, with a great cavity in its centre. That cavity is now, as it was probably wont to be in ancient ages, a volcanic crater, awfully rivalling our Mounts Etna and Vesuvius, in the most terrible epochs of their reign. Unfavorable as the state of the atmosphere was to close examination, we could easily mark its illumination of the water over a circuit of sixty miles. If we had before retained any doubt of the power of lunar volcanoes to throw fragments of their craters so far beyond the moon's attraction that they would

necessarily gravitate to this earth, and thus account for the multitude of massive aerolites which have fallen and been found upon our surface, the view which we had of Aristarchus would have set our skepticism forever at rest. This mountain, however, though standing three hundred miles in the ocean, is not absolutely insular, for it is connected with the main land by four chains of mountains, which branch from it as a common centre.

“The next great ocean is situated on the western side of the meridian line, divided nearly in the midst by the line of the equator, and is about nine hundred miles in north and south extent. It is marked C in the catalogue, and was fancifully called the Mare Tranquillitatis. It is rather two large seas than one ocean, for it is narrowed just under the equator by a strait not more than one hundred miles wide. Only three annular islands of a large size, and quite detached from its shores, are to be found within it; though several sublime volcanoes exist on its northern boundary; one of the most stupendous of which is within one hundred and twenty miles of the Mare Nectaris before mentioned. Immediately contiguous to this second great ocean, and separated from it only by a concatenation of dislocated continents and islands, is the third, marked D, and known as the Mare Serenitatis. It is nearly square, being about three hundred and thirty miles in length and width. But it has one most extraordinary peculiarity, which is a perfectly straight ridge of hills, certainly not more than five miles wide, which starts in a direct line from its southern to its northern shore, dividing it exactly in the midst. This singular ridge is perfectly *sui generis*, being altogether unlike any mountain chain either on this earth or on the moon itself. It is so very keen, that its great concentration of the solar light renders it visible to small telescopes; but its character is so strikingly peculiar, that we could not resist the temptation to depart from our predetermined adherence to a general survey, and examine it particularly. Our lens G x brought it within the small distance of eight hundred yards, and its whole width of four or five miles snugly within that of our canvas. Nothing that we had hitherto seen more highly

excited our astonishment. Believe it or believe it not, it was one entire crystallization! Its edge, throughout its whole length of three hundred and forty miles, is an acute angle of solid quartz crystal, brilliant as a piece of Derbyshire spar just brought from a mine, and containing scarcely a fracture or a chasm from end to end! What a prodigious influence must our thirteen times larger globe have exercised upon this satellite, when an embryo in the womb of time, the passive subject of chemical affinity! We found that wonder and astonishment, as excited by objects in this distant world, were but modes and attributes of ignorance, which should give place to elevated expectations, and to reverential confidence in the illimitable power of the Creator.

“The dark expanse of waters to the south of the first great ocean has often been considered a forth; but we found it to be merely a sea of the first class, entirely surrounded by land, and much more encumbered with promontories and islands than it has been exhibited in any lunar chart. One of its promontories runs from the vicinity of Pitatus (No. 19), in a slightly curved and very narrow line, to Bullialdus (No. 22), which is merely a circular head to it, two hundred and sixty-four miles from its starting-place. This is another mountainous ring, a marine volcano, nearly burnt out, and slumbering upon its cinders. But Pitatus, standing upon a bold cape of the southern shore, is apparently exulting in the might and majesty of its fires. The atmosphere being now quite free from vapor, we introduced the magnifiers to examine a large, bright circle of hills which sweep close beside the western abutments of this flaming mountain. The hills were either of snow-white marble, or semi-transparent crystal, we could not distinguish which, and they bounded another of those lovely green valleys, which, however monotonous in my descriptions, are of paradisaical beauty and fertility, and like primitive Eden in the bliss of their inhabitants. Dr. Herschel here again predicated another of his sagacious theories. He said the proximity of the flaming mountain, Bullialdus, must be so great a local convenience to dwellers in this valley during the long periodical absence of solar light, as to render it a place of

populous resort for the inhabitants of all the adjacent regions, more especially as its bulwark of hills afforded an infallible security against any volcanic eruption that could occur. We therefore applied our full power to explore it, and rich indeed was our reward.

“The very first object in this valley that appeared upon our canvas was a magnificent work of art. It was a temple—a fane of devotion, or of science, which, when consecrated to the Creator, is devotion of the loftiest order; for it exhibits his attributes purely free from the masquerade, attire, and blasphemous caricature of controversial creeds, and has the seal and signature of his own hand to sanction its aspirations. It was an equitriangular temple, built of polished sapphire, or of some resplendent blue stone, which, like it, displayed a myriad points of golden light twinkling and scintillating in the sunbeams. Our canvas, though fifty feet in diameter, was too limited to receive more than a sixth part of it at one view, and the first part that appeared was near the centre of one of its sides, being three square columns, six feet in diameter at the base, and gently tapering to a height of seventy feet. The intercolumniations were each twelve feet. We instantly reduced our magnitude, so as to embrace the whole structure in one view, and then indeed it was most beautiful. The roof was composed of some yellow metal, and divided into three compartments, which were not triangular planes inclining to the centre, but subdivided, curbed, and separated, so as to present a mass of violently agitated flames rising from a common source of conflagration and terminating in wildly waving points. This design was too manifest, and too skilfully executed to be mistaken for a single moment. Through a few openings in these metallic flames we perceived a large sphere of a darker kind of metal nearly of a clouded copper color, which they enclosed and seemingly raged around, as if hieroglyphically consuming it. This was the roof; but upon each of the three corners there was a small sphere of apparently the same metal as the large centre one, and these rested upon a kind of cornice, quite new in any order of architecture with which we are acquainted, but nevertheless exceedingly grace-

ful and impressive. It was like a half-opened scroll, swelling off boldly from the roof, and hanging far over the walls in several convolutions. It was of the same metal as the flames, and on each side of the building it was open at both ends. The columns, six on each side, were simply plain shafts, without capitals or pedestals, or any description of ornament; nor was any perceived in other parts of the edifice. It was open on each side, and seemed to contain neither seats, altars, nor offerings; but it was a light and airy structure, nearly a hundred feet high from its white glistening floor to its glowing roof, and it stood upon a round green eminence on the eastern side of the valley. We afterwards, however, discovered two others, which were in every respect fac-similes of this one; but in neither did we perceive any visitants besides flocks of wild doves which alighted upon its lustrous pinnacles. Had the devotees of these temples gone the way of all living, or were the latter merely historical monuments? What did the ingenious builders mean by the globe surrounded by flames? Did they by this record any past calamity of *their* world, or predict any future one of *ours*? I by no means despair of ultimately solving not only these but a thousand other questions which present themselves respecting the objects in this planet; for not the millionth part of her surface has yet been explored, and we have been more desirous of collecting the greatest possible number of new facts, than of indulging in speculative theories, however seductive to the imagination.

“But we had not far to seek for inhabitants of this “Vale of the Triads.” Immediately on the outer border of the wood which surrounded, at the distance of half a mile, the eminence on which the first of these temples stood, we saw several detached assemblies of beings whom we instantly recognized to be of the same species as our winged friends of the Ruby Colosseum near the Lake Langrenus. Having adjusted the instrument for a minute examination, we found that nearly all the individuals in these groups were of a larger stature than the former specimens, less dark in color, and in *every respect* an improved variety of the race. They were chiefly engaged in eating a large yellow fruit like a gourd, sections of which they

divided with their fingers, and ate with rather uncouth voracity, throwing away the rind. A smaller red fruit, shaped like a cucumber, which we had often seen pendant from trees having a broad dark leaf, was also lying in heaps in the centre of several of the festive groups; but the only use they appeared to make of it was sucking its juice, after rolling it between the palms of their hands and nibbling off an end. They seemed eminently happy, and even polite, for we saw, in many instances, individuals sitting nearest these piles of fruit, select the largest and brightest specimens, and throw them archwise across the circle to some opposite friend or associate who had extracted the nutriment from those scattered around him, and which were frequently not a few. While thus engaged in their rural banquets, or in social converse, they were always seated with their knees flat upon the turf, and their feet brought evenly together in the form of a triangle. And for some mysterious reason or other this figure seemed to be an especial favorite among them; for we found that every group or social circle arranged itself in this shape before it dispersed, which was generally done at the signal of an individual who stepped into the centre and brought his hands over his head in an acute angle. At this signal, each member of the company extended his arms forward so as to form an acute horizontal angle with the extremity of the fingers. But this was not the only proof we had that they were creatures of order and subordination. . . . We had no opportunity of seeing them actually engaged in any work of industry or art; and so far as we could judge, they spent their happy hours in collecting various fruits in the woods, in eating, flying, bathing, and loitering about upon the summits of precipices. . . . But although evidently the highest order of animals in this rich valley, they were not its only occupants. Most of the other animals which we had discovered elsewhere, in very distant regions, were collected here; and also at least eight or nine new species of quadrupeds. The most attractive of these was a tall, white stag, with lofty, spreading antlers, black as ebony. We several times saw this elegant creature trot up to the seated parties of the semi-human beings I have described, and browse

the herbage close beside them, without the least manifestation of fear on its part or notice on theirs. The universal state of amity among all classes of lunar creatures, and the apparent absence of every carnivorous or ferocious species, gave us the most refined pleasure, and doubly endeared to us this lovely nocturnal companion of our larger, but less favored, world. Ever again when I "eye the blue vault and bless the *useful light*," shall I recall the scenes of beauty, grandeur, and felicity I have beheld upon her surface, not "as *through a glass darkly*, but face to face;" and never shall I think of that line of our thrice noble poet,

—— "Meek Diana's crest
Sails through the azure air, an island of the blest,"

without exulting in my knowledge of its truth.'

"With the careful inspection of this instructive valley, and a scientific classification of its animal, vegetable, and mineral productions, the astronomers closed their labors for the night, — labors rather mental than physical, and oppressive, from the extreme excitement which they naturally induced. A singular circumstance occurred the next day, which threw the telescope quite out of use for nearly a week, by which time the moon could be no longer observed that month. The great lens, which was usually lowered during the day, and placed horizontally, had, it is true, been lowered as usual, but had been inconsiderately left in a perpendicular position. Accordingly, shortly after sunrise the next morning, Dr. Herschel and his assistants, Dr. Grant and Messrs. Drummond and Home, who slept in a bungalow erected a short distance from the observatory circle, were awakened by the loud shouts of some Dutch farmers and domesticated Hottentots (who were passing with their oxen to agricultural labor), that the 'big house' was on fire! Dr. Herschel leaped out of bed from his brief slumbers, and, sure enough, saw his observatory enveloped in a cloud of smoke.

"Luckily it had been thickly covered, within and without, with a coat of Roman plaster, or it would inevitably have been destroyed with all its invaluable contents; but, as it was, a hole fifteen feet in circumference had been burnt completely

through the 'reflecting chamber,' which was attached to the side of the observatory nearest the lens, through the canvas field on which had been exhibited so many wonders that will ever live in the history of mankind, and through the outer wall. So fierce was the concentration of the solar rays through the gigantic lens, that a clump of trees standing in a line with them was set on fire, and the plaster of the observatory walls, all round the orifice, was vitrified to blue glass. The lens being almost immediately turned, and a brook of water being within a few hundred yards, the fire was soon extinguished, but the damage already done was not inconsiderable. The microscope lenses had fortunately been removed for the purpose of being cleaned, but several of the metallic reflectors were so fused as to be rendered useless. Masons and carpenters were procured from Cape Town with all possible despatch, and in about a week the whole apparatus was again prepared for operation.

"The moon being now invisible Dr. Herschel directed his inquiries to the primary planets of the system, and first to the planet Saturn. We need not say that this remarkable globe has for many ages been an object of the most ardent astronomical curiosity. The stupendous phenomenon of its double ring having baffled the scrutiny and conjecture of many generations of astronomers, was finally abandoned as inexplicable. It is well known that this planet is stationed in the system nine hundred millions of miles distant from the sun, and that having the immense diameter of seventy-nine thousand miles, it is more than nine hundred times larger than the earth. Its annual motion round the sun is not accomplished in less than twenty-nine and a half of our years, whilst its diurnal rotation upon its axis is accomplished in 10h. 16m., or considerably less than half a terrestrial day. It has not less than seven moons, the sixth and the seventh of which were discovered by the elder Herschel in 1789. It is thwarted by mysterious belts or bands of a yellowish tinge, and is surrounded by a double ring—the outer one of which is two hundred and four thousand miles in diameter. The outside diameter of the inner ring is one hundred and eighty-four thousand miles, and the breadth of the outer one being seven thousand two hundred miles, the space

between them is twenty-eight thousand miles. The breadth of the inner ring is much greater than that of the other, being twenty thousand miles; and its distance from the body of Saturn is more than thirty thousand. These rings are opaque, but so thin that their edge has not until now been discovered. Sir John Herschel's most interesting discovery with regard to this planet is the demonstrated fact that these two rings are composed of the fragments of two destroyed worlds, formerly belonging to our solar system, and which, on being exploded, were gathered around the immense body of Saturn by the attraction of gravity, and yet kept from falling to its surface by the great centrifugal force created by its extraordinary rapidity on its axis. The inner ring was therefore the first of these destroyed worlds (the former station of which in the system is demonstrated in the argument which we subjoin), which was accordingly carried round by the rotary force, and spread forth in the manner we see. The outer ring is another world exploded in fragments, attracted by the law of gravity as in the former case, and kept from uniting with the inner ring by the centrifugal force of the latter. But the latter, having a slower rotation than the planet, has an inferior centrifugal force, and accordingly the space between the outer and inner ring is nearly ten times less than that between the inner ring and the body of Saturn. Having ascertained the mean density of the rings, as compared with the density of the planet, Sir John Herschel has been enabled to effect the following beautiful demonstration. [Which we omit, as too mathematical for popular comprehension. — *Ed. Sun.*]

“Dr. Herschel clearly ascertained that these rings are composed of rocky strata, the skeletons of former globes, lying in a state of wild and ghastly confusion, but not devoid of mountains and seas. . . . The belts across the body of Saturn he has discovered to be the smoke of a number of immense volcanoes, carried in these straight lines by the extreme velocity of the rotary motion. . . . [And these also he has ascertained to be the belt of Jupiter. But the portion of the work which is devoted to this subject, and to the other planets, as also that which describes the astronomer's discoveries among the stars,

is comparatively uninteresting to general readers, however highly it might interest others of scientific taste and mathematical acquirements. — *Ed. Sun.*]

. . . . "It was not until the new moon of the month of March, that the weather proved favorable to any continued series of lunar observations; and Dr. Herschel had been too enthusiastically absorbed in demonstrating his brilliant discoveries in the southern constellations, and in constructing tables and catalogues of his new stars, to avail himself of the few clear nights which intervened.

"On one of these, however, Mr. Drummond, myself, and Mr. Holmes, made those discoveries near the Bay of Rainbows, to which I have somewhere briefly alluded. The bay thus fancifully denominated is a part of the northern boundary of the first great ocean which I have lately described, and is marked in the chart with the letter O. The tract of country which we explored on this occasion is numbered 6, 5, 8, 7, in the catalogue, and the chief mountains to which these numbers are attached are severally named Atlas, Hercules, Heraclides Verus, and Heraclides Falsus. Still farther to the north of these is the island circle called Pythagoras, and numbered 1; and yet nearer the meridian line is the mountainous district marked R, and called the Land of Drought, and Q, the Land of Hoar Frost; and certainly the name of the latter, however theoretically bestowed, was not altogether inapplicable, for the tops of its very lofty mountains were evidently covered with snow, though the valleys surrounding them were teeming with the luxuriant fertility of midsummer. But the region which we first particularly inspected was that of Heraclides Falsus (No. 7), in which we found several new specimens of animals, all of which were horned and of a white or gray color; and the remains of three ancient triangular temples which had long been in ruins. We thence traversed the country south-eastward, until we arrived at Atlas (No. 6), and it was in one of the noble valleys at the foot of this mountain that we found the very superior species of the *Vespertilio-homo*. In stature they did not exceed those last described, but they were of infinitely greater personal beauty, and appeared in our eyes scarcely less

lovely than the general representations of angels by the more imaginative schools of painters. Their social economy seemed to be regulated by laws or ceremonies exactly like those prevailing in the Vale of the Triads, but their works of art were more numerous, and displayed a proficiency of skill quite incredible to all except actual observers. I shall, therefore, let the first detailed account of them appear in Dr. Herschel's authenticated natural history of this plauet.'

"[This concludes the Supplement, with the exception of forty pages of illustrative and mathematical notes, which would greatly enhance the size and price of this work, without commensurably adding to its general interest. — *Ed. Sun.*]"

This was the whole of the "Moon Hoax," which, in its day, created much speculation and wonder.

THE ROORBACK.

TWENTY-FIVE years ago the word "Roorback" was a rallying cry in a Presidential campaign. When it had served its purpose, it passed into tradition, as a phrase which comparatively few persons could absolutely define. This hoax came about in a quiet way. In September, 1844, a small sheet, published in the Whig interest in the town of Ithaca, New York, and called *The Chronicle*, published the following note, with the appended spurious extract from a book of travels purporting to have been written by an Englishman named Featherstonhaugh: —

"NOTE TO THE EDITOR OF THE ITHACA CHRONICLE.

"MR. SPENCER: — Will you have the goodness to insert in your paper the following extract from Roorback's 'Tour Through the Western and Southern States in 1836'? This work has received the approbation of every American critic, not only for its graphic descriptions of scenery, but for its candid and impartial remarks on men and manners. Amidst the present turmoil and fanaticism of politics, I would furnish a statement made long before the contagion reached us, when there could be no inducement to disguise the truth, or publish falsehood.

AN ABOLITIONIST.

"EXTRACT FROM FEATHERSTONHAUGH'S 'TOUR.'

"Just as we reached the *Duck* River in the early gray of the morning, we came up with a singular spectacle, the most striking one of the kind I have ever witnessed. It was a camp of negro slave-drivers, just packing up to start. They had about three hundred slaves with them, who had bivouacked the preceding night in chains in the woods; these they were conducting into

Natchez, on the Mississippi River, to work upon the sugar plantations in Louisiana. It resembled one of the coffles of slaves spoken of by Mungo Park, except that they had a caravan of nine wagons and single-horse carriages for the purpose of conducting the white people, and any of the blacks that should fall lame, to which they were now putting the horses to pursue their march. The female slaves were some of them sitting on logs of wood, whilst others were standing, and a great many little black children were warming themselves by the fire of the bivouac. In front of them all, and prepared for the march, stood in double files about two hundred male slaves, manacled, and chained to each other. I had never seen so revolting a sight before! Black men in fetters, torn from the lands where they were born, from the ties they had formed, and from the comparatively easy condition which agricultural labor affords, and driven by white men, with liberty and equality in their mouths, to a distant and unhealthy country, to perish in the sugar-mills of Louisiana, where the duration of life for a sugar-mill slave does not exceed seven years. *Forty-three of these unfortunate beings had been purchased, I was informed, of the Hon. J. K. Polk, the present Speaker of the House of Representatives; the mark of the branding-iron, with the initials of his name on their shoulders, distinguishing them from the rest.*"

The curious part of this forgery was the ingenuity with which the actual words of the English traveller were used as a setting. Part of the foregoing extract is a veritable copy of a passage in a genuine book of travels, written by an Englishman named Featherstonhaugh, — but the words in italics are all interpolated. Where the Roorback forgery reads "Duck River," the genuine book says "New River;" and the concluding passage is pure invention.

The *Ithaca Chronicle's* pretended extract was eagerly copied into the *Albany Evening Journal* on Monday, September 16, 1844, and Thurlow Weed made the most of its revelations as a document for the campaign. First displaying the forgery in large type, with obtrusive head-lines, the *Evening Journal* added to it this allusion to the Opposition candidate for the Presidency:—

"This same James K. Polk, whose manacled bondsmen were seen by the Tourist in 1836, on their way to die in the sugar-mills of Louisiana, WITH THE INITIALS OF HIS NAME,

J. K. P.,

BURNT INTO THEIR FLESH, is now the Democratic candidate for the Presidency of the United States! According to all accounts, he treats the poor

Africans whom he owns no better now than he did then, for we are told that he hires them out by the week, month, or year, as we at the North hire out cattle to our neighbors, to labor for stipulated sums, which are paid to him. If they are sent off from his plantation to different portions of Tennessee, it is not at all unlikely that they carry the initials of their master's name burnt with the branding-iron into their shoulders, and are all marked as shepherds mark their flocks. And these poor, branded slaves of James K. Polk's, are HUMAN BEINGS!"

This was a bomb-shell in the Democratic camp. The *New York Evening Post*, of September 23d (then a Democratic paper), denounced it as "an atrocious fraud;" and the *Albany Argus* took much pains to find a copy of the genuine "Tour Through the Western and Southern States" (issued in 1834, not 1836), and, by publishing the real and pretended passages in parallel columns, fully exposed the fraud. The *Argus* added: "Mr. Featherstonhaugh makes no mention of Speaker Polk, for the reason that when he wrote Governor Polk was not Speaker." This was true. John Bell was Speaker of the House in 1834.

The *New York American*, one of the Whig journals which had copied the story, made a retraction after this exposure, and wound up its apology with the emphatic statement that the interpolation of the passage in question was a "forgery which would hardly be adequately punished by branding liar and forger on the forehead of the scoundrel who perpetrated it."

Polk was elected; and the "Roorback hoax" passed into history.

THE LINCOLN PROCLAMATION.

WALL Street has been responsible for numberless rascalities, and still preserves its reputation for ingenious diabolism. "Corners" are made, brokers steal bonds, stocks are "watered," honest men cheated, and widows and orphans left penniless,—all to put money into the pockets of shrewd speculators, who are sometimes pillars of the Church, or founders of religious institutions, and who

"Compound for sins they are inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to."

But nothing worse was ever done for purposes of speculation — all the circumstances of the time being considered — than the spurious Proclamation, purporting to have been issued by President Lincoln, which appeared in three morning papers in New York on the 18th of May, 1864. It was published at a critical period in the War, when foreign intervention was continually feared, and when the government needed the cordial aid of every loyal press and every loyal man. The papers which gave it currency were the *Journal of Commerce*, the *World* and the *Herald*. The *Times* and *Tribune*, with editors shrewdly suspicious, refused to print it. Yet the manner in which this hoax found its way into print lent it the color of truth. It was furnished to all the morning papers in New York at a late hour of the night, written upon the thin sheets of oiled tissue-paper used in the office of the Associated Press, and known to newspaper men as “manifold.” It apparently came through the regular channels, and the night-editors of three newspapers, deceived by its air of genuineness, accepted it without question, and published it.

In this spurious document, the President was made to say these doleful words:—

“EXECUTIVE MANSION, }
“ May 17, 1864. }

“ *Fellow-Citizens of the United States:—*

“ In all seasons of exigency, it becomes a nation carefully to scrutinize its line of conduct, humbly to approach the throne of grace, and meekly to implore forgiveness, wisdom, and guidance.

“ For reasons known only to Him, it has been decreed that this country should be the scene of unparalleled outrage, and *this nation the monumental sufferer of the Nineteenth Century. With a heavy heart, but an undiminished confidence in our cause, I approach the performance of a duty rendered imperative by my sense of weakness before the Almighty, and of justice to the people.*

“ It is necessary that I should tell you that the first Virginia campaign, under Lieut. Gen. Grant, in whom I have every confidence, and whose courage and fidelity the people do well to honor, is virtually closed. He has conducted his great enterprise with discreet ability. He has crippled their strength and defeated their plans.

“ In view, however, *of the situation in Virginia, the disaster at Red River, the delay at Charleston, and the general state of the country*, I, Abraham Lincoln, do hereby recommend that Thursday, the 26th day of May, A.D., 1864, be solemnly set apart throughout these United States *as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer.*

“ Deeming furthermore that the present condition of public affairs presents

an extraordinary occasion, and in view of the pending expiration of the service of (100,000) one hundred thousand of our troops, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power vested in me by the Constitution and the laws, have thought fit to call forth, and hereby do call forth, the citizens of the United States, between the ages of (18) eighteen and (45) forty-five years, to the aggregate number of (400,000) four hundred thousand, in order to suppress the existing rebellious combinations, and to cause the due execution of the laws.

“And, furthermore, in case any State, or number of States, shall fail to furnish, by the fifteenth day of June next, their assigned quota, it is hereby ordered that the same be raised by an immediate and peremptory draft.

“The details for this object will be communicated to the State authorities through the War Department.

“I appeal to all loyal citizens to favor, facilitate, and aid this effort to maintain the honor, the integrity, and the existence of the National Union, and the perpetuity of popular government.

“In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed. Done at the City of Washington this 17th day of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, and of the independence of the United States the eighty-eighth.

“By the President,

“ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

“WM. H. SEWARD, Secretary of State.”

The fact was, that at the time this proclamation appeared, Grant had driven the enemy in Virginia, and Sherman was gaining ground in the south-west. Our armies had never been in so good condition. The rebellion, as subsequent events proved, was in reality in its death-throe; and although the varying fortunes of war had brought us disaster as well as victory, the hope of an early subjugation of the foe had taken a strong hold upon the loyal men of the North. This hope was well founded; for Lee surrendered to Grant eleven months later, — in April, 1865.

The forgers chose their time with skill. The hoax was put out on Tuesday night; Wednesday was steamer day. The Cunard ship was departing for her voyage, when she was overhauled by a revenue-cutter, despatched by the Collector of the port, and when she had again got under way, she bore the antidote to the poison, — a telegraphic message from Secretary Seward, branding the document as a forgery. Two ingenious newspaper men,* who had done the work, were summarily caught

* Howard and Mallison, of the Brooklyn *Eagle*.

and immured in Fort Lafayette; whence they emerged, a few months later, wiser and sadder than when they went in.

The war produced several other hoaxes; one of which was a spurious *Herald Extra*, prematurely announcing the "Capture of Mobile, with eight thousand prisoners, one hundred and thirty cannon, and four hundred thousand bales of cotton!" and this made a brief sensation. False rumors of successes and defeats were of daily occurrence; but the Proclamation forgery was the only deliberate and mischievous hoax, and the only one which had more than an ephemeral existence.

In time of peace, newspaper hoaxes are of the mild type, — unoffensive affairs, which please the fancy of the reader, or justify the employment of capital letters in three-line headings. Of this class are the stories of wild men prowling in the woods, of sea-serpents disporting in the placid waters of remote lakes, of marvellous discoveries of hidden treasures, or of revelations of ancient relics, — all of which may be taken with grains of salt.



Times, Wednesday night

My dear Maverick:

I am much obliged to you for a parcel of these notes. They are interesting. I think you or somebody equally well posted would write a history of the City Press. It could be made the nucleus for a great deal of interesting matter.

Yours as ever
H. J. Raymond

A. Maverick Esq.

Facsimile of a Letter from Mr Raymond.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE PRESS OF TO-DAY.

PAPERS PUBLISHED IN NEW YORK AT THE CLOSE OF 1869 — A CLASSIFIED LIST
— PECULIARITIES OF DIFFERENT JOURNALS — THE DAILIES AND THE WEEKLIES
— WHAT WAS, IS, AND IS TO BE.

IN the preparation of these pages, the progress of Journalism in New York has been traced, from its comparatively low state a generation ago, to and through the periods marked by signal improvements in style and quality. It has been shown that the disadvantages under which the newspapers of 1840 were conducted did not preclude outbursts of enterprise; that the younger journals of that day were in the habit of startling the town with novel efforts; that the gradual increase of newspaper readers created a demand for a cheaper Press than that with which New York had been content for the previous century; that this new phase of Journalism widened and grew stronger as the years advanced, and the appetite of the public grew keener; that the call for a fresher and better quality of newspaper literature brought forth the *Times*, — and that the success of the venture, in which Mr. Raymond and his friends embarked, was assured from the outset by a combination of circumstances, which are now fully revealed. The career of Mr. Raymond, as an editor and a politician, has been followed, step by step; and the dilatory verdict in which his old enemies did justice to his character has been duly recorded. Some account of the inner life of Journalism — the anecdotes, the humors, and the hoaxes, for which it is noted — has also been given.

We now come to consider the Press of to-day.

All the causes operative in the earlier history of Journalism in New York, which produced such radical changes,

are in existence now. The field for the display of skill, judgment, and activity still grows wider, as cities expand, and lines of intercommunication ramify, and civilization advances into regions which were yesterday tracts of uninhabited wilderness. The public appetite, too, is becoming fastidious. That which contented thousands, thirty years ago, would not now please a score. That which was permissible, ten years ago, is now regarded as wholly unsatisfactory. The older time, when an editorial utterance in behalf of a party was accepted as oracular by the members of that party, was long since changed into the skeptical and questioning. The newspaper is gradually ceasing to reflect individual opinion, and gradually becoming more catholic in its general tone. The cost of publication has quadrupled since the first years of the *Tribune* and the *Herald*; the expenditure in all departments of the daily journals of New York this year is greater than that which was considered extravagant in 1860; the prices paid to the professional journalist are now more accordant with the quality of the work performed; and the general scope of Journalism is broader and grander than ever before.

Thirty years ago, the Chief Editor of a newspaper in New York rarely employed more than two or three assistants. Limited capital, small circulation, cheap advertising, all forbade great outlay. Editors were reporters and editors alternately; and their emoluments were not commensurate with the labors required of them. If the assistant, after hard application for a week, received his pay promptly at its close, he counted himself fortunate. If the proprietors made a small profit at the end of the year, that year was marked with a white stone in their calendar. If the subscribers to a paper adhered to it, without interruption, for a twelvemonth, the fact was taken as evidence of the singular popularity of its conductors. Those days were days of hardship, of doubt, and of small returns for literary effort.

But the lapse of thirty years has changed every phase of newspaper life. Each of the great daily papers of New York to-day employs more than a hundred men, in different departments, and expends half a million of dollars annually, with less

concern to the proprietors than an outlay of one-quarter of that sum would have occasioned in 1840. The editorial corps of the morning papers issued in New York on the first day of the present year numbered at least half a score of persons; the reporters were in equal force; sixty printers and eight or ten pressmen were employed to put in type and to print the contents of each issue of the paper; twenty carriers conveyed the printed sheet to its readers; and a dozen mailing clerks and book-keepers managed the business details of each establishment. Editorial salaries now range from twenty-five dollars to sixty dollars a week; reporters receive from twenty dollars to thirty dollars a week; and the gross receipts of a great daily paper for a year often reach the sum of one million of dollars, of which an average of one-third is clear profit. These statistics are applicable to four or five of the daily morning journals of New York. The evening papers, however, employing fewer persons, and incurring smaller expenses, than their morning contemporaries, make a proportionate profit on the business of a year.

The process of making a daily newspaper has also undergone a singular change within the space of thirty years. The minute subdivision of labor into distinct departments has been a slow growth; but it is now reduced to a system which produces admirable results. The facilities of printing have been multiplied by the introduction of the rotary Hoe press, which is capable of throwing off eighteen thousand sheets hourly. The latest improvement in the processes of stereotyping enables the printer to reproduce the pages of a daily paper in duplicate, with the labor of an hour.

In the organization of a daily newspaper in New York, the Chief Editor controls all the details of the Editorial department; his decrees being final in all matters concerning the tone of the Journal, the engagement of assistants, and the preparation of the contents of each sheet. His partners are charged with the affairs of business, and he meets them in consultation; but in his own department he is supreme. Around this figure, as on a pivot, revolve all the departments into which the editorial force is divided. One assistant, placed in charge of the

news, is known as the Night Editor. Another, to whom is given the place and title of the City Editor, directs the work performed by the reporters, whose duty is to gather all the local intelligence of the day. A special department is devoted to the news of the money market, and the assistant in charge is the Financial Editor. Another gives his attention to the literature of the time, and is known as the Literary Editor. A critic is assigned the duty of writing upon the drama and the opera; and the only persons who are not in charge of departments are the editorial writers, who are in direct daily communication with the Chief, receiving his suggestions and writing articles upon topics indicated by him, or upon others of their own selection, to which he gives his approval. Under this system, which is now generally adopted, the different parts of the daily paper are made harmonious, and the labor of each day is performed, not only without friction, but in the most rapid and satisfactory manner.

The methods of obtaining news have been simplified by the organization of the Associated Press Agency, in New York. The "General News Association of the City of New York" was organized in October, 1856, by the joint efforts of the proprietors of seven of the daily papers, namely, the *Journal of Commerce*, *Express*, *Herald*, *Sun*, *Tribune*, *Courier and Enquirer*, and *Times*. It was a final consolidation of the "Harbor News Association," which had been in existence since January, 1849, with the subsequent Telegraphic and General News Associations, established by different newspapers in the city; and all the property belonging to the pre-existing organizations was formally transferred. It was provided that all the expenses incurred in collecting, preparing, and distributing news should be borne in equal proportions by all the members of the new Association, and that the responsible labor should be assumed by a General Agent, whose salary should be paid by equal assessments. Any member was to be permitted to withdraw, by giving six months' notice; but no member was to sell his share in the property of the Association to any persons except the other members, who bound themselves to purchase such share, when offered, at two-thirds of its appraised value.

.....

This organization has been in existence for more than thirteen years; yet none of its original members have withdrawn. Once or twice James Gordon Bennett has threatened to take the *Herald* out; but he reconsidered his determination, and that paper continues to receive the news through the regular channel. The *Herald*, however, often incurs heavy expenses for special telegraphic despatches, and, when the Atlantic Cable went into operation, a large part of its earlier business was the transmission of long messages to Bennett. This fact was noted in the first official report of the Atlantic Telegraph Company. The other daily papers in New York receive thousands of words over the land telegraphs in the course of a single week, and these are exclusively for their own benefit. The cost of such despatches is an addition to the regular weekly assessment for what is technically called "Associated Press news," — to which all the seven papers in the Association are entitled.

The General Office of the Associated Press is in the building on the north-west corner of Broadway and Liberty Street, New York. The general agent, Mr. James W. Simonton, who succeeded D. H. Craig, has under his orders a large force of assistants, to whom specific duties are assigned. Through a complete system of agencies, all the news of the world is received daily at the General Office, — by the Atlantic Cable, by the Cuba Cable, by the lines of land telegraph, by ocean steamers, and by ships which fly to and from the South American ports. Agents are stationed in London and Liverpool, and in all the principal cities and towns of the United States, — in Montreal, Quebec, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, New Orleans, Washington, Albany, and San Francisco, — and it is the duty of these agents to send early and full accounts of all the leading events of each day. Sometimes these messages are sent over the telegraphic wires in cipher, and are translated by the key held in the General Office in New York.

The news thus gathered from every quarter is prepared for use by a duplication of copies on oiled-silk paper, prepared expressly for this purpose, and messengers convey the packages in envelopes, upon which the name of each paper in the

Association is printed. The news of New York, in like manner, is prepared for transmission to other places by other agents, to each of whom a special kind of work is given.

The evening papers in New York do not belong to the Association; but are permitted to receive the same news which is furnished to the morning papers, on the payment of a stipulated sum. The average amount of this assessment is about eight thousand dollars per year for each of the principal evening papers in the city. The amount of revenue derived by the General Association by such sales of news to the evening journals, and to papers outside of New York, materially reduces the yearly expenses of the original seven.

The Associated Press has often been denounced as a grasping monopoly, — and there is some truth in this assertion, — but it is certain that its simplification of the methods of getting news, and the perfect system with which it is managed, are great helps to the newspaper press of New York, and of the whole country. One or two rival Associations furnish news to papers which are not admitted to the privileges of the older organizations; but the heavy outlay required to establish a thorough system of news-collecting, together with the exclusion of "outside" journals from telegraphic facilities, virtually invest the Associated Press with supreme power.

But while each great printing establishment in New York possesses an internal economy which is smooth in its operation, and nearly perfect in result, the men themselves know little of each other; and in this respect the profession of Journalism differs from all others. In medicine, members of societies meet at stated times for comparisons of views and for general discussion. In the ranks of the clergy, and among the members of the Bar, there is a greater or less degree of affiliation. But, unfortunately for the higher interests of Journalism, the rivalries of business too often remain operative after the hours of routine duty expire.

Frequent attempts have been made to organize Press Clubs in New York, for the purpose of cultivating the social graces. Nearly twenty years ago, one of these Associations, taking the name of the "Press Club," held monthly sessions at the Astor

House; the members dining quietly together. It was composed exclusively of newspaper proprietors, and its purpose was accomplished in bringing together, at stated periods, and in friendly intercourse, the conductors of all the leading journals of the city. But this experiment faded away. It was followed by a "Journalists' Club," composed of the subordinates employed in different departments of the newspaper offices; but none of the members of this Club possessed the means to continue the hire of rooms, or to meet the contingent expenses of the organization; and, like its predecessor, the experiment failed. No further attempt was made for several years, and the men of the Press in New York met as before, only at rare intervals, and in the busier hours of the day, when no time could be spared for the interchange of courtesies. A year or two ago, however, a new effort was made to revive a pleasant custom; and, in order to give assurance of vitality, formalities were laid aside, and no permanent organization was attempted. It was agreed that all reputable persons* engaged in Journalism should be invited to meet on the last Saturday of each month, — excepting July, August, and September, — at a simple dinner. The price of the entertainment was limited to three dollars for each person, and every guest had the privilege of inviting one friend. The presiding officer was to be chosen from among the gentlemen present, and there was to be no other form of organization than that of an Executive Committee, which was charged with the duty of ordering and paying for the dinner. This programme was successfully carried out. The dinners of the new Club — usually given at Delmonico's — have been attended by large numbers of gentlemen from all the principal newspapers in the city, and by distinguished guests; and out of this organization grew the complimentary banquet to Charles Dickens, of which mention has been made in a previous chapter of this volume. Moreover, the Press men entertained the members of "Sorosis," and the literary sisters returned the compliment. "Sorosis" still exists, and, like the Press Club, dines with Delmonico.

* In newspaper life, as in all other branches of business, there are "black sheep," whom good men snub.

The reporters of New York, about eighteen months ago, organized a "Bohemian Club," taking this title for the purpose of redeeming the name of Bohemian from the disrepute into which it had fallen. This club has now forty or fifty members, all actively engaged in reportorial duty for different newspapers in the city. They dine together once a month; the assessment for expenses being one dollar each, with extra charges for wine.

The day of a cheap daily press expired soon after the beginning of the Civil War. The price of a morning paper had been two cents for many years prior to 1861; but the sudden rise in values immediately affected all the sources of supply. Printing-paper rose to twenty-four cents a pound, — nearly double its former price; ink and type also went to higher figures; higher wages were demanded by workmen; salaries were increased, and the price of a newspaper rose to four cents, with an additional penny for the Sunday issues. Several cheap papers have sprung up since the war, which are sold for two cents each; but for this sum it is impossible, in the present condition of the market, that they should attempt to vie with their older and richer contemporaries.

The whole number of newspapers now published in the city of New York is upwards of *one hundred and fifty*. Of these, twenty-four are issued daily, — thirteen in the morning and eleven in the evening. The remainder are weekly papers; and of the whole number of these, eighteen are the organs of religious sects. Of the daily papers, two are published in the French language, and three in German. Of the weeklies, eighteen are in German, one in Italian, and two in Spanish. The whole list, classified, is as follows: —

DAILY PAPERS — MORNING.

- Times — Raymond, Jones & Co.
- Tribune — Tribune Association.
- Herald — James Gordon Bennett.
- Sun — Charles A. Dana.
- World — Manton Marble.
- Journal of Commerce — Hale, Hallock & Co.
- Star — Joseph Howard, Jr.

Transcript — Transcript Association.
Daily Bulletin — Bulletin Association.

DAILY PAPERS — EVENING.

Evening Post — Willam C. Bryant & Co.
Commercial Advertiser — Hugh J. Hastings.
Express — James and Erastus Brooks.
Evening Mail — James S. Johnston & Co.
Evening Commonwealth — George Marsland.
Evening Telegram — James Gordon Bennett, Jr.
Press and Globe — Evening Press Association.
Daily News — Benjamin Wood.
Democrat — Mark M. Pomeroy.

FRENCH PAPERS — DAILY.

Courrier des Etats-Unis — Charles Lassalle.
Messager Franco-Americain — H. de Mareil.

GERMAN PAPERS — DAILY.

Abend Zeitung — F. Rauchfuss.
Demokrat — F. Schwedler.
Staats-Zeitung — Oswald Ottendorfer.
New Yorker Journal — Evening paper.

WEEKLY PAPERS.

Advertisers' Gazette — George P. Rowell & Co.
Advocate and Family Guardian — American Female Guardian Society.
Albion — Kinahan Cornwallis.
American Artisan — Brown, Coombs & Co.
American Baptist — Baptist Free Mission Society.
American Journal of Mining — Western & Co.
American Lloyds — T. D. Taylor.
American Missionary — American Missionary Association.
American Colonist — John V. Quick.
American Railroad Journal — J. H. Schultz.
Anti-Slavery Standard — American Anti-Slavery Society.
Appleton's Journal — D. Appleton & Co.
Army and Navy Journal — W. C. and F. P. Church.
Atlas — Anson Herrick's Sons.
Bank-Note and Commercial Reporter — D. Hawes.
Bible Society Record — American Bible Society.
Billiard Cue — Phelan & Collender.
Boyd's Shipping Gazette — W. Hicks.
Boys' and Girls' Weekly — Frank Leslie.
Child's Paper — American Tract Society.
Chimney Corner — Frank Leslie.
Christian Advocate — Carlton & Lanahan.

Christian Intelligencer — C. Van Wyck.
 Church Journal — Houghton & Co.
 Christian Union — J. B. Ford & Co.
 Citizen and Round Table — Robert B. Roosevelt.
 Commercial and Financial Chronicle — W. B. Dana & Co.
 Cosmopolitan — R. McMurdy.
 Counting House Monitor — E. W. Bullinger.
 Cuban, The — Cuban Junta.
 Day's Doings — James Watts & Co.
 Druggists' Price Current — I. C. Michels.
 Dry Goods Price Current — P. R. Sabin.
 El Cronista — J. Ferrer de Couto.
 Emerald — McBride & Marrat.
 Examiner and Chronicle — Edward Bright & Co.
 Fireman's Journal — F. J. Miller.
 Fireside Companion — G. Munroe.
 Frank Leslie's Budget of Fun.
 Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper.
 Frank Leslie's Illustrirte Zeitung.
 Free Trader — John Sarell.
 Freeman's Journal — J. A. McMaster.
 Gas-Light Journal — M. L. Callender & Co.
 Good Words — H. W. Adams.
 Grocer's Journal — F. D. Longchamp.
 Harper's Bazar — Harper & Brothers.
 Harper's Weekly — Harper & Brothers.
 Hebrew Leader — J. Boudi.
 Health Reformer — R. T. Trall.
 Hearth and Home — Pettengill, Bates & Co.
 Hearthstone, The — J. H. & C. M. Goodsell.
 Herald of Life — George Storrs.
 Home Journal — Morris Phillips & Co.
 Humphrey's Journal of Photography — J. H. Ladd.
 Ilustracion Americana — Frank Leslie.
 Independent — H. C. Bowen.
 Industrial American — Edward Young's Son & Co.
 Insurance Journal — T. and J. Slator.
 Insurance Monitor — C. C. Hine.
 Insurance Times — English & Wilmshurst.
 Internal Revenue Record — W. C. & F. P. Church.
 Irish American — Lynch, Cole & Meehan.
 Irish Citizen — John Mitchel.
 Iron Age — David Williams.
 Jewish Messenger — S. M. Isaacs & Sons.
 Jewish Times — M. Ellinger.
 Jolly Joker.
 Jones' U. S. Counterfeit Detector — J. W. Jones & Co.
 Journal of Applied Chemistry — Dexter & Co.
 Journal of the Telegraph — James D. Reid.

Katholische Kirchen Zeitung — Benziger Brothers.
 L'Eco d'Italia — G. F. Secchi de Casali.
 Liberal Christian — Unitarian Society.
 Life Boat — American Seaman's Friend Society.
 Literary Album — Street & Smith.
 Merryman's Monthly — J. C. Haney & Co.
 Methodist — H. W. Douglas.
 Metropolitan Record — John Mullaly.
 Missionary Advocate — Carlton & Lanahan.
 Monde Illustré — H. P. Sampers.
 Moore's Rural New Yorker — D. D. T. Moore.
 Musical Pioneer — F. J. Huntington & Co.
 Musik Zeitung — Gutmann & Stein.
 Nation — E. L. Godkin & Co.
 National Police Gazette — George W. Matsell & Co.
 National Temperance Advocate — J. N. Stearns.
 New Jerusalem Messenger — New Jerusalem Church.
 New World — Frank Leslie.
 New York Clipper — F. Queen.
 New York Courier — James L. Smith & Co.
 New York Day Book — Vanevrie, Horton & Co.
 New York Dispatch — Estate of A. J. Williamson.
 New York Evangelist — Field & Craighead.
 New York Leader — Leader Association.
 New York Ledger — Robert Bonner.
 New York Mercantile Journal — Mercantile Journal Company.
 New York Underwriter — J. B. Ecclesine.
 New York Weekly — Street & Smith.
 New York Weekly Review — Theodore Hagen.
 Observer — Sidney E. Morse, Jr., & Co.
 Petroleum Recorder — John Hillyer.
 Phunny Phellow — Street & Smith.
 Practical Painter — Willis, Macdonald & Co.
 Presbyterian — R. Carter & Brothers.
 Produce Exchange Reporter — W. H. Trafton.
 Producer's Price Current — B. Urner.
 Protectionist — J. Herbert.
 Protestant Churchman — Episcopalian.
 Real Estate Record — C. W. Sweet.
 Revolution — Susan B. Anthony.
 Scientific American — Munn & Co.
 Scottish American Journal — A. M. Stewart.
 Scotsman, American — John Stewart.
 Seamen's Friend — S. H. Hall.
 Sheldon's Dry Goods Price List — J. D. Sheldon & Co.
 Shipping and Commercial List — Autens & Bourne.
 Shoe and Leather Reporter — Dexter & Co.
 Soldier's Friend — W. O. Bourne.
 Spirit of the Times — George Wilkes.

Stockholder — S. P. Dinsmore & Co.
 Sunday Mercury — Cauldwell & Whitney.
 Sunday-School Advocate — Carlton & Lanahan.
 Sunday-School Journal — Carlton & Lanahan.
 Sunday Times — E. G. Howard & Co.
 Table-Talk — Wilson, Lockwood, Everett & Co.
 Tablet — D. and J. Sadlier & Co.
 Tobacco Leaf — C. Pfirshing.
 Turf, Field and Farm — Bruce & Simpson.
 United States Economist — Joseph Mackey.
 United States Mining Journal — John Hillyer.
 Watson's Art Journal — H. C. Watson.
 Western World — Western World Co.
 Working Farmer — William L. Allison.
 [Besides eighteen weekly German papers.]

In addition to twenty-four daily papers, and nearly five times that number of weekly issues, several magazines and other monthly publications are also issued in New York. The dailies gather up all that floats; the weeklies, only that which preserves its freshness from Saturday to Saturday; the monthlies, that which requires greater expenditure of thought and time and labor. The oldest existing New York magazine is *Harper's*, which has attained an immense circulation. The *Galaxy* is lively and popular, and is steadily gaining. *Putnam's*, recently revived, is fortunate in its antecedent history. *Packard's* is an experiment in a new field, and is prosperous. *Hours at Home*, the *American Agriculturist*, the *Phrenological Journal*, *Onward*, and *Old and New* meet the wants of different classes of readers. All live; therefore they find nutriment somewhere.

The writer is indebted to George P. Rowell & Co., advertising agents in New York, for the subjoined list of newspapers in foreign languages,* published in the United States in the year 1869.

*From the "American Newspaper Directory."

A LIST OF NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS PRINTED WHOLLY OR IN PART IN THE GERMAN, FRENCH, SCANDINAVIAN, SPANISH, HOLLANDISH, ITALIAN, WELSH, AND BOHEMIAN LANGUAGES:—

GERMAN.

CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco.—California Demokrat.

San Francisco—Abend Post.

CONNECTICUT.

New Haven—Beobachter.

New Haven—Connecticut Staats Zeitung.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Washington—Columbia.

ILLINOIS.

Alton—Banner.

Belleville—Stern des Westens.

Belleville—Zeitung.

Chester—Randolph Co. Zeitung.

Chicago—Abend Zeitung.

Chicago—Illinois Staats Zeitung.

Chicago—Union.

Chicago—Die Laterne.

Freeport—Deutscher Anzeiger.

Highland—Bote and Schutzen Zeitung.

Highland—Union.

Springfield—Illinois Staats Demokrat.

INDIANA.

Evansville—Democrat.

Evansville—Union.

Fort Wayne—Indiana Staats Zeitung.

Huntingburg—Signal.

Indianapolis—Telegraph.

Indianapolis—Future.

Indianapolis—Indiana Volksblatt.

Indianapolis—Spottvogel.

La Fayette—Indiana Union.

Tell City—Anzeiger.

Terre Haute—Buerger Zeitung.

IOWA.

Burlington—Iowa Tribune.

Clinton—Iowa Volks Zeitung.

Davenport—Der Demokrat.

Dubuque—Iowa Staats Zeitung.

Dubuque—National Demokrat.

Elkader—Der Nord Iowa Herald.

Keokuk—Telegraph.

KENTUCKY.

Louisville—Anzeiger.

Louisville—Volksblatt.

Louisville—Katholischer Glaubensbote.

Louisville—Omnibus.

LOUISIANA.

New Orleans—Deutsche Zeitung.

MARYLAND.

Baltimore—Deutsche Correspondent.

Baltimore—Wecker.

Baltimore—Katholische Volks Zeitung.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Boston—Der Pioneer.

MICHIGAN.

Detroit—Michigan Journal.

Detroit—Familien Blatter.

MINNESOTA.

St. Paul—Minnesota Volksblatt.

St. Paul—Minnesota Staats Zeitung.

MISSOURI.

Kansas City—Post.

St. Joseph—Das Westliche Volksblatt.

St. Louis—Never Anzeiger des Westens.

St. Louis—Volkszeitung.

St. Louis—Westliche Post.

St. Louis—Mississippi Blatter.

St. Louis—Herold des Glaubens.

St. Louis—Neue Welt.

NEBRASKA.

Arago—Westlicher Pionier.

Nebraska City—Nebraska Zeitung.

NEW JERSEY.

Egg Harbor—Der Zeitgeist.

Elizabeth — New Jersey Landbote.
 Hoboken — Hudson Co. Journal.
 Hoboken — Hudson Co. Volksblatt.
 Newark — New Jersey Freie Zeitung.
 Newark — New Jersey Volksman.
 Newark — Der Erzachler.
 Trenton — New Jersey Staats Journal.

NEW YORK.

Buffalo — Aurora.
 Buffalo — Demokrat.
 Buffalo — Telegraph.
 New York — Abend Zeitung.
 New York — Demokrat.
 New York — Journal.
 New York — Staats Zeitung.
 New York — Amerikanische Post.
 New York — Atlantische Blatter.
 New York — Belletristisches Journal.
 New York — Beobachter am Hudson.
 New York — Die Welt.
 New York — Frank Leslie's Illustrate Zeitung.
 New York — Handel's Zeitung.
 New York — Katholische Kirchen Zeitung.
 New York — Museum.
 New York — Musik Zeitung.
 New York — Nachrichten aus Deutschland und der Schweiz.
 New York — Schule des Volks.
 New York — Amerikanische Agriculturist.
 New York — Amerikanische Bierbrauer.
 New York — Der Lutherische Herold.
 New York — Farmers' Zeitung.
 New York — Gerhard's Gartenlaube.
 New York — Amerikanischer Botschafter.
 Rochester — Beobachter.
 Syracuse — Central Demokrat.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Goldsboro — Die North Carolina Staats Zeitung.

OHIO.

Canton — Deutsche in Ohio.
 Cincinnati — Volksblatt.
 Cincinnati — Volksfreund.

Cincinnati — Christliche Apologete.
 Cincinnati — Die Deborah.
 Cincinnati — Der Sendbote.
 Cleveland — Wachter am Erie.
 Cleveland — Christliche Botschafter.
 Cleveland — Christliche Kinderfreund.
 Columbus — Der Odd Fellow.
 Dayton — Volkszeitung.
 Marietta — Zeitung.
 Portsmouth — Correspondent.
 Sandusky — Herold.
 Sandusky — Bay Stadt Demokrat.
 Toledo — Deutsche Zeitung.

OREGON.

Portland — Oregon Deutsche Zeitung.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Allentown — Stadt and Land-Bote.
 Allentown — Friedensbote.
 Allentown — Lutherische Zeitschrift.
 Allentown — Jugend Freund.
 Allentown — Kirchen und Missions Berichte.
 Allentown — Sonntagsschul-Lehrer und Eltein Freund.
 Allentown — Theologische Monatshefte.
 Bethlehem — Der Brueder Botschafter.
 Boyertown — Demokrat.
 Doylestown — Der Morgenstern.
 Doylestown — Express and Reform.
 Easton — Correspondent and Demokrat.
 Erie — Freie Press.
 Erie — Leuchthurm.
 Erie — Zuschauer am Eriesee.
 Hamburg — Hamburger Schnellpost.
 Harrisburg — Pennsylvanische Staats Zeitung.
 Harrisburg — Vaterlands Wachter.
 Lancaster — Volksfreund und Beobachter.
 Lausdale — Montgomery Co. Presse.
 Lebanon — Wahrer Demokrat.
 Lebanon — Der Froehliche Botschafter.
 Lebanon — Pennsylvanier.

- Mauch Chunk — Lecha Thal Beobachter.
 Middleburg — Volksfreund.
 Milford Square — Reformer and Pa. Advertiser.
 Milford Square — Mennonitische Friedensbote.
 Norristown — Montgomery Co. Democraticische Post.
 Norristown — Wahrheits Freund.
 Pennsburg — Bauern Freund.
 Philadelphia — Abend Post.
 Philadelphia — Demokrat.
 Philadelphia — Vereinigte Staaten Zeitung.
 Philadelphia — Freie Presse.
 Philadelphia — Neue Welt.
 Philadelphia — Reformirte Kirchenzeitung.
 Philadelphia — Die Republikanische Flagge.
 Philadelphia — Sonntag's Blatt und Familien Journal.
 Philadelphia — Der Lammerherte.
 Pittsburgh — Freiheits Freund.
 Pittsburgh — Republikaner.
 Pottsville — Amerikanischer Republikaner.
 Pottsville — Jefferson Demokrat.
 Reading — Adler.
 Reading — Banner of Berks.
 Reading — Republikaner von Berks.
 Reading — Der Reformirte Hausfreund.
 Scranton — Wochenblatt.
 Skippackville — Der Neutralist and Allegemeine Neuigskeits-Bote.
 Snubury — Der Deutsche Demokrat.
 Wilkesbarre — Demokratischer Wachter.
 Williamsport — National Demokrat.
 York — Gazette.
- SOUTH CAROLINA.
- Charleston — Zeitung.
- TENNESSEE.
- Memphis — Anzeiger des Sudens.
 Nashville — Tennessee Staats Zeitung.
 Nashville — Demokrat.
- TEXAS.
- Galveston — Union.
 New Braunfels — New Braunfelser Zeitung.
 San Antonio — Texas Free Press.
- WEST VIRGINIA.
- Wheeling — West Virginia Courier.
- WISCONSIN.
- Fond du Lac — Reform.
 Fond du Lac — Zeitung.
 Fountain City — Buffalo Co. Republikaner.
 La Crosse — Nord Stern.
 Manitowoc — Nord Western.
 Manitowoc — Zeitung.
 Milwaukee — Banner and Volksfreund.
 Milwaukee — Herold.
 Milwaukee — See-Bote.
 Sheboygan — National Demokrat.
 Watertown — Weltbuerger.
 West Bend — Washington Co. Banner.
- ONTARIO, D. C.
- Neustadt — Der Wachter am Sauegen.
 New Hamburg — Canada, Staats Zeitung.
 New Hamburg — Canadisches Volksblatt.
 Stratford — Canadischer Colonist.
 Waterloo — Deutcher Canadier.
- FRENCH.
- CALIFORNIA.
- San Francisco — Le National.
- ILLINOIS.
- Kankakee — Courrier de l'Ouest.
- LOUISIANA.
- Abbeville — Meridional.
 Donaldsonville — Drapeau L'Ascension.
 Edgar — Meschacebe and L'Avant Courier.
 Gentilly — Louisianais.
 New Orleans — Bee.
 New Orleans — L'Epogne.

New Orleans — La Renaissance Louisianaise.

New Orleans — Propagateur Catholic.

Opelousas — Courier.

Opelousas — Journal.

Opelousas — St. Landry Progress.

Plaquemine — Iberville South.

St. Martinsville — Courier of the

Teche.

Vermillionville — Lafayette Advertiser.

NEW YORK.

Buffalo — L'Phare des Lacs.

Champlain — Le Charivari.

New York — Courier des Etats Unis.

New York — Le Messenger Franco American.

New York — Le Nouveau Monde.

NEW BRUNSWICK, D. C.

Shediac — Le Moniteur Acadian.

QUEBEC, D. C.

Beauharnois — Le Courier de Beauharnois.

Montreal — La Minerve.

Montreal — Le Nouveau Monde.

Montreal — Le Pays.

Montreal — L'Ordre.

Montreal — La Lanterne.

Montreal — La Guepe.

Montreal — La Revue Canadienne.

Montreal — L'Echo de la France.

Montreal — L'Echo du Cabinet de Lecture Paroissial.

Montreal — Revue Agricole.

Quebec — L'Evenement.

Quebec — Le Journal de Quebec.

Quebec — Le Canadian.

Quebec — Le Courrier du Canada.

Quebec — Le Charivari Canadien.

Quebec — Journal de L'Instruction Publique.

St. Hyacinthe — Journal.

St. Hyacinthe — Gazette de St. Hyacinthe.

Sorel — La Gazette de Sorel.

SCANDINAVIAN.

ILLINOIS.

Chicago — Hemlaudet.

Chicago — Sandebudet.

Chicago — Skandinaven.

Chicago — Svenska Amerikanaren.

Galva — Illinois Swede.

IOWA.

Decorah — Ved Arnen.

Decorah — Kerkelig Maanedstidende

MINNESOTA.

Minneapolis — Nordisk Folkeblad.

Red Wing — Svenska Minnesota Bladet.

NEW YORK.

New York — Skandinavisk Post.

WISCONSIN.

La Crosse — Faedrelandet og Emigranten.

SPANISH.

CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco — La Voz de Chile y El Neuvo Monde.

LOUISIANA.

New Orleans — El Imparcial.

New Orleans — Las Dos Republicais.

NEW YORK.

New York — El Cronista.

New York — Ilustracion Americana.

New York — El Correo Hispano Americano.

DUTCH.

IOWA.

Pella — Gazette.

Pella — Weekblad.

MICHIGAN.

Grand Rapids — Vrijheids Banier.

Holland — De Hollander.

Holland — De Hope.

ITALIAN.

CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco — La Voce del Popolo.

San Francisco — L'Eco della Patria.

NEW YORK.

New York — L'Eco d'Italia.

WELSH.

NEW YORK.

Utica — Y'Drych.

Utica — Y'Cyfall.

BOHEMIAN.

MISSOURI.

St. Louis — Narodni Noviny.

In this list appear the names of more than two hundred newspapers published for the exclusive benefit of the Germans, Scandinavians, Frenchmen, Italians, Bohemians, and Dutchmen who have emigrated to the United States to find permanent homes. It is an important incident in the life of this large foreign element of our population that a free press is essential to their happiness. It is a luxury they never enjoyed until they had become American citizens.

Readers who have not carefully followed the course of American Journalism might find difficulty in accounting for the existence of one hundred and fifty newspapers in a single city. Indeed, the mere fact of existence is all that can be placed to the credit of some dozens of the sheets which regularly appear from the presses of New York; for they have limited circulations, few advertisements, and no influence beyond a small circle of supporters. It has already been shown in these pages * that most of the public journals now in existence in New York are comparatively young; and, unless imperative conditions are observed, the lease of life accorded to some of them must be brief. The taste of the reading public, yearly educated by a higher standard, demands continued enterprise, steady common sense, and increased dignity in the conduct of the American newspaper; and although the "flash" journal is likely to achieve temporary success among the classes who digest coarse food, and the heavy journal to find custom in the small corner of society which lives in the past, both the vulgar and the dull are fated to death and oblivion. Before the end of the present year, the names of some of the journals comprised in the foregoing catalogue will probably have disappeared. Their places will be supplied by something better.

The world has not got on without a struggle. Everything in nature struggles, — the plant to peep out of the ground,

* Chapters v. and vi.

opinions to make a way, newspapers to exist. The London *Times*, confessedly the greatest and the most profitable newspaper in the world, was once as stupid as any journal that died years ago in New York or Boston; although there had been ten centuries of European development to aid it at the start. Yet it was skilfully drawn out of all the perilous places, and it has become what it is, because its conductors made it, first, a grand newspaper, considered simply in the light of a news-gatherer, and next, a reflex of the opinion of its time. Moreover, it has preserved a strict impersonality; and in this element alone it possesses a degree of strength which has never yet been attained by any American newspaper.

In the United States, it is too often true, that a newspaper is established so completely in the interest of a party or a clique, that, while the strength of clique or party is sufficient to insure it a legitimate support through the regular channels of subscription and advertising, the editorial columns are never free from partisan bias; and the editor, though not reduced to the necessity of direct and abject begging, is in reality in worse condition than he who goes humbly, hat in hand, to ask for crumbs. In fact, much of the Political Journalism of our day is open to the charges of prejudice and illiberality. Comparatively few editors of leading American journals display the power of taking a judicial view of great public questions; apparently preferring partisan arguments rather than comprehensive views. Hence, the impartial reader, who is not wedded to conceits and whims, but, believing there are honest men in all parties, desires to sift all questions in dispute, is compelled to strike his own balance between conflicting statements. On the eve of an election, a citizen, wishing to vote a "scratched" ticket, putting the name of Hans Breitmann, Republicau German, in place of that of Timothy Finnegan, Democratic Irishman, unfit for office, finds his Democratic journal loud in adulation of Timothy Finnegan, and denunciatory of Hans, because the former is the "regular" candidate of the "regular" convention, nominated through the agency of the "regular" primaries; and it would be treason to "the

party" to speak one word against Timothy, even though he were publicly known as the greatest scapegrace unchanged. Nor is this practice confined to the Democratic press; for, unhappily, the Political Journalism of all our great cities is shaped in the interest of what is, rather than of that which should be; and so long as independent criticism is quenched by party drill, so long must tax-payers groan, and thieves in office steal.

One class of journals has wholly died out in New York. In the course of a dozen years, many attempts to establish a comic paper have been made, and have failed. Like Jonah's gourd, they have had a rapid and unhealthy growth, only to wither in untimely death. In England, this style of journal possesses vitality. *Punch*, established in London thirty years ago, still prints its cuts in cartoon and type, — not, perhaps, with all its former vigor; and London also has *Judy*, *Fun*, the *Tomahawk*, the *Will o' the Wisp*, and *Vanity Fair*. *Charivari* pleases the wits of France with epigram and illustration; and *Kladderdatsch* stirs the German blood by such saucy words as the censor permits. But in New York there are only left to us the memories of the departed fun of *Yankee Doodle* and the *Lantern* and *Momus* and *Mrs. Grundy* and *John Donkey* and *Vanity Fair*. Thus far, the genuine witty paper has not taken root in American soil. Only the fungi live, and they should die. In its best days, *Vanity Fair* was a crackling, witty, representative journal, fairly illustrating American life and manners; but it finally went the way of all the others.

John Brougham started one of the comic papers in New York, — the *Lantern*, — and a funny story is told of him and it. Burton, the actor, was no friend to Brougham in those days, and no love was lost on either side. The story runs to the effect that Brougham, on entering a restaurant, found Burton and a companion sitting at a table. Burton replied to the question, "Have you read the *Lantern* this week?" by saying, "No! I never read the thing, unless I'm drunk — unless I'm drunk — (repeating in a louder tone) unless I'm drunk!" Brougham immediately rose from the table at which he was sitting, advanced, hat in hand, towards Burton, and, making a bow in his

grandest manner, observed, "Then, Mr. Burton, I am sure of one constant reader!" Burton made no reply.

Mention has been made of the specialties to which many of the newspapers of New York are devoted. This feature is not peculiar to the United States; for in England the establishment of "organs" is a habit. Yet the custom, copied from an older country, is here carried to an extreme. Inspired by a feeling that no calling is secure, no party organized, no sect vitalized, no reform worthily urged, unless each is represented in type, the American people impress the printer into all the ranks, conditions, and occupations of life. Trade, finance, commerce, religion, spiritualism, the rights of women; politics, literature, art, science; fashion, frivolity and vulgarity; the Ring, the Turf, the Brothel,—all have their representatives in the American Press.

There are but three or four so-called "religious" papers in the United States which do not exclusively represent a sect or espouse a dogma. Probably the bitterest controversies, the most unrelenting hostility, the worst antagonisms, are those peculiar to this class of public journals. Political editors quarrel, and recover; satirists ridicule each other, and, like lawyers after argument in a cause, meet on terms of perfect fellowship when the labor of the day is done; rival artists send their sketches to their respective papers, and then adjourn amicably to some convenient restaurant; but the conductor of the *Predestinarian* constantly abuses his colleague who edits the Roman Catholic sheet, and the Baptist will have none of the *Churchman's* Episcopalianism. Some of the strongest quality of personal abuse—the phrase is not too severe—which finds its way into print is written for the denominational press that loudly professes to accept the obligations of meekness and Christian charity.

The New York *Independent*, however, is singular among the newspapers which claim to represent the religious element. It is professedly Congregationalist in conviction, but its name indicates its real character. Independent in all things, it does not hesitate to differ with the devout in its own church, nor to rebuke the shortcomings of those whose support it seeks.

The twenty-first anniversary of its birth was celebrated, with unusual typographic display and pictorial pomp, in December, 1869; and an historical sketch from the pen of its editor gave some interesting information. The paper was established to promote two ideas, — one religious, the other political; one the Congregational as against the Presbyterian church polity, the other the freedom of the slave against the tyranny of his master. Its original proprietors were five laymen: Henry C. Bowen, Theodore McNamee, Simeon B. Chittenden, Seth B. Hunt, and Jonathan Hunt. Its original editors were three Congregational clergymen: Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon, Rev. Richard S. Storrs, Jr., and Rev. Joseph P. Thompson. At the end of thirteen years, — in December, 1861, — this triumvirate of divines retired, leaving the vacancy to be filled by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. "By natural gravitation," observes Mr. Tilton, from whose sketch we draw these particulars, "the paper became, under Mr. Beecher's leadership, almost as much a sympathetic co-worker with Presbyterians as it had formerly been their polemic antagonist. But Mr. Beecher did not wholly escape that same theological suspicion which from the beginning had been inadvertently drawn like a mild fog about the establishment. It is just to him, however, to say that through this thin haze he was always plainly visible as a 'burning and shining light.' On the first of January, 1863, the negroes were emancipated from their bondage, and Mr. Beecher was emancipated from his editorship."* He was succeeded by Theodore Tilton, who is still at the head of the paper, assisted by Rev. Joshua Leavitt, Oliver Johnson, and others.

The *Observer*, an old paper, established in the interest of the Old-School branch of the Presbyterian denomination, is edited by Rev. S. Irenæus Prime, who is assisted by his brother, Rev. E. D. G. Prime, and other scholarly writers. The *Observer* is prosperous and influential; and since the reunion of the Old and New Schools it has ceased to be the organ of the

* Mr. Beecher has since resumed editorial service, as the editor of the *Christian Union*.

former as against the latter. Its principal conductor is a gentleman of broad culture and long experience in religious journalism. But he is not apt to look with favor upon anything which possesses the faintest savor of Radicalism.

The *Evangelist*, conducted by Rev. Henry M. Field, was formerly the representative of the New-School Presbyterian Church; but, like the *Observer*, it has buried the hatchet of polemical controversy, and is now devoted in nearly equal measure to discussions of religious questions and to summaries of secular intelligence.

The Methodist denomination has two principal organs, — the *Christian Advocate*, and the *Methodist*, — both of which are published in New York, and are read by large numbers of believers in that faith in all parts of the United States.

The *Examiner and Chronicle*, conducted by Rev. Edward Bright, is a capable representative of the Baptist body.

The Jews have their own organs, Orthodox and Reformatory. The Irish possess presses, — one edited by John Mitchel, — which clamor loudly for the independence of Ireland, and in support of Fenianism; but which are rarely seen or read save by citizens of Irish birth or Irish descent. The Roman Catholics have four or five organs. The Spaniards in New York give support to one weekly paper; the Italians to one, — *L'Eco d'Italia*. The large French and German population of New York calls for two daily journals for the former, and three for the latter. The *Clipper* and *Wilkes' Spirit of the Times*, published weekly, represent the "sporting" element, — the last-named aiming at a higher standard than that usually accorded to papers of this stamp. Woman's rights (so-called) and the "Sorosis" Club enlist the services of a little weekly paper called *The Revolution*, which is conducted by Susan B. Anthony and Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and is engaged in an energetic effort to transform women into men, with results limited by the laws of nature. The druggists have a *Circular*, printed for their own use; the merchants, a *Dry Goods Reporter*; the brokers, a variety of papers devoted exclusively to reports of the money market and the Stock Exchange; the grocers, a *Grocers' Journal*; billiard-players, a *Billiard Cue*;

dealers in tobacco, a *Tobacco Leaf*. And thus, through a long list of specialties, there are journals living or dying daily. Once, the Latter-Day Saints were represented by *The Mormon*; but that sheet long since expired, and, although the Mormons are still numerous in New York and Brooklyn, and a Mormon Church has regular services in Williamsburgh, the purse of the Saints is not reopened to equip another newspaper office.

At the head of the Literary Journals now published in New York stands *The Nation*,—a weekly sheet, conducted with care and judgment by E. L. Godkin, assisted by W. P. Garrison, a son of William Lloyd Garrison. *The Nation* is scholarly and temperate, its judgment is generally good, and its success is deserved.

The *Round Table*, long edited with ability by Henry Sedley (now engaged in the office of the *Times*), has been merged into the *Citizen*. Under the composite title of *The Citizen and Round Table*, it is now edited and published by Robert B. Roosevelt, combining some of the literary features of the *Round Table* with the political character of the *Citizen*, as the latter existed under the management of the late Charles G. Halpine, better known as "Private Miles O'Reilly."

The Sunday papers—so-called—form a distinct class. They are four in number: the *Sunday Dispatch*, *Sunday Times*, *Sunday Mercury*, and *Courier*. All find readers; and the *Dispatch* and *Mercury* have created ample fortunes for their owners. Three of the leading morning papers also appear on Sunday morning; but in a city so large and so irreverent as New York, there is sufficient custom for the Sunday issues of the *Herald*, the *World*, and the *Times*, as well as for the four journals which appear only hebdomadally, and are distinctively known as "Sunday papers." At least one-half the entire population of the city occupies the early hours of the first day in the week in the eager perusal of literature prepared especially for Sunday.

The Illustrated Papers in New York are *Harper's Weekly*, *Harper's Bazar*, *Appleton's Journal*, *Frank Leslie's*, and the *Chimney Corner*. All these obtain large circulations, but the

illustrations are of varying degrees of excellence. The pencil of Thomas Nast, our best caricaturist, is monopolized by the Harpers, and he often excels other artists in his comical and effective illustrations of passing events. *Appleton's Journal* is becoming noted for its pictorial effects in the higher walks of art.

Robert Bonner's *Ledger* furnishes a remarkable illustration of the results of judicious advertising.* Through lavish expenditure of money, Mr. Bonner has persuaded a quarter of a million of readers to subscribe to the *Ledger*. It must be added, to his credit, that in securing valuable contributions from Beecher, Everett, Bryant, Saxe, Parton, and a host of the best American poets, essayists, and divines, he has given the readers of the *Ledger* an ample return for the price of a yearly subscription.

* A humorous picture of the effects of advertising appeared in the *Richmond Enquirer* of December 20, 1869:—

“The first time that a man looks at an advertisement he does not see it.

“The second time, he does not notice it.

“The third time, he is dimly conscious of it.

“The fourth time, he faintly remembers having seen something of the kind before.

“The fifth time, he half reads it.

“The sixth time, he turns up his nose at it.

“The seventh time, he reads it all through, and says ‘Pshaw!’

“The eighth time, he ejaculates, ‘Here’s that confounded thing again!’

“The ninth time, he wonders if there is anything in it.

“The tenth time, he thinks it might possibly suit somebody else’s case.

“The eleventh time, he thinks he will ask his neighbor if he has tried it or knows anything about it.

“The twelfth time, he rather wonders how the advertiser can make it pay.

“The thirteenth time, he rather thinks it must be a good thing.

“The fourteenth time, he happens to think it is just what he has wanted for a long time.

“The fifteenth time, he resolves to try it as soon as he can afford it.

“The sixteenth time, he examines the address carefully, and makes a memorandum of it.

“The seventeenth time, he feels tantalized to think he is hardly able to afford it.

“The eighteenth time, he sees painfully how much he needs that particularly excellent article.

“The nineteenth time, he counts his money to see how much he would have left if he bought it, and

“The twentieth time, he frantically rushes out in a fit of desperation, and buys.”

The *Home Journal* is the sole representative in New York of a class of papers which multiply more rapidly abroad than here; namely, the "fashionable" journal. The word in this connection means the gossip of the drawing-rooms and of society generally, the lighter branches of the literature of the day, and the story of engagements, marriages, public and private balls, and affairs of like character. The names and literary reputations of George P. Morris and N. P. Willis gave this paper its start. It is now edited by Morris Phillips, who long enjoyed the confidence of Mr. Willis.

A feeble attempt was made, a few months ago, to establish a paper in New York in opposition to the Republican idea of government. The title given to this experimental and exceedingly absurd sheet was *The Imperialist*. Its days were few and full of trouble; and readers who gave it a casual glance professed their inability to understand whether it was an earnest piece of idiocy, or a lamentable attempt at waggery. But it is dead, and it requires no further mention.

—Returning to the consideration of the Daily Press of New York, a phenomenon appears.

Why the Evening Papers in New York should have multiplied to such an alarming extent in the past three or four years, is a mystery which no writer upon the subject of Journalism can hope to explain. The youngest of these sheets * died suddenly at the end of 1869; yet nine survive. The prices at which these nine are sold range from one cent to five cents each. The oldest is the *Commercial Advertiser*, which has been in existence since 1794. The next in age is the *Evening Post*, established in 1801. The third in order is the *Express*, first issued as a morning paper, but changed into an evening sheet several years ago. Then were born the *Evening Mail*, the *News*, the *Commonwealth*, the *Telegram*, the *Democrat*, and the *Press and Globe*. Some of these have gained a daily circulation of ten thousand copies; others, seven to eight thousand; others, a few hundreds only. No one of them can ever reach the circulation which is regarded as essential to the existence

* The *Republic*.

of a morning paper; for the latter is never accounted a success until it is delivered daily to at least twenty thousand readers; but the advertising patronage of the business houses in the city is fairly apportioned among all, in great part through the skilful manipulation of Advertising Agencies; and thus a respectable support is secured.

The *Evening Mail* is a pleasant tea-table paper, edited by Jonas M. Bundy, and published by J. S. Johnston & Co. The *Express* is conducted by James and Erastus Brooks; and is, unfortunately for itself, the most slovenly paper ever published in New York. The *Evening Commonwealth*, owned and edited by George Marsland, is a new-comer, making gradual progress. The *News*, *Democrat*, and *Telegram* rank in one class. The *Commercial Advertiser* has the smallest circulation of all; and its size and price have lately been reduced.

The *Evening Post* is sixty-eight years old, and for more than forty years has been conducted by William Cullen Bryant. Its first number appeared on the 16th of November, 1801; but the sheet was then little more than a quarter of the present size. The first editor was William Coleman. In 1826, a quarter of a century from the time of the first issue, Mr. Bryant began to write for its columns; and in 1827 he became a proprietor. In 1829, Mr. Coleman died, and William Leggett became connected with the paper; and in 1834, on the departure of Mr. Bryant for Europe, Mr. Leggett was elevated to the place of chief editor. In 1836, Mr. Leggett retired, and established the *Plaindealer*, which had a brief existence of one year. In 1837, William G. Boggs bought a share of the *Evening Post*, and retired, in the fall of 1848, to give place to John Bigelow; who, in turn, parted with his shares in 1861 in favor of Parke Godwin, who also retired in May, 1868. Mr. Godwin, a son-in-law of Mr. Bryant, first became a proprietor of the *Evening Post* in 1840, but transferred his interest to Timothy O. Howe in 1844; and afterwards wrote for the columns of the paper without proprietary position, until he succeeded Mr. Bigelow in 1861. Isaac Henderson, who entered the service of the *Evening Post* in 1846, became a partner in 1847; and on the retirement of Mr. Godwin purchased his shares.

Mr. Henderson is now the chief owner of the paper. He was recently Navy Agent in New York.

An incident in the editorial career of Mr. Bryant, and in the history of the *Evening Post*, — not generally known, — had a direct bearing upon the success of a great public improvement in New York. On his return from Europe, several years before the project of laying out Central Park had taken shape, Mr. Bryant accepted the invitation of a friend to visit the upper end of the island of New York, and in the course of a ramble passed through the forest which skirts the bank of the East River, and is still known by the name of Jones's Woods. The utility and beauty of the public parks in the great cities of Europe had strongly impressed Mr. Bryant, and he determined to urge upon the authorities and the citizens of New York the necessity of creating a Park which should be worthy of the city. Acting upon this resolution, he set forth, through the columns of the *Evening Post*, cogent reasons for undertaking this work; suggesting the purchase and adornment of Jones's Woods as a proper step in the right direction. Many articles on this subject came from his pen, and the awakened interest of the public eventually produced the desired result. In the original plan of the Central Park the woods in question were included; but for good reasons the project underwent the modifications which were subsequently embodied in the present Park.

Mr. Bryant's reminiscences of the first half-century of the *Evening Post** contain one or two paragraphs which are not out of place in this connection; for they reveal some of the peculiarities of the old style of Journalism in New York, and show us, too, wherein the customs of to-day are improvements upon the past. Mr. Bryant wrote: —

“ The *Evening Post* of the 24th of November, 1801, records the death of Philip Hamilton, eldest son of General Alexander Hamilton, in the twentieth year of his age, — ‘murdered,’ says the editor, ‘in a duel.’ The practice of duelling is then denounced as a ‘horrid custom,’ the remedy for which must be ‘strong and pointed legislative interference,’ inasmuch as ‘fashion has placed it on a footing which nothing short of that can control.’ The editor himself belonged to the class with which fashion had placed it upon that foot-

* *Ante*, p. 37.

ing, and was destined himself to be drawn by her power into the practice he so strongly deprecated.

“The quarrel with Cheetham went on. On the next day, in a discussion occasioned by the duel in which young Hamilton fell, he mentioned Cheetham, and spoke of ‘the insolent vulgarity of that base wretch.’ At a subsequent period, the *Evening Post* went so far as, in an article reflecting severely upon Cheetham and Duane, to admit the following squib into its columns:—

“ ‘ Lie on, Duane, lie on for pay,
And Cheetham, lie thou too ;
More against truth you cannot say,
Than truth can say ‘gainst you.’ ”

“These wranglings were continued a few years, until the *Citizen* made a personal attack upon Mr. Coleman, of so outrageous a nature that he determined to notice it in another manner. Cheetham was challenged. He was ready enough in a war of words, but he had no inclination to pursue it to such a result. The friends of the parties interfered; a sort of truce was patched up, and the *Citizen* consented to become more reserved in its future assaults.

“A subsequent affair, of a similar nature, in which Mr. Coleman was engaged, was attended with a fatal termination. A Mr. Thompson had a difference with him which ended in a challenge. The parties met in Love Lane, now Twenty-first Street, and Thompson fell. He was brought, mortally wounded, to his sister’s house in town; he was laid at the door, the bell was rung, the family came out, and found him bleeding and near his death. He refused to name his antagonist, or give any account of the affair, declaring that everything which had been done was honorably done, and desired that no attempt should be made to seek out or molest his adversary. Mr. Coleman returned to New York and continued to occupy himself with his paper as before.

“Such is the tradition which yet survives concerning the event of a combat to which the parties, who bore no previous malice to each other, were forced by the compulsion of that ‘fashion,’ against which one of them, on the threshold of his career as a journalist, had protested, even while indirectly recognizing its supremacy. The quarrel arose out of political differences, Mr. Coleman being in the opposition, and Mr. Thompson a friend of the administration.”

. . . “Those who recollect what occurred when General Jackson withdrew the funds of the government from the bank of the United States, — a measure known by the name of the removal of the deposits — cannot have forgotten to what a pitch party hatred was then carried. It was a sort of fury; nothing like it had been known in this community for twenty years, and there has been nothing like it since. Men of different parties could hardly look at each other without gnashing their teeth; deputations were sent to Congress to remonstrate with General Jackson, and some even talked — of course it was mere talk, but it showed the height of passion to which men were transported — of marching in arms to the seat of government and putting down the administration. A brief panic took possession of the money market; many worthy men really believed that the business and

trade of the country were in danger of coming to an end, and looked for a universal ruin. In this tempest the *Evening Post* stood its ground, vindicated the administration in its change of agents, on the ground that the United States Bank was unsafe and unworthy, and derided both the threats and the fears of the Whigs."

. . . "In 1837, the *Times*, a democratic morning paper, was published in the city. The editor, one Dr. Holland, . . . sent a challenge to Mr. Bryant, by a friend, who was authorized to make the due arrangements for the meeting. . . . Mr. Bryant treated the matter very lightly; he put the challenge in his pocket, and told the bearer that everything must take its proper turn, that Dr. Holland, having already been called a scoundrel by Mr. Leggett, must give that affair the precedence, and that, for his own part, he should pay no further attention to the matter in hand till that was settled. The affair passed off without any consequences."

Of the morning journals of New York, four are widely known and influential, — known for qualities peculiar to each, and influential in separate directions. Representing different phases of American life, different ideas of Journalism, different methods of thought and action, all are needed; all are prosperous; and there is room for all. At frequent intervals, these papers engage in a quadrangular quarrel, but no injury is inflicted which the lapse of a day will not mend; and, although the newspaper antagonisms of the time are sometimes bitter, the combatants have learned lessons from the past, — lessons which Mr. Bryant has recited in the passages already quoted, and no irate editor now thinks of pistoling his opponents by way of punishment for words written in the heat of acrimonious political argument, or uttered in the fervor of personal animosity. Perhaps it is not idle to hope for the coming of the time when Journalism shall become wholly impersonal, and when the sweeter courtesies of life shall take the place of the pitiful jealousies, the despicable innuendoes, and the malignant falsehoods which have too often sullied the record of newspaper life in the United States, and especially in New York.

The *Tribune*, still edited by Horace Greeley, holds its own after twenty-nine years of active life. Mr. Greeley has had a long and violent struggle with fortune; but he has succeeded in building up a great newspaper, in obtaining celebrity for

himself, and in amassing a comfortable independence. His paper is now a valuable property. The errors into which his impatient nature hurried him have been atoned by several frank confessions; and his nature has become so temperate, in comparison with the unreasoning violence of his earlier years, that it may reasonably be expected he will continue decorous.

The *Herald*, still nominally edited by James Gordon Bennett, is really conducted by his subordinates. The profits of the *Herald* are larger than those of any other paper in New York, from its large circulation, and its enormous advertising patronage; but its influence is among the things of the past.

The *World*, begun as a religious newspaper, long since relinquished the effort to run counter to the laws of Mammon. But it is incisively witty — and successful.

The *Times*, which began, must end this record. Soon after the death of Mr. Raymond, that paper passed for a short time under the management of Mr. John Bigelow, formerly of the *Evening Post*, and later United States Minister to France. Mr. Bigelow retiring, Mr. George Jones — long the publisher of the *Times* — became its responsible head. He now exercises a general supervision over its editorial management, as well as its financial affairs. The present editorial force was constituted under his direction, and the departments of the paper are arranged in the following order:—

Managing Editor and leading Political Writer — George Sheppard.

Editorial Writers — L. J. Jennings, John Webb, and George E. Pond; together with a large corps of contributors, not employed in regular service, but engaged to write upon special topics.

Literary and Dramatic Critic — Henry Sedley.

Financial Editor — C. C. Norvell.

Commercial Editor — Michael Hennessey.

Night Editor — E. M. Bacon.

Assistant Night Editor — Ranald McDonald.

City Editor — R. R. Sinclair.

Mail-Reader — Jacob Thompson.

Washington Bureau — L. L. Crouse, and a large number of assistants.

Mr. Henry W. Raymond, who entered the service of the *Times* to learn the whole routine of practical journalism,* has followed so well in the footsteps of his father, that he is already regarded as one of the most useful workers on the paper. Henry J. Raymond began his career as a reporter, and by his ability and energy worked his way upward; there is no reason to doubt that his son, whose physical and mental resemblances to his father are equally striking, will show himself capable of achieving the success which is always won by natural ability, and by well-directed industry.

Two distinguished journalists who were formerly identified with the *Times* have lately retired from its service. A fluent and graceful writer, — Mr. John Swinton, — who for many years conducted the department of "Minor Topics," now rests upon his laurels. Of Scottish birth, and characterized by great natural shrewdness and ready wit, Mr. Swinton brought to the profession of Journalism a keen and just sense of its requirements. In greater degree than almost any other member of his profession in this country, he possesses the faculty of pointing a paragraph in such a manner that it becomes as effective as the labored essay of the didactic writer. The art of turning neat paragraphs is an art which should be more carefully cultivated by writers for the public journals; for the day of elaborate and heavy disquisition long since expired. Mr. William Swinton, brother of the gentleman last named, was for several years a contributor to the *Times*. He is well known as the author of works on military subjects, and is a forcible and pleasing writer.

It is difficult to arrive at the exact truth concerning the circulation or the annual profits of the newspapers of New York; but the reader who is curious in such matters may gather some interesting details from the subjoined statements,

taken from the books of the Assessors of Internal Revenue in July, 1869. A comparison of these figures will show the relative proportion of patronage received by different classes of journals. The return is for the nine months ending on the 30th of June, 1869, and in each case an exemption of twelve hundred and fifty dollars per quarter was allowed by law, — no tax being imposed upon advertisements.

NEWSPAPERS.	Quarter Ending		
	Dec'r 31, '68.	March 31, '69.	June 30, '69.
Herald	\$188,395	\$199,757	\$204,919
World	200,958	214,694	127,281
Tribune	130,699	191,778	102,780
Times	129,688	96,530	118,643
Staats Zeitung	36,500	48,250	68,750
Sun	38,965	39,914	49,683
Evening Post	26,856	28,135	23,927
Express	22,916	23,971	24,763
News	64,750	66,750	69,750
Journal of Commerce	24,500	30,000	23,000
Democrat	9,408	20,501	23,850
Demokrat (German)	5,019	5,457	5,000
Commercial Advertiser	5,594	17,066	10,317
Franco-American	4,072	4,026	—
Ledger	161,008	180,616	155,014
Weekly and Phunny Phellow	119,135	121,991	130,981
Harper's Weekly and Bazar	105,349	113,838	113,098
Sunday Times	7,223	7,730	—
Mercury	38,805	38,690	38,087
Observer	23,324	27,390	13,159
Hearth and Home	—	26,000	10,339
Clipper	16,602	14,831	—
Atlas	8,825	8,458	7,468
Evangelist	9,600	12,198	8,575
Scientific American	17,177	19,748	20,574
Irish American	10,500	11,661	11,012
Dispatch	12,615	16,379	16,150
Irish Republic	7,514	7,250	6,950
Methodist	6,249	10,448	2,885
Christian Intelligencer	3,220	4,680	3,430
Wilkes' Spirit	5,250	5,389	6,854
Leader	6,030	6,330	6,210
Day Book	6,667	13,884	6,322
Scottish American	4,332	5,105	5,151
Shipping List	4,702	14,884	4,980
Army and Navy Journal	3,220	4,850	2,830

NEWSPAPERS.	Quarter Ending		
	Dec'r 31, '69.	March 31, '69.	June 30, '69.
Examiner and Chronicle	\$6,464	\$23,415	\$10,334
Albion	2,250	2,240	2,880
Courier	3,892	5,941	5,927
Commercial Chronicle	2,360	4,694	—
Producers' Price Current	1,612	1,426	1,533
Irish People	2,139	1,880	2,615
Round Table	862	924	—
Handel Zeitung	2,262	916	710
Emerald	10,755	7,923	3,721
Turf, Field, and Farm	948	325	5,120
New Yorker Journal	—	—	18,950
Fireside Companion	—	23,229	17,974
Rural New Yorker	—	109,989	6,835
Yankee Notions	—	496	835
Liberal Christian	—	1,864	1,883
Counting House Monitor	—	1,690	1,900
Comic Monthly	—	2,230	4,672
Telegram	—	1,776	3,558

These imposing statistics reveal some part of the immense force inherent in the Journalism of New York. With infinite labor, and with unflinching zeal, the proprietors of the great newspaper establishments have built up a profitable business; and with the rapid increase in the facilities of publication, the tendency to expansion must increase. We have seen what the Press of New York was, and what it is. What it will be, no prophet can foretell; but the vast changes which have taken place in the lifetime of a single generation establish precedents for greater wonders.

The question of technical education in Journalism assumed a new phase in the summer of 1869, when a circular letter was sent out by the Faculty of Washington College, in Virginia, — an institution over which General Robert E. Lee presides, — proposing to grant free scholarships to candidates for a newspaper career. This curious document* recited the terms upon which the Faculty were willing to aid young men who intended to make Journalism their profession. The age of the candidates was to be over fifteen years; unimpeachable character

* Issued Aug. 19, 1869.

was a requisite qualification; the appointments were to be for two years. The scholarships were to include tuition and all college charges; and a condition was attached, to the effect that each student "should labor one hour per day in the line of his profession." The Typographical Unions in the Southern States were requested to nominate the candidates. The response was feeble; and the newspapers became facetious over a programme which was inherently absurd. The practical journalists, who had worked their own way upward by diligent application, knew the impossibility of learning the lessons of Journalism within the walls of a collegiate institution.

Thoreau, in one of his cynical hermit moods, insisted that men's inner lives fail when they go continually to the post-office, and that the only difference between one man and his neighbor lies in the fact that one has been "out to tea," and the other has not. And an atrabilarious Archdeacon of the Established Church in England not long ago saw fit to denounce the Press in unmeasured terms, concluding with the statement that there were "no newspapers in St. Paul's time;" else there had been no Christian religion.

Mr. Thoreau and the Archdeacon were wise in their own way; but it was owl-like wisdom, after all. The New England hermit, secluding himself from all the advantages of civilization, elected to be a cynic in the woods. He wrote books, and mused upon the banks of running brooks, and had weird fancies and quaint humors. But he did not discover the spirit of his time, and he died young. The caustic Archdeacon, on the other hand, was no hermit, but lived in the full blaze of light, only to blink at things apparently beyond his comprehension.

For that which the great majority of mankind do must be worth the doing; else it would not be done. Were the printing and publishing of newspapers an unprofitable undertaking, no editor or capitalist would risk loss in making them. Were the reader of newspapers to discover that his mind grew vacant, or his purse lean, as the consequence of his devotion to their columns, common sense would end his delusion. But the patronage bestowed upon the Press is constant, and it gives

good profit; so the papers multiply and are read, and the world clamors for them.

It is interesting to recall the memories of what the New York newspapers were, in order to understand them as they are. In the old days, as we have shown, newspaper life was slow; now it is fast. Thirty years ago, when the Pony Expresses ran, and when single locomotives sped along a few iron tracks, carrying tidings of what men were doing, events were subjects for rejoicing; but all the speed of horses' legs, or of tireless engines, could not compass in a day what is now done for us in the ticking of a watch. Thirty years ago the Telegraph was no part of the newspaper system; now, no newspaper is complete without its regular instalments of "Manifold" from the offices of the Associated Press. Slender wires of copper, stretched across interminable plains, cause us to hear the very heart-throbs of our brothers three thousand miles away on the Pacific slope; and seven other copper wires, bundled into the compass of a man's thumb, and sunk in the depths of the Atlantic, make the Old World and the New more than brothers, — for each knows the other's thought as soon as uttered, and neither moves without a sympathetic pulsation. The mail which leaves London on the first of each month is opened in California on the sixteenth; and thirty days later, the English tea-merchant's order puts the Hang-Kow dealer's subordinates at work among chests of Souchong and Bohea. These rapid advances may be but the forerunners of still more wonderful events. Men now living may yet prepare news for print, received from Paris by Balloon Express; or may see composing-rooms lighted by oxygen gas, and the daily journal printed in a carpeted parlor by the aid of the electric engine. Man has grappled with the forces of Nature, and with skilful hand bends them to his will.

Changes are at hand in American Journalism. In another quarter of a century, the well-known men who have built up the present great Dailies of New York, and upon whose heads Time's fingers have been busy, will have doffed the harness they wear so well, to give place to the younger. We regard with gratitude the work these men have done; and the natural

question then arises, "On what scale, and in what spirit, shall it be continued?" Accepting the promise of the Present, the prospect of the Future brightens. For, as men come to know each other better, through the more rapid annihilation of time and space, they will be plunged deeper into affairs of trade and finance and commerce, and be burdened with a thousand cares, — and the Press, as the reflector of the popular mind, will then take a broader view, and reach forth towards a higher aim; becoming, even more than now, the living photograph of the time, the sympathetic adviser, the conservator, regulator, and guide of American Society.

APPENDIX.

CONTENTS OF APPENDIX.



A.

	PAGE
Autobiographical Fragment, by Henry J. Raymond	361

B.

The Pittsburg Address, written by Henry J. Raymond in 1856	365
--	-----

C.

Disunion and Slavery: Mr. Raymond's Letters to William L. Yancey in 1860	384
--	-----

D.

The Philadelphia Address, written by Henry J. Raymond in 1866	448
---	-----

E.

Address delivered before the Associate Alumni of the University of Vermont, by Henry J. Raymond	462
--	-----

F.

A Pilot-Boat Voyage in Search of News	486
---	-----

APPENDIX A.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL FRAGMENT.

[THE subjoined fragment of Mr. Raymond's Autobiography first appeared in the column of the *New York Times* on the 15th of August, 1869—two months after the death of Mr. Raymond. It was introduced by the Editor then in charge of the *Times*, in the following terms:—

“Mr. Raymond had a good right to suppose that the events of his life were destined to have a permanent interest to his countrymen. His career, though brief, was a very brilliant one, and gave promise of the most exalted civic honors. We are not surprised, therefore, to learn that among his papers was found the commencement of an autobiography which, though like most autobiographies, is only a fragment, happily gives details of that period of his life usually least accessible to the biographer. In reading this brief memorial of Mr. Raymond's early struggles with the world, our readers will feel a new respect for the talent and energy by which he triumphed, and those who are beginning life under similar disadvantages will derive from his example and success fresh encouragement.”]

“I have been very much interested in Mr. Greeley's recollections of his early experience in newspapers, and especially in the establishment of the *Tribune*. For some reason or other, everybody, I believe, finds something especially interesting in the details of the rise and progress of a newspaper; but my connection with Mr. Greeley at that time makes it quite natural that my interest in it should be even sharper than that of the public at large. The generous appreciation which Mr. Greeley expresses, now that more than a quarter of a century has elapsed, of my services at that time, is especially grateful to me. I was with him less than four years, instead of eight, as he says; and, though I did work, I believe, quite as hard during that time upon the *Tribune* as he now gives me credit for having done, I think I have worked still harder for a good many years since that time. But I certainly deserve no special credit for it in either case. I did it from no special sense of duty, — still less with any special aim or ambitious purpose. I liked it; I knew no greater pleasure, having had but little experience then, — and I am free to say that I have found only one since.

“Mr. Greeley speaks more slightly than I think is just of his previous

efforts in editing newspapers, and especially of what was my earliest favorite among newspapers, the *New-Yorker*. I made its acquaintance in the winter of 1835, when, being but fifteen, and too young to go to college, for which I was better prepared than my father was to send me, I had undertaken to act as clerk in a country store for the magnificent sum of seventy-five dollars a year. I did not like the business, and as time hung heavy on my hands I dropped in at the post-office and asked what was the best newspaper to subscribe for. The postmaster threw me half a dozen which had been sent to him by the publishers as specimen numbers; and after due deliberation I selected the *New-Yorker* as the one which promised to be the most interesting and instructive. I sent my three dollars' subscription, received the paper in return, and thus began my acquaintance with it, which was uninterrupted until in 1841 I aided, perhaps, to kill it—certainly at its funeral ceremonies.

“Mr. Greeley speaks deprecatingly of its neutrality in politics and its meagre election returns. Yet those very features gave him a solid reputation much more widely than he has any notion of, and laid the foundation of his future authority and success. There was a candor in its discussions, a fair examination of both sides of the political topics which divided the country, and a readiness to give due weight to the arguments of an opponent, which, combined with great clearness of thought and command of the subject, won for the political articles of the *New-Yorker* a very high degree of influence and respect. I know that they made far greater impression upon political opponents than the vehement party diatribes which then, as now, were regarded as so much more effective. And the election returns of the *New-Yorker*, for years, commanded a degree of respect to which none of the party journals of the day could aspire. They were regarded as unbiassed by party feeling, perfectly honest, and coming from a well-informed and thoroughly reliable quarter. The *New-Yorker* was as great an authority in that section of the country, on election returns, as the *Mercury* (the weekly edition of the *Journal of Commerce*), under Mr. Gerard Hallock:—and when the verdict of either of those journals came to hand, all disputes on the subject ceased.

“The reputation which Mr. Greeley thus won for himself in the *New-Yorker* was of very essential service to him in his other journalistic efforts, long after the *New-Yorker* itself ceased to exist. The calm, dispassionate character of its articles, — their strength of argument all the more conspicuous by reason of the absence of passion, — and the accuracy of its statements won for Mr. Greeley a degree of public confidence sufficient to set up half-a-dozen men in any business where confidence was the main thing required.

“Mr. Greeley edited the *Jeffersonian* in 1838, and the *Log Cabin* in 1840, on the same general principles, — though, as they were both campaign papers, with less fastidious care, and no pretension to neutrality. The *Log Cabin* was, in my judgment, the best campaign paper ever published, — certainly the best of which I ever had any knowledge; and it was the best because it was never afraid or unwilling to give an opponent's argument, — its statements of fact were carefully truthful, and always backed by good authority, and its tone was that of earnest and thorough conviction. Its enormous circulation made the reputation which Mr. Greeley had won in the *New-Yorker* as wide as it was high; and laid the foundation for the very large circulation

which the *Weekly Tribune* subsequently received. The financial crash of 1837, and the public sentiment which grew out of it, was probably the real cause of the Democratic defeat of 1840; but of all the immediate and direct agencies in the Whig victory of that year, the *Log Cabin* was undoubtedly the most powerful and effective. It was not without substantial reason that Mr. Greeley afterward complained to Governor Seward that his services had not been properly appreciated by the party he had aided to place in power.

"I graduated in August, 1840, and, though I could not vote, I spent the next two months in 'stumping' the immediate vicinity of my native town for 'Tippecanoe and Tyler too.' After the election I traversed the same region in search of a select school to teach; and it was only upon the downfall of all such hopes, and in despair of finding anything to do there, that I 'hied' to New York city, of which I had heard, but which I had never seen but once, and in which I knew but one human being, and he a student in a lawyer's office in Wall Street. I had once seen Mr. Greeley, in the *Journal* office in Albany,— while on my way home for the vacation after the College Commencement in 1838. I had stopped in to inform the editor, as a piece of news, that the college had conferred the degree of LL. D. upon Silas Wright. I found Mr. Weed and Mr. Greeley both there — both hard at work, and both greatly disgusted at the bestowal of such an honor upon so notorious a loco-foco. The thing had not struck me in this light before, but I began to be a little ashamed of having supposed I should do them a favor by giving them a piece of news which pleased them so little. But I had sent a good many literary contributions — mainly critical, though some (as I then thought) poetic — to the *New-Yorker*; and I therefore felt at liberty on my arrival in December, 1840, to call upon Mr. Greeley and ask him if he didn't want an assistant. He said no, he had just engaged one, a young man from Pennsylvania. But he readily assented to my request that I might be at the office whenever I chose; in return for which I promised to help in anything that might turn up in which I could be of assistance. And I did. I forthwith advertised in the *Washington Intelligencer* for a school in the South, and while awaiting replies arranged to 'study law' in a down-town lawyer's office. But I was at the *New-Yorker* office every day, and somehow or other a good deal of the work fell into my hands. I added up election returns, read the exchanges for news, and discovered a good deal which others had overlooked; made brief notices of new books, read proof, and made myself generally useful. At the end of about three weeks I received the first reply to my advertisement, offering me a school of thirty scholars in North Carolina. I told Mr. Greeley at once that I should leave the city the next morning. He asked me to walk with him to the post-office, whither he always went in person to get his letters and exchanges, and on the way inquired where I was going. I told him to North Carolina to teach a school. He asked me how much they would pay me. I said, four hundred dollars a year. 'Oh,' said he, 'stay here — I'll give you that.' And this was my first engagement on the Press, and decided the whole course of my life.

"I at once settled down to work. There was not, as Mr. Greeley says, very much to do on the *New-Yorker*, though I believe I did my share of what there was. But I extended my sphere of operations considerably. I secured what I deemed a first-class engagement, to write daily a fancy ad-

vertisement of some Vegetable Pills, which had just been invented, and which were to be commended to public favor every morning in the daily journals by being ingeniously connected with some leading event of the day,—for which service, which cost me perhaps ten minutes of daily labor, I received the sum of *fifty cents*. I was fortunate enough next to get a Latin class in an uptown seminary. And I sent proposals for New York correspondence to a great variety of newspapers, daily and weekly, throughout the country, several of which were confiding enough to close with my proposals. Among the dailies for which I thus engaged were the Philadelphia *Standard*, edited by R. W. Griswold, whom I had known in Vermont, and who was always my friend; the Cincinnati *Chronicle*, edited by E. D. Mansfield, now for some years the 'Veteran Observer' of the New York *Times*; the Bangor *Whig* and the Buffalo *Commercial Advertiser*, edited by D. Foote, whom in after years I came to know, and of course to esteem, as did all who knew him. A daily letter for each of these papers, with my law studies, my Latin class, my work on the *New-Yorker*, kept my leisure reasonably well employed, and gave me a fair income, as none of these journals paid me less than five-dollars a week, and one or two of them gave me six.

"I picked up now and then instructive hints during my studies of New York life. While walking down Broadway one afternoon, before I had begun to earn much money, I fell into the wake of a tall, handsome, splendidly dressed young man,—displaying himself in all the luxury of white kids and diamond studs, to the general admiration. I fancied him one of the nabobs of the town, and fell into a train of wondering thought as to how he had probably reached his present height of dazzling splendor. Of course I could not wholly forbear contrasting my own position with his, though without any feelings of special envy. The next day Mr. Greeley asked me to go to the office of *Porter's Spirit of the Times*, then in Barclay Street, and get him a copy of the paper. While waiting at the desk, the door opened and my magnificent friend of the day before, all accoutred as he was, sailed in. He walked into the back part of the office, took off, folded and put away his white gloves, hung up his hat and coat, put on an ink-stained linen jacket, and set himself busily to work *writing wrappers*. I felt decidedly encouraged as to the prospects of New York life!"

APPENDIX B.

THE PITTSBURG ADDRESS:—1856.

BIRTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES.

[THE Republican Convention assembled at Pittsburg on the 22d of February, 1856. The following Address to the People of the United States, drawn by Henry J. Raymond, was reported and adopted on Saturday, February 23.]

To the People of the United States:—

Having met in Convention in the city of Pittsburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, this 22d day of February, 1856, as the representatives of people in various sections of the Union, to consult upon the political evils by which the country is menaced, and the political action by which those evils may be averted, we address to you this Declaration of our Principles, and of the purposes which we seek to promote.

We declare, in the first place, our fixed and unalterable devotion to the Constitution of the United States, to the ends for which it was established, and to the means which it provided for their attainment. We accept the solemn protestation of the people of the United States, that they ordained it, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity." We believe that the powers which it confers upon the Government of the United States are ample for the accomplishment of these objects; and that if these powers are exercised in the spirit of the Constitution itself, they cannot lead to any other result. We respect those great rights which the Constitution declares to be inviolable, freedom of speech and of the press, the free exercise of religious belief, and the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. We would preserve those great safeguards of civil freedom, the *habeas corpus*, the right of trial by jury, and the right of personal liberty, unless deprived thereof for crime by due process of law. We declare our purpose to obey, in all things, the requirements of the Constitution, and of all laws enacted in pursuance thereof. We cherish a profound reverence for the wise and patriotic men by whom it

was framed, and a lively sense of the blessings it has conferred upon our country, and upon mankind throughout the world. In every crisis of difficulty and of danger, we shall invoke its spirit, and proclaim the supremacy of its authority.

In the next place, we declare our ardent and unshaken attachment to this Union of American States, which the Constitution created, and has thus far preserved. We revere it as the purchase of the blood of our forefathers, as the condition of our national renown, and as the guardian and guaranty of that liberty which the Constitution was designed to secure. We will defend and protect it against all its enemies. We will recognize no geographical divisions, no local interests, no narrow or sectional prejudices, in our endeavors to preserve the union of these States against foreign aggression and domestic strife. What we claim for ourselves, we claim for all. The rights, privileges, and liberties which we demand as our inheritance, we concede as their inheritance to all the citizens of this Republic.

Holding these opinions, and animated by these sentiments, we declare our conviction that the Government of the United States is not administered in accordance with the Constitution, or for the preservation or prosperity of the American Union; but that its powers are systematically wielded FOR THE PROMOTION AND EXTENSION OF THE INTERESTS OF SLAVERY, in direct hostility to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, in flagrant disregard of other great interests of the country, and in open contempt of the public sentiment of the American people and of the Christian world. We proclaim our belief that the policy which has for years past been adopted in the administration of the General Government tends to the utter subversion of each of the great ends for which the Constitution was established; and that, unless it shall be arrested by the prompt interposition of the people, the hold of the Union upon their loyalty and affection will be relaxed, the domestic tranquillity will be disturbed, and all constitutional securities, for the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, will be destroyed. The slaveholding interest cannot be made permanently paramount in the General Government, without involving consequences fatal to free institutions. We acknowledge that it is large and powerful; that in the States where it exists, it is entitled, under the Constitution, like all other local interests, to immunity from the interference of the General Government, and that it must necessarily exercise, through its representatives, a considerable share of political power. But there is nothing in its position, as there is certainly nothing in its character, to sustain the supremacy which it seeks to establish. There is not a State in the Union in which the slaveholders number *one-tenth* part of the free white population — nor in the aggregate do they number *one-fiftieth* part of the white population of the United States. The annual productions of the other classes in the Union far exceed the total value of all the slaves. To say nothing, therefore, of the questions of natural justice and of political economy which slavery involves, neither its magnitude, nor the number of those by whom it is represented, entitle it to *one-tenth* part of the political powers conferred upon the Federal Government by the Constitution. Yet we see it seeking, and at this moment wielding, all the functions of government, — executive, legislative, and judicial, — and using them for the augmentation of its powers and the establishment of its ascendancy.

From this ascendancy, the principles of the Constitution, the rights of the several States, the safety of the Union, and the welfare of the People of the United States, demand that it should be dislodged.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE PROGRESS OF SLAVERY TOWARDS ASCENDANCY
IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

It is not necessary for us to rehearse in detail the successive steps by which the slaveholding interest has secured the influence it now exerts in the General Government. Close students of political events will readily trace the path of its ambition through the past twenty-five years of our national history.

It was under the administration of President Tyler, and during the negotiation which preceded the annexation of Texas, that the Federal Administration for the first time declared, in its diplomatic correspondence with foreign nations, that slavery in the United States was a "POLITICAL INSTITUTION, ESSENTIAL TO THE PEACE, SAFETY, AND PROSPERITY OF THOSE STATES OF THE UNION IN WHICH IT EXISTS;" and that the paramount motive of the American Government, in annexing Texas, was twofold, — *first*, to prevent the abolition of slavery within its limits; and, *secondly*, to render slavery more secure and more powerful within the slaveholding States of the Union. Slavery was thus taken under the special care and protection of the Federal Government. It was no longer to be left as a State institution, to be controlled exclusively by the States themselves; it was to be defended by the General Government, not only against the invasion or insurrection of armed enemies; but against the moral sentiment of humanity, and the natural development of population and material power.

Thus was the whole current of our national history suddenly and unconstitutionally reversed. The General Government, abandoning the position it had always held, declared its purpose to protect and perpetuate what the great founders of our Republic had regarded as an evil; as at variance with the principles on which our institutions were based, and as a source of weakness, social and political, to the communities in which it existed. At the time of the Revolution, slavery existed in all the colonies; but neither then, nor for half a century afterwards, had it been an element of political strife, for there was no difference of opinion or of policy in regard to it. The tendency of affairs has been towards emancipation. Half the original thirteen States had taken measures, at an early day, to free themselves from the blighting influence and the reproach of slavery. Virginia and North Carolina had anticipated the Continental Congress of 1774, in checking the increase of their slave population, by prohibiting the slave-trade at any of their ports.

SENTIMENTS OF THE FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION CONCERNING SLAVERY.

The Constitution, conferring upon Congress full power to prevent the increase of slavery by prohibiting the slave-trade, had, out of regard for existing interests and vested rights, postponed the exercise of that power over the States then existing until the year 1808, leaving Congress free to exer

cise it over new States and over the Territories of the United States, by prohibiting the migration or importation of slaves into them, without any restriction except such as its own discretion might supply. Congress promptly availed itself of this permission, by reaffirming that great ordinance of the Confederation, by which it was ordained and decreed that all the territory then belonging to the United States should be forever free. Four new States were formed out of the territory lying South of the Ohio River, and admitted into the Union, previous to 1820; but the territory from which they were formed had belonged to States in which slavery existed at the time of their formation; and in ceding it to the General Government, or in assenting to the formation of new States within it, the old States to which it belonged had inserted a proviso against any regulation of Congress that should tend to the emancipation of slaves. Congress was thus prevented from prohibiting slavery in these new States, by the action of the old States out of which they had been formed. But as soon as the constitutional limitation upon its power over the States then existing had expired, Congress prohibited, by fearful penalties, the addition, by importation of a single slave, to the number already in the country.

The framers of the Constitution, although the historical record of their opinion proves that they were earnest and undivided in their dislike of slavery, and in their conviction that it was hostile in its nature and its influences to Republican freedom, after taking these steps to prevent its increase, did not interfere with it further in the States where it then existed. Those States were separate communities, jealous of their sovereignty, and unwilling to enter into any league which should trench, in the least degree, upon their own control of their own affairs. This sentiment the framers of the Constitution were compelled to respect; and they accordingly left slavery, as they left all other local interests, to the control of the several States. But no one who reads with care the debates and the recorded opinions of that age, can doubt that the ultimate removal of slavery was desired by the people of the whole country, and that Congress had been empowered to prevent its increase, with a view to its gradual and ultimate extinction. Nor did the period of emancipation seem remote. Slave labor, employed as it was in agriculture, was less profitable than the free labor which was pouring in to take its place. And even in States where this consideration did not prevail, other influences tended to the same result. The spirit of liberty was then young, generous, and strong. The men of the nation had made sacrifices and waged battles for the vindication of their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and it was not possible for them to sit down in the quiet enjoyment of blessings thus achieved, without feeling the injustice, as well as the inconvenience, of holding great numbers of their fellow-men in bondage. In all the States, therefore, there existed a strong tendency towards emancipation. The removal of so great an evil was felt to be a worthy object of ambition by the best and most sagacious statesmen of that age; and Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and all the great leaders and representatives of public opinion, were active and earnest in devising measures by which it could be accomplished.

But the great change produced in the industry of the Southern States, in the early part of the present century, by the increased culture of cotton, the

introduction of new inventions to prepare it for use, and its growing importance to the commerce of the country and the labor of the world, by making slave labor more profitable than it had ever been before, checked this tendency towards emancipation, and soon put an end to it altogether. As the demand for cotton increased, the interests of the cotton-growing States became more and more connected with slavery; the spirit of freedom gradually gave way before the spirit of gain; the sentiments and the language of the Southern States became changed; and all attempts at emancipation began to be regarded, and resisted, as assaults upon the rights and the interests of the slaveholding section of the Union. For many years, however, this change did not affect the political relations of the subject. States, both free and slaveholding, were successively added to the Confederacy, without exciting the fears of either section. Vermont came into the Union in 1791, with a Constitution excluding slavery. Kentucky, formed out of Virginia, was admitted in 1792, Tennessee in 1796, Mississippi in 1817, and Alabama in 1819, — all slave States, formed out of territory belonging to slave States, and having slavery established in them at the time of their formation. On the other hand, Ohio was admitted in 1803, Indiana in 1816, and Illinois in 1818, having formed State Governments under acts of Congress which made it a fundamental condition that their Constitution should contain nothing repugnant to the Ordinance of 1787 — or in other words, that slavery should be prohibited within their limits forever. In all these occurrences, as in the admission of Louisiana in 1812, there had been no contest between freedom and slavery, for it had not been generally felt that the interests of either were seriously involved.

THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

The first contest concerning the admission of a new State, which turned upon the question of slavery, occurred in 1819, when Missouri, formed out of territory purchased from France in 1803, applied to Congress for admission to the Union as a slaveholding State. The application was strenuously resisted by the people of the free States. It was everywhere felt that the decision involved consequences of the last importance to the welfare of the country, and that, if the progress of slavery was ever to be arrested, that was the time to arrest it. The slaveholding interest demanded its admission as a right, and denied the power of Congress to impose conditions upon new States applying to be admitted into the Confederacy. The power rested with the free States, and Missouri was denied admission. But the subject was reviewed. The slaveholding interest, with characteristic and timely sagacity, abated something of its pretensions, and settled the controversy on the basis of compromise. Missouri was admitted into the Union by an act bearing date March 6, 1820, in which it was also declared that “in all that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36° 30' of north latitude, not included within the limits of the State of Missouri, SLAVERY AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, SHALL BE, AND IS HEREBY, FOREVER PROHIBITED.” In each house of Congress a majority of the members from the slaveholding States voted in favor of the

bill with this provision; thus declaring and exercising, by their votes, the constitutional power of Congress to prohibit slavery even in territories where it had been permitted, by the law of France, at the date of their cession to the United States. A new slave State, Arkansas, formed out of that portion of this territory lying south of $36^{\circ} 30'$, to which the prohibition was not extended, was admitted to the Union in 1836. Two slave States thus came into the Confederacy by virtue of this arrangement; while freedom gained nothing by it but the prohibition of slavery from a vast region which civilization had made no attempt to penetrate.

Thus ended the first great contest of freedom and slavery for position and power in the General Government. The slaveholding interest had achieved a virtual victory. It secured all the immediate results for which it struggled; it acquired the power of offsetting, in the Federal Senate, two of the free States of the Confederacy; and the time could not be foreseen when, in the fulfilment of its compact, it would yield any positive and practical advantage to the interests of freedom. Neither then, nor for many years thereafter, did any statesman dream that, when the period should arrive, the slaveholding interest would trample on its bond, and fling its faith to the winds.

A quarter of a century elapsed before the annexation of Texas. Slavery had been active, meantime, in fastening its hold upon the Government, in binding political parties to its chariot, and to seeking in Congress to stifle the right of petition, and to crush all freedom of speech and of the press. In every slaveholding State, none but slaveholders, or those whose interests are identified with slavery, were admitted to fill any office, or exercise any authority, civil or political. The whites, not slaveholders, in their presence, or in the midst of their society, were reduced to a vassalage little less degrading than that of the slaves themselves. Even at this day, although the white population of the slaveholding States is more than six millions, of whom but three hundred and forty-seven thousand five hundred and twenty-five, or less than *one-seventeenth*, are the owners of slaves, none but a slaveholder, or one who will act with exclusive reference to slavery, is ever allowed to represent the State in any National Convention, in either branch of Congress, or in any high position of civil trust and political power. The slaveholding class, small as it is, is the governing class, and shapes legislation, and guides all public action for the advancement of its own interest and the promotion of its own ends. During all that time, and from that time even to the present, all slaveholding delegates in National Conventions, upon whatever else they may differ, always concur in imposing upon the convention assent to their requisitions in regard to slavery, as the indispensable condition of their support. Holding thus in their hands power to decide the result of the election, and using that power, undeviatingly and sternly, for the extortion of their demands, they have always been able to control the nominations of both parties, and thus, whatever may be the issue, to secure a President who is sure to be the instrument of their behests. Thus has it come to pass that, for twenty years, we have never had a President who would appoint to the humblest office within his gift, in any section of the Union, any man known to hold opinions hostile to slavery, or to be active in resisting its aggressions and usurpations of power. Men, the most upright

and the most respectable, in States where slavery is only known by name, have been ineligible to the smallest trust — have been held unfit to distribute letters from the Federal post-office to their neighbors, or trim the lamps of a lighthouse upon the remotest point of our extended coast. Millions of our citizens have been thus disfranchised for their opinions concerning slavery, and the vast patronage of the General Government has been systematically wielded in its service, and for the promotion of its designs.

It was by such discipline, and under such influences, that the government and the country were prepared for the second great stride of slavery towards new dominion, and for the avowal of motives by which it was attended.

ANNEXATION OF TEXAS AND THE WAR WITH MEXICO.

Texas was admitted into the Union on the 29th of December, 1845, with a Constitution forbidding the abolition of slavery, and a stipulation that *four more* States should become members of the Confederacy, whenever they might be formed within her limits, and with or without slavery, as their inhabitants might decide. The General Government then made virtual provision for the addition of *five* new slave States to the Union, — practically securing to the slaveholding interest ten additional members in the Senate, — representing States, it might be, with less than a million inhabitants, and outvoting five of the old States, with an aggregate population of eleven millions. The corrupt and tyrannical Kings of England, when votes were needed in the House of Lords to sustain them against the people, created Peers as the emergency required. Is there in this anything in more flagrant contradiction to the principles of Republican freedom, or more dangerous to the public liberties, than in the system practised by the slaveholding interest represented in the General Government?

But a third opportunity was close at hand, and slavery made a third struggle for the extension of its domain and the enlargement of its power.

The annexation of Texas involved us in war with Mexico. The war was waged on our part with vigor, skill, and success. It resulted in the cession to the United States of New Mexico, California, and Deseret, vast territories over which was extended by Mexican law a prohibition of slavery. The slaveholders demanded access to them all, resisted the admission of California and New Mexico, which the energy of freemen, outstripping in its activity the government, and even the slaveholding interest, had already converted into free States, and treasonably menaced Congress and the Union with overthrow, if its demands were not conceded. The free spirit of the country was roused with indignation by these pretensions, and for a time the whole nation roused to the tempest which they had created. Untoward events aided the wrong. The death of the President threw the whole power of the administration into timid and faithless hands. Party resentments and party ambitions interposed against the right. Great men, leaders of the people, from whom, in better days, the people had learned lessons of principles and patriotism, yielded to the howlings of the storm, and sought shelter, in submission, from its rage. The slaveholding interest was again victorious. California, with her free constitution, was indeed admitted into the Union; but New Mexico, with her constitution forbidding slavery within her borders,

was denied admission, and remanded to the condition of a territory; and while Congress refused to enact a positive prohibition of slavery in the Territories of New Mexico and Deseret, it was provided that, when they should apply for admission as States, they should come in with or without slavery, as their inhabitants might decide. Additional concessions were made to the slave power; the General Government assumed the recapture of fugitive slaves, and passed laws for the accomplishment of that end, subversive at once of State sovereignty, and of the established safeguard of civil freedom. Then the country again had rest. Wearied with its efforts, or content with their success, the slaveholding interest proclaimed a truce.

When Franklin Pierce, on the 4th of March, 1853, became President of the United States, no controversy growing out of slavery was agitating the country. Established laws, some of them enacted with unusual solemnity, and under circumstances which made them of more than ordinary obligation, had fixed the character of all the States, and ended the contest concerning the territories. Sixteen States were free States, and fifteen States were slave States. By the Missouri Compromise of 1820, slavery was forever prohibited from all the Louisiana Territory lying north of the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$; while over that territory lying south of that line, and over the Territories of New Mexico and Deseret, no such prohibition had been extended. The whole country reposed upon this arrangement. All sections and all interests, whether approving it or not, seemed to acquiesce in its terms. The slaveholding interest, through all its organs, and especially through the General Government, proclaimed that this was a final and irrevocable adjustment of the struggle between freedom and slavery for political power; that it had been effected by mutual concessions, and in the spirit of compromise; and that it should be as enduring as the Union, and as sacred as the Constitution itself. Both political parties gave it their sanction in their National Conventions, the whole country assented to its validity; and President Pierce, in his first official message to Congress, pledged himself to use all the power of his position to prevent it from being disturbed.

But all these protestations proved delusive, and the acquiescence and contentment which they produced afforded the opportunity, not only for new aggressions on the part of slavery, but for the repudiation of engagements into which its agents had solemnly entered. Less than a year had elapsed before these pledges were broken, and the advantages which they secured to freedom withdrawn by the slaveholding power.

REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

In the course of time and the natural progress of population, that portion of the Louisiana Territory lying west of the Mississippi River, and north of the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$, came to be desired for occupation; and on the 24th of March, 1854, an act was passed erecting upon it the two Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, and organizing governments for them both. From this whole region, the slaveholding interest, thirty-four years before, had agreed that "Slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, should be forever prohibited," and had received, as the price of this agreement, the admission of Missouri, and subsequently, the

admission of Arkansas, into the Union. By the Kansas and Nebraska bill, this prohibition was declared to be "*inoperative and void*;" and the intent and meaning of the bill was further declared to be, "not to legislate slavery into any territory or State, *nor to exclude it therefrom*, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Thus, without a single petition for such action from any quarter of the Union, but against the earnest remonstrances of thousands of our citizens against the settled and profound convictions of the great body of the people in every portion of the country, and in wanton disregard of the obligations of justice and of good faith, the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was repealed, and the seal which had guaranteed freedom to that vast territory which the United States had purchased from France was snatched from the bond. Oregon, Washington, New Mexico, Deseret, and the new State acquired from Texas north of 36° 30', by compact, were all opened up to slavery, and those who might first become the inhabitants thereof were authorized to make laws for its establishment and perpetuation.

THE INVASION OF KANSAS AND ACTION OF THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT.

Nor did the slaveholding interest stop here in its crusade of injustice and wrong. The first election of members for the Territorial Legislature of Kansas was fixed for the 30th of March, 1855, and the law of Congress prescribed that at that election none but "actual residents of the territory" should be allowed to vote. Yet, to prevent people of the territory themselves from exercising the right to prohibit slavery, which the act of Congress had conferred upon them, the slaveholding interest sent armed bands of men from the neighboring State of Missouri, who entered the territory on the day of election, took possession of the polls, excluded the legal voters, and proceeded themselves to elect members of the Legislature, without the slightest regard to the qualifications prescribed by law. The judges of election, appointed under authority of the administration at Washington, aided and abetted in the perpetration of the outrages upon the rights of the people of Kansas, and the President of the United States removed from office the Governor whom he had himself appointed, but who refused to acknowledge the Legislature which the slaveholding invaders from Missouri had thus imposed upon the territory.

That Legislature met on the 2d of July, 1855. Its first act was to exclude those members, duly elected, who would not consent to the enactment of laws for the admission of slavery into the territory. Having thus silenced all opposition to its behests, the Legislature proceeded to the enactment of laws for the government of Kansas upon the subject of slavery. The laws of Missouri in regard to it were at first extended over the territory. It was then enacted, that every person who should raise an insurrection or rebellion of negroes in the territory; every person who should entice away a slave, with intent to procure his freedom; every person who should aid or assist in so enticing away a slave within the territory; and every person who should entice or carry away a slave from any other State or territory of the Union, and bring him within the Territory of Kansas, with the intent to effect or

procure his freedom, upon the conviction thereof should suffer DEATH. It was further enacted, that if any person should write, print, or publish any book, paper, argument, opinion, advice, or innuendo, calculated to produce a disorderly, dangerous, or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in the territory, or to induce them to escape from their masters, he should be deemed guilty of FELONY, and be punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term not less than FIVE YEARS; and that if any free person, by speaking or writing, should assert or maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in that territory; or should introduce or circulate any book, paper, pamphlet, or circular, containing any such denial of the right of persons to hold slaves in that territory, he should be deemed guilty of felony, and be punished by IMPRISONMENT at hard labor for a term not less than TWO YEARS. It was still further enacted, by the same Legislature, that every free white male citizen of the United States, and inhabitant of the territory, who should pay a tax of one dollar, and take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, the act organizing the Territory of Kansas, the territorial law, and the act for the recapture of fugitive slaves, should be entitled to vote at any election in said territory, — thus making citizens of Missouri, or of any other State, legal voters in Kansas, upon their presentation at the polls, upon taking the oaths prescribed, and upon the payment of one dollar, — in direct violation of the spirit of the act of Congress, and in open disregard of the rights of the people of the territory. And having made these enactments for the establishment of slavery, the Legislature appointed Sheriffs, Judges, and other officers of the territory, for their enforcement, — thus depriving the people of all power over the enactment of their own laws, and the choice of officers for their execution.

That these despotic acts, even if they had been passed by a Legislature duly elected by the people of the territory, would have been null and void, inasmuch as they are plainly in violation of the Federal Constitution, is too clear for argument. Congress itself is expressly forbidden by the Constitution of the United States to make any laws abridging the freedom of speech and of the press; and it is absurd to suppose that a Territorial Legislature, deriving all its power from Congress, should not be subject to the same restrictions. But these laws were not enacted by the people of Kansas. They were imposed upon them by an armed force. Yet the President of the United States, in a special message sent to Congress on the 24th of January, 1856, declares that they have been enacted by the duly constituted authorities of the territory, and that they are of binding obligation upon the people thereof. And on the 12th of February, 1856, he issued his proclamation, denouncing any attempt to resist or subvert these barbarous and void enactments, and warning all persons engaged in such attempts, that they will be opposed, not only by the local militia, but by any available forces belonging to the regular army of the United States. Thus has the Federal Government solemnly recognized the usurpation set up in Kansas by invaders from Missouri, and pledged all the power of the United States to its support. American history furnishes no parallel to the cruelty and tyranny of these acts of the present administration. The expulsion of aliens, and the penalties inflicted upon citizens for exercising freedom of speech and of the press, under the alien and sedition laws, which were overthrown by the Republican

party of 1798, were lenient and mild when compared with the outrages perpetrated upon the people of Kansas, under color of law, by the usurping invaders, sustained by the Federal Government.

With a full sense of the importance of the declaration, we affirm that the execution of these threats by the President of the United States, upon the people of Kansas, would be an unconstitutional exercise of executive power, presenting a case of intolerable tyranny; that American citizens cannot submit to it, and remain free; and that if blood shall be shed in the prosecution of so unlawful a purpose, those by whose agency it may be spilt will be held to a strict and stern account by the freemen of the Republic. So plain, palpable, and deliberate a violation of the Constitution would justify the interposition of the States, whose duty it would be, by all the constitutional means in their power, to vindicate the rights and liberties of the citizen against the power of the Federal Government; and we take this occasion to express to our fellow-citizens in Kansas, against whom these unconstitutional acts are directed, our profound sympathy with them in the resistance which it is their right and their duty to make to them, and our determination to make that sympathy efficient by all the means which we may lawfully employ.

Thus for a period of twenty-five years has slavery been contending, under various pretexts, but with constant success, against the tendencies of civilization and the spirit of our institutions, for the extension and perpetuation of its power. The degree in which the General Government has aided its efforts may be traced in the successive steps it has taken. In 1787, all the States in the Confederacy united in ordaining that slavery should be forever prohibited from all the territory belonging to the United States. In 1789, the first Congress of the United States passed a law reaffirming this ordinance, and re-enacting the prohibition of slavery which it contained. In 1820, the slaveholding interest secured the admission of Missouri, as a slave State, into the Union, by acceding to a similar prohibition of slavery from the Louisiana Territory lying north of 36° 30'. In 1854, that prohibition was repealed, and the people of the territory were left free to admit or exclude slavery, in their own discretion. In 1856, the General Government proclaims its determination to use all the power of the United States to enforce upon the people obedience to laws imposed upon them by armed invaders, establishing slavery, and visiting with terrible penalties their exercise of freedom of speech and of the press upon that subject. While two-thirds of the American people live in States where slavery is forbidden by law, and while five-sixths of the capital, enterprise, and productive industry of the country rest upon freedom as their basis, slavery thus controls all departments of their common government, and wields their powers on its own behalf.

THE PLEAS URGED IN DEFENCE OF THESE AGGRESSIONS OF SLAVERY.

As a matter of course, for all these acts, and for all the outrages by which they have been attended, the slaveholding interest pretends to find a warrant in the Constitution of the United States. All usurpation, in countries professing to be free, must have the color of law for its support. No outrage, committed by power upon popular rights, is left without some attempt at vindication. The partition of Poland, the overthrow of the Constitution of

Hungary, the destruction of Irish independence, like the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the conquest of Kansas, were consummated with a scrupulous observance of the forms of law.

THE PLEA THAT THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE WAS NOT A COMPACT.

I. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, it is urged on behalf of those by whom it was effected, involved no violation of good faith, because that Compromise was merely an act of Congress, and as such repealable at pleasure. Regarded as a legal technicality, we are not disposed to contest this plea. The Compromise was undoubtedly embodied in a Congressional enactment, subject to repeal. But in this case, by the very nature of the transaction, the faith of the parties was pledged that this enactment *should not be* repealed. The spirit of the law, whatever its form, was the spirit of a compact. Its enactment was secured by an exchange of equivalents. The slaveholding interest procured the admission of Missouri into the Union, by consenting and voting, through its Representatives in Congress, that north of its southern line, in the Territory of Louisiana, slavery should be prohibited *forever*. Without that consent and that vote, the admission of Missouri could not have been secured; nor would the prohibition of slavery until 1854, or until any other date, or for any other time than that specified in the act, — namely, *forever*, — have purchased the assent of the free States to the admission of Missouri as a slave State into the Union. The word *forever*, therefore, was a part of the law, and of the consideration for its enactment. Such a law may be repealed; but its repeal is the rupture of a compact, — the repudiation of a solemn covenant. The Missouri Compromise has been regarded as such a compact, from the date of its enactment, in all sections, and by all the people of the country. Successive Presidents have invoked for it a respect and an obligation scarcely inferior to that of the Constitution itself; and Senator Douglas himself, as late as 1845, declared that it had been “canonized in the hearts of the American people, as a sacred thing, which no ruthless hand would ever be reckless enough to disturb.” Whatever, therefore, the mere form of the bond may have permitted, good faith on the part of the representatives of the slaveholding interest required that it should be kept inviolate.

II. Nor is this charge of bad faith, brought against the slaveholding interest for having repealed the Missouri Compromise, answered or evaded by the pleas urged in its defence, that originally it was forcibly imposed by the free States upon the slave States, without their consent; that it was subsequently violated by the free States, in their refusal to extend its provisions over New Mexico and Utah; or that its repeal, having been offered by the free States themselves, could not be resisted or refused by the representatives of slavery. (1.) Even if it were true that the prohibition of slavery north of 36° 30' was originally enacted by the free States, against the votes of the South, the fact that the admission of Missouri was accepted as the price of that prohibition would have made the slaveholding interest a party to the transaction, assenting to its terms, and bound by its obligations. But the fact is not so. The act of March 6, 1820, which admitted Missouri, and prohibited slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of 36° 30', received

in the Senate the vote of *fourteen* members from slaveholding States, while only *eight* were cast against it; and in the House of Representatives, *thirty-eight* members from the slave States voted for it, and *thirty-seven* against it. A majority of the votes from slaveholding States, in each branch of Congress, were thus given for the bill; and so far were the representatives of slavery from regarding it as having been forced upon them, that Charles Pinckney, one of their greatest and ablest leaders, declared, on the night of its passage, that "*it was regarded in the slaveholding States as a triumph.*" (2.) Still more absurd is it to say that the refusal of the North to extend the provisions of the Compromise over other regions was a violation of its terms, or in any way released the parties to it from their obligation to abide by its requirements. (3.) It is true that the ostensible author of the proposition to repeal it was a Senator from a free State; but the fact did not authorize the inference that the sentiment of the free States was justly and truly represented by his action. There was, indeed, no room to doubt that it was condemned by the unanimous voice of the free States, and that it would be regarded by them, and by the country at large, as a very gross and wanton violation of obligations which had been voluntarily assumed. No matter from what geographical quarter of the Union it came, it was brought forward in the interest and on behalf of the slaveholders. This, indeed, is among the worst of the effects of slavery, and among the most signal proofs of its ascendancy, that able and ambitious men should enlist in its service, and volunteer to perform offices on its behalf which its representatives would scorn to perform themselves — from the conviction that by that path the honors and dignities of the General Government are to be secured. The slaveholding interest owed it to honor and good faith to resist the temptation which such men might hold out for the repudiation of its obligations.

THE PLEA THAT CONGRESS HAS NO POWER TO PROHIBIT SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

III. But it is urged that the original enactment of the Missouri Compromise, by which slavery was prohibited from entering a portion of the territory of the United States, was a violation of the Constitution; that Congress has no rightful power to make such a prohibition; but that into any territory over which the Constitution is extended, the slaveholder has a right, by virtue of its provisions, to take his slaves.

In reply to this, we answer: —

First. — That, whether the plea be true or false, it comes too late; that the slaveholding interest conceded the constitutionality of the prohibition, by assenting to its enactment, and aiding it by the votes of its representatives.

Second. — That, if the plea were true, the enactment was null and void, by reason of its unconstitutionality, and its repeal, therefore, was a needless ostentation of bad faith; and,

Third. — That the plea is not true, but is directly contrary to the plain letter as well as to the spirit of the Constitution, and to the uniform practice of the government from its foundation.

The Constitution declares that "the Congress shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories or other property

belonging to the United States." This language is very plain and very broad. It imposes no limitation upon the power of Congress to make rules and regulations respecting the territories, except that they shall be such as are "needful;" and this, of course, lies in the discretion of power to determine. It assumes that power to legislate for the territories, which are the common property of the Union, must exist somewhere; and also that it may most justly, and most safely, be placed in the common government of the Union. The authority of Congress over the territories is, therefore, without any other limit than such as its judgment of what is "needful," of what will best promote their welfare, and that of the whole country to which they belong, may impose. If Congress, therefore, deem it expedient to make a rule and regulation which shall prohibit slavery from any territory, we find nothing in the Constitution which removes such a prohibition from the sphere of its authority. The power of Congress over the territories of the United States is as complete and as full as that possessed by any State Legislature over territory belonging to that State; and if the latter may prohibit slavery within its territory, so may the former also.

It has been urged, we are aware, that the rules and regulations which Congress is authorized to make respecting the territories are restricted to them and regarded as property; and that this clause of the Constitution confers no governmental power over them whatever. But this cannot be so, because it is under this clause that Congress does govern the territories—that it organizes their governments, and provides for their ultimate admission as States. There is no other clause of the Constitution from which this power of government can be inferred; as it unquestionably exists, therefore it must rest upon this provision. But from whatever source it may be derived, the authority to govern necessarily implies the right to decide what policy and what laws will best promote the welfare of those on whose behalf that authority is exercised. If Congress, therefore, believes that the well-being of the territories and of the country at large will be promoted by excluding slavery from them, it has, beyond all question, the right thus to prohibit and exclude it.

This view of the authority of Congress over the territories of the United States is sustained by other clauses of the Constitution. In the ninth section of the first article, it is declared that "the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States *now existing* may think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year 1808." This is not a grant of power. On the contrary, it is a restriction imposed upon power assumed to exist. The language of the clause takes it for granted that Congress had power to prohibit the migration and the importation of slaves; a power doubtless conferred by the authority "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States;" for, whether slaves are to be regarded as persons or as property, commerce of necessity relates to both. This clause of the Constitution, therefore, imposes upon the authority of Congress to prohibit the migration or importation of slaves a specific and a limited restriction; namely, that this power should not be exercised over any of the States *then existing*, prior to the year 1808. Over any State *not then existing*, and, by still stronger implication, over any *territories* of the United States, the exercise of its authority was unrestricted; and it might

prohibit the migration or importation of slaves into them, at any time, in its own discretion.

Nor do any considerations connected with alleged rights of property in slaves contravene the existence or the exercise of this authority. The Constitution does not recognize slaves as property, in any instance, or to any extent. In the clause already cited, they are called "persons." In the clause respecting their escape into other States, they are to be returned, not as property, but as "persons held to service or labor." And in the apportionment of representation and of direct taxes, it is provided by the Constitution that to the whole number of free persons are to be added three-fifths of all other "persons." In all its provisions which have reference to slaves, they are described and regarded as persons. The idea of their being property is carefully and intentionally excluded. If they are property at all, therefore, it is not by virtue of the Constitution, but of local laws, and only within their jurisdiction. The local laws of any State are excluded from the territories of the United States, by the necessity of the case as well as by the exclusive sovereignty conferred upon Congress.

THE PLEA OF POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

Failing thus to establish the right of the slaveholder to carry his slaves as property, by virtue of the Constitution, into territory belonging to the United States, the slaveholding interest has been compelled to claim, for the inhabitants of the territories themselves, the right to provide for excluding or admitting slavery, as a right inherent in their sovereignty over their own affairs. This principle of popular sovereignty, as it is styled, was embodied in the bills for organizing New Mexico and Utah, and is made the substitute for the prohibition of slavery in the Missouri Compromise, which it repealed; and the slaveholding interest is now sustained by the Federal Government in this new position, as it has been in all the positions it has successively assumed. The principle of popular sovereignty is fundamental in our institutions. No one doubts that the people are sovereign over all the territories, as well as over all the States of the Confederacy. But this sovereignty is subject to limitation and definition, and can only exist within the limitations of the Constitution. The people are sovereign in the House of Representatives; but their sovereignty may be overruled by the Senate, or defeated by the veto of the President. The States are sovereign; but only within certain limits, and in subordination to the sovereignty of the nation. Two sovereignties over the same country, and on the same subject, it is manifest, cannot coexist; one must of necessity exclude the other. But the Constitution, in express and unmistakable terms, makes Congress sovereign over the territories, by conferring upon it power to make "*all* needful rules and regulations respecting them." The doctrine of popular sovereignty in the people of the territories finds no warrant or support in the Constitution. In the language of Mr. Calhoun, "it involves an absurdity; if the sovereignty over the territories be in their inhabitants, instead of the United States, they would cease to be territories of the United States the moment we permit them to be inhabited." So long as they remain territories they are the possession and under the exclusive dominion of the United States;

and it is for the General Government to make such laws for them as their welfare, and that of the nation, may require.

We deny that Congress may abdicate a portion of its authority, and commit to the inhabitants of a territory powers conferred upon it by the Constitution. Such an abdication is an abandonment of duty, and cannot be justified on the pretended principle of popular sovereignty. That principle, indeed, is discarded in the very act of Congress in which it is claimed to be embodied. If sovereignty exists, it must be exercised through the organized departments of government: the legislative, executive, and judicial. But the act to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, prescribes the requisites of citizenship and the qualifications of voters, confers upon the President and Senate the appointment of a Governor, who is clothed with the veto power, and of judges by whom the common law shall be interpreted. Each department of the government thus rests virtually in the power of the President of the United States. To style the small remnant of power which such a law leaves to the people "popular sovereignty," is an abuse of language, and an insult to common sense. Yet even this has been effectually destroyed by the General Government in their high-handed endeavor to force slavery into Kansas against the will of the hardy settlers who have made it their home.

This whole system of doctrine by which slavery seeks possession of the territories of the United States, either by asserting the sovereignty of their inhabitants, or by denying the power of Congress to exclude and prohibit slavery from them, is novel and alien to the principles and the administration of our government. Congress has always asserted and exercised the right of prohibition. It was exercised by the vote of the First Congress, in 1789, reaffirming the ordinance of the old Confederacy by which slavery was prohibited from the territory north-west of the Ohio River. It was exercised in 1820, in the prohibition of slavery from the Louisiana Territory north of 36° 30'. It was exercised in 1848, when slavery was prohibited from the Territory of Oregon.

Nor is it in the least degree impaired by the argument that these territories, when they become States, and are admitted into the Union, can establish or prohibit slavery, in their discretion. Their rights as States do not begin until their obligations as territories end. The Constitution knows nothing of "inchoate States." Congress has power to make "all needful rules and regulations" for them as territories, until they are admitted into the Union as members of the common Confederacy.

GENERAL TENDENCY OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY.

In all these successive acts, in the admission of Missouri and of Arkansas, in the annexation of Texas, and the provision for admitting four new States from her territory, in the war of Mexico and the conquest of her provinces, in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and in the cruel war now waged against the people of Kansas for the extension of slavery into that territory, we trace the footsteps of a powerful interest, aiming at absolute political power, and striding onward to a complete ascendancy over the General Government. It finds powerful allies, and an open field in the political arena, for

the prosecution of its purposes. Always acting as a compact unit, it finds its opponents divided by a variety of interests. Partisan alliances and personal ambitions have hitherto prevented any union against its aggressions; and not feeling or fearing the displeasure of their constituents, representatives from the free States have been induced to aid in the promotion of its designs. All other interests have been compelled to give way before it. The representatives of freedom on the floors of Congress have been treated with contumely, if they resist or question the right to supremacy of the slaveholding class. The labor and the commerce of sections where slavery does not exist obtain tardy and inadequate recognition from the General Government, which is swayed by its influence, and for the accomplishment of its ends. The Executive of the nation is the willing servant of its behests, and sacrifices to its favor the rights and the interests of the country. The purse and the sword of the nation are at its command. A hundred millions of dollars were expended in the annexation of Texas, and the war with Mexico, which was a part of its price. Two hundred millions have been offered for Cuba, and war with all Europe is threatened, if necessary, to prevent the emancipation of its slaves. Thus is the decision of great questions of public policy, touching vast interests and vital rights, — questions even of peace and of war, — made to turn, not upon the requirements of justice and honor, but upon its relation to the subject of slavery, — upon the effect it will have upon the interest of the slaveholding class.

The people of the free States have cherished the hope that the efforts made to extend slavery, which have fallen under their notice, were accidental, and indicative of weakness rather than ambition. They have trusted that the sagacious statesmen of the slaveholding States would gradually perceive and acknowledge the inconvenience and danger of slavery, and would take such measures as they might deem wise and safe for its ultimate removal. They have feared the effect of agitation upon this subject, relied upon the good faith and honor of the slaveholding States, and believed that time, the natural growth of population, and the recognized laws of political and social economy, would gradually and peacefully work out the extinction of a system so repugnant to justice and the national character and welfare. It has seemed to them incredible, that in this late age, when Christianity has for near two thousand years been filling the world with its light, and when almost every nation on earth but our own has abolished chattel slavery, the effort should be made, or the wish cherished, by any portion of our people, to make the interest of slavery predominant, and to convert this Republic, the only government which professes to be founded upon human rights, into the mightiest slave empire the world has ever seen. But it is impossible to deceive ourselves longer. The events of the past two years have disclosed the designs of the slave power, and the desperate means it is prepared to use for their accomplishment. We cannot shut our eyes longer to the fact that the slaveholding interest is determined to counteract the tendencies of time and of civilization, by its own energy, by its bold appropriation of all the powers and agencies of the government, and by the violation, if need be, of the most sacred compacts and compromises. It is resolved that slavery shall be under the protection of the national flag; that it shall no longer be the creature of local law, but that it shall stand clothed with all the sanctions,

and sustained by all the power, of this great Republic. It is determined that the President shall do its bidding, and that Congress shall legislate according to its decrees. It is resolved upon the dethronement of the principles of Republicanism, and the establishment, in their stead, of an OLIGARCHY bound together by a common interest in the ownership of slaves.

Nor have we any reason to believe that slavery will be content with this absolute supremacy over the Federal Government, which it has already so well-nigh achieved. On the contrary, the dark shadow of its sceptre falls upon the sovereignty of the several States, and menaces them with dire disaster. South Carolina, abandoning her once-cherished doctrine of State Rights, asserts the Federal supremacy over laws made by States, exclusively for the protection of their citizens. The State of Virginia is contesting in courts of law the right of the State of New York to forbid the existence of slavery within her limits. A Federal Court in Pennsylvania has denied the right of that State to decree freedom to slaves brought by their masters within her borders, and has proclaimed that slavery exists by the law of nations. The division of California, and the organization of a slave State within her limits, have been proposed. A Senator on the floor of Congress has urged that the government of the United States should no longer restrain, by its naval power, the African slave-trade, and the demand for its restoration is openly made by Southern journals and by leading public men in the Southern States.

When these great objects shall have been accomplished, — when the States, as well as the General Government, shall have become subject to the law of slavery, and when three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders shall hold despotic rule over the millions of this Republic, — slavery cannot fail, from the necessity of its nature, to attempt outrages which will awaken storms that will sweep it in carnage from the face of the earth. The longer tyranny is practised unresisted, the fiercer and the more dreadful is the resistance which in the end it provokes. History is full of instances to prove that nothing is so dangerous as a wrong long unredressed; that evils, which at the outset it would have been easy to remove, by sufferance become fatal to those through whose indifference and toleration they have increased. The tendencies of the measures adopted by the slaveholding interests to secure its own extension through the action of the Federal Government, is to give to Congress jurisdiction of the general subject; and its representatives must be sagacious enough to perceive, that if they establish the principle that Congress may interfere with slavery for its protection, it may interfere with it also for its destruction. If, therefore, they succeed in such an enlargement of the power of Congress, — having already discarded the principle of compromise from legislation, — they must foresee that the natural effect of their encroachments upon the rights and liberties of the non-slaveholding population of the country will be to arouse them to the direct exercise of the power thus placed in their hands. Whether it is safe or wise for that interest to invite such a contest we need not here consider.

The time draws nigh, fellow-countrymen, when you will be called upon to decide upon the policy and the principles of the General Government. Your votes at the approaching Presidential election will determine whether slavery shall continue to be the paramount and controlling influence in the Federal

Administration, or whether other rights and other interests shall resume the degree of consideration to which they are entitled. The issue is upon us by no act of ours, and it cannot be evaded. Under a profound conviction of impending dangers, the grounds whereof we have now set forth, we call upon you to deliver the Constitution and the Union from the subjugation which threatens both. Holding, with the late Mr. Calhoun, that "the obligation to repel aggression is not much less solemn than that of abstaining from making aggression, and that the party which submits to it, when it can be resisted, is not much less guilty and responsible for consequences than that which makes it," we invoke a surrender of all party prejudices and all personal feelings, and a cordial and earnest union for the vindication of rights and liberties which we cannot surrender without degradation and shame. We summon you to send delegates, in numbers three times as large as your representation in Congress, to meet in Convention at Philadelphia, on the 17th day of June next, to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States. Let them come prepared to surrender all personal preferences and all sectional or local views, — resolved only to make such nominations and to take such action as shall advance the principles we hold and the purposes we seek to promote. Disclaiming any intention to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists, or to invalidate those portions of the Constitution by which it is removed from the national control, let us prevent the General Government from its ascendancy, bring back its administration to the principles and the practice of its wise and illustrious founders, and thus vindicate the Constitution and the Union, and secure the blessings of LIBERTY to ourselves and our posterity.

We do, therefore, declare to the people of the United States, as objects for which we unite in political action : —

1. We demand and shall attempt to secure the repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of slavery into territories once consecrated to freedom, and will resist by every constitutional means the existence of slavery in any of the territories of the United States.

2. We will support, by every lawful means, our brethren in Kansas in their constitutional and manly resistance to the usurped authority of their lawless invaders, and will give the full weight of our political power in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas to the Union as a free, sovereign, and independent State.

3. Believing that the present National Administration has shown itself to be weak and faithless, and that its continuance in power is identified with the progress of the slave power to national supremacy, with the exclusion of freedom from the territory, and with increasing civil discord, it is a leading purpose of our organization to oppose and overthrow it.

On motion of Judge Spaulding, of Ohio, the Address was accepted and the resolutions adopted by a unanimous vote, accompanied with nine cheers.

APPENDIX C.

DISUNION AND SLAVERY.

MR. RAYMOND'S LETTERS TO W. L. YANCEY, OF ALABAMA.

I. THE NORTHERN STATES AND THE SLAVE-TRADE IN 1867.

NEW YORK, Nov. 23, 1860.

HON. W. L. YANCEY: *Sir*,—I have read your reply of Nov. 9 to an editorial article in the *Times* of October 27, in which you claim to have corrected what you style the “hostile and malignant criticisms of two leading editors in the black Republican cause, namely, Mr. Thurlow Weed and Mr. Henry J. Raymond,”—upon your speeches in the North during the recent Presidential canvass. As you have thus given the matter a personal direction, you will excuse me for giving you a personal answer.

Let me say, in the first place, that you have no right to characterize those criticisms as either “hostile or malignant.” They are perfectly fair and legitimate comments upon public speeches on public topics. Of all men, you should be the last to reproach your political opponents at the North with discourtesy. You spoke in nearly all our principal cities, to large audiences, two-thirds of whom had not the slightest sympathy with your views, or the least respect for the object you sought to accomplish. But you were heard with the most respectful attention. In no instance was there the slightest indication of personal disrespect; in no case were you interrupted, or even questioned on any point. You were heard everywhere with just as much deference and courtesy, as if every word you uttered had accorded fully with the opinions and sentiments of those you addressed. If you will contrast this reception with that which would have greeted any one of your opponents, who should attempt to address the people of your own section on the same subject, you will find no ground for claiming superiority over us in the matter of courtesy.

The object of your visit to the North was to vindicate the claim put forth by Southern politicians, of the right to increase and extend the institution of slavery. You attempted this, in your speeches, first, by showing, as a matter of history, that the framers of the Constitution regarded the increase of slavery as desirable for the country, and made specific provision for it in the Constitution itself; and, secondly, by showing, as a matter of statistics, that slavery is a benefit to the States in which it exists, and to the North

through its trade with those States. Under the first head you asserted that Massachusetts "took the lead," in the Convention that framed the Constitution, in "*insisting*" that the slave-trade should not be prohibited until 1808, and afterwards in placing this clause beyond the reach of amendment. I have characterized this assertion as a perversion of the facts of history; — and your letter, of November 9, is an attempt to vindicate your assertion against this criticism. It is not enough for you to show that Massachusetts *assented to* these measures. No one disputes or doubts that fact, — nor did we need a missionary from Alabama to inform us of it. Your assertion was much broader, and its object was very different. You represented that Massachusetts, as the head of the Northern Colonies, "*insisted*" on continuing the slave-trade for twenty years longer, for the specific purpose of "*widening the basis of slavery,*" and "*increasing the number of slaves,*" while Virginia, as the head of the Southern Colonies, resisted the attempt. And you made this representation for the purpose of basing upon it the appeal to the people of the North, that, as *their* fathers had thus clearly declared their approval of slavery, and provided for its increase, — and had forced this increase upon the South, — it was unjust for them, their descendants, to denounce and restrict it now.

Now, I did say that this line of argument showed that you were either very imperfectly informed in the history of the country, or very reckless and unscrupulous in the statement of facts. The first horn of the dilemma I abandon. Your quotations from the Madison Papers, and the sagacious manner in which you have weeded out from the passages relating to this question everything which makes against your position, show that you are not "*imperfectly informed*" on this subject. Nor is it quite fair to say that you are "*reckless and unscrupulous*" in your statements. Those moods imply a certain degree of indifference as to the truth or falsehood of statements made; while you are exceedingly careful, first to make a statement which is exactly the opposite of the truth, and then to make it plausible by scrupulously falsifying the public records by which it is to be tested. That I have full warrant for this serious charge, I shall prove by appending to this letter the full debate on that clause of the Constitution which relates to the prohibition of the slave-trade, on which you base your statement, and from which you have pretended in your letter to quote evidence of its truth. You accuse me of having given "*garbled extracts*" from that debate. In order to show at whose door that charge justly lies, I copy your letter, including the debate as you have professed to quote it.

Now, you will see from this record, what you very well knew before, that neither Massachusetts, nor any other Northern State, "*insisted*" that the slave-trade should not be prohibited by Congress until 1808; that, on the contrary, they demanded that the General Government should have power to prohibit it *at once*; and that they yielded their consent to its continuance for twenty years, only to threats of secession on the part of South Carolina and Georgia, and for the purpose of securing the adhesion of those States to the Union. Mr. Pinckney in that debate declared "South Carolina can never receive the plan if it prohibits the slave-trade." Gen. Pinckney said he "*should consider the rejection of the clause as an exclusion of South Carolina from the Union.*" Mr. Baldwin, of Georgia, said, "*Georgia was decided on*

this point," and that "it might be understood in what light she would view an attempt to abridge one of her favorite prerogatives." Mr. Williamson, of North Carolina, "thought the *Southern States could not be members of the Union if the clause should be rejected.* Mr. Rutledge said, "If the Convention thinks that North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia will *ever agree to the plan, unless their right to import slaves be untouched,* the expectation is vain." Those quotations are all from the debate on this proposition. These declarations were made by leading Southern men, and were the turning-points of the action of the Convention upon that clause. Yet you have not quoted a single one of them in your citations from that debate. Why not? Because they would have rendered it impossible for you to attribute this action of the Convention, and of the Northern States, to the *motive* you had assigned, namely, a desire to continue the slave-trade, in order to "increase the number of slaves," and widen "the basis of slavery." If you had quoted them, they would have furnished the explanation of the sentences you quote from New England men. They would have shown that not a single man from Massachusetts, or any other Northern colony, said one solitary syllable in favor of slavery, or of continuing the slave-trade; and that their only motive for assenting to it at all was the fear that without such assent the formation of the Union would be impossible. And to induce them still further to yield their hostility to it, the Southern delegation held out hopes that if the matter were left open, the Southern States themselves might prohibit the traffic. Mr. Pinckney said, "If the Southern States are left alone, they will probably of themselves stop importations; and again, "If the States be left at liberty on this subject, South Carolina may, perhaps, by degrees *do, of herself, what is wished,* as Virginia and Maryland have already done." Mr. Baldwin said of Georgia, "If left to herself she may probably put a stop to the evil." It was by such alternate threats and promises that the Northern delegates were induced to assent to the compromise proposed by the committee to which the subject was recommitted, — namely, that the trade should not be prohibited before 1800, — and also to the amendment offered by Mr. Pinckney, of South Carolina, making it 1808.

It is impossible to suppose that you were ignorant of these facts, or that you could possibly have mistaken the motive of this action of the Northern delegates.

You quote from Rufus King the remark that "the subject should be considered in a political light only," and draw the inference that he and his State, as well as Connecticut, were indifferent to its moral aspects, which Virginia urged so warmly. You say: —

"The prohibition was warmly supported on moral grounds by Virginia, and Connecticut immediately pronounced, 'Let every State import what it pleases,' — while Massachusetts ably seconded Connecticut that it was 'to be considered in a political light only.'"

This is a very adroit management of words, true in themselves, but so arranged as to convey a very gross and palpable falsehood. You represent Connecticut as *following* the moral protest of Virginia, by the exclamation, "Let every State import what it pleases," as if protesting against that moral view of the case, — whereas Mr. Ellsworth used those words after Mr. Rut-

ledge, of South Carolina, had declared that "religion and humanity had nothing to do with this question," and that "the true question is whether the Southern States shall or shall not be parties to the Union; and he added, as a salvo to his own mind, "the morality or wisdom of slavery are considerations belonging to the States themselves." Mr. King's remark was not made until the next day, and then related to what had been said of the refusal of South Carolina and Georgia to join the Union, instead of anything that had been said on behalf of Connecticut. If you had any desire to submit Mr. King's sentiments on this whole subject, why did you not quote what he said upon it on the 8th of August, when the question of representation was under debate?

"Mr. King had hoped that some accommodation would have taken place on this subject; that at least a time would have been limited for the importation of slaves. *He never could agree to let them be imported without limitation*, and then he represented in the National Legislature. *Indeed he could so little persuade himself of the rectitude of such a practice, that he was not sure he could assent to it under any circumstances.*" — [Madison Papers, III., 1262.]

You quote Gov. Morris, of Pennsylvania, as proposing to recommit the clause for the purpose of making a bargain between the North and South, and sneeringly say it was made a "subject of *trade*, and not of moral speculation." Let me commend to any to whom you may have given such an impression of his views, the following speech made by him on the same subject and on the same occasion:—

From the Madison Papers, Vol. III., page 1263.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to insert "free" before the word "inhabitants." Much, he said, would depend on this point. *He never would concur in upholding domestic slavery.* It was a nefarious institution. It was the curse of Heaven on the States where it prevailed. Compare the free regions of the Middle States, where a rich and noble cultivation marks the prosperity and happiness of the people, with the misery and poverty which overspread the barren waste of Virginia, Maryland, and the other States having slaves. Travel through the whole continent, and you behold the prospect continually varying with the appearance and disappearance of slavery. The moment you leave the Eastern States, and enter New York, the effects of the institution become visible. Passing through the Jerseys and entering Pennsylvania, every criterion of superior improvement witnesses the change. Proceed southwardly, and every step you take, through the great regions of slaves, presents a desert increasing with the increasing proportion of these wretched beings. Upon what principle is it that the slaves shall be computed in the representation? Are they men? Then make them citizens and let them vote. Are they property? Why, then, is no other property included? The houses in this city (Philadelphia) are worth more than all the wretched slaves who cover the rice-swamps of South Carolina. The admission of slaves into the representation, when fairly explained, comes to this:—that the inhabitant of Georgia and South Carolina who goes to the coast of Africa, and in defiance of the most sacred laws of humanity tears away his fellow-creatures from their dearest connections, and damns them to a most cruel bondage, shall have more votes in a government instituted for protection of the rights of mankind, than the citizen of Pennsylvania or New Jersey, *who views with a laudable horror so nefarious a practice.* He would add that domestic slavery is the most prominent feature in the aristocratic countenance of the proposed Constitution. The vassalage of the poor has ever been the favorite offspring of aristocracy. And what is the proposed compensation to the Northern States for a sacrifice

of every principle of right, of every impulse of humanity? They are to bind themselves to march their militia for the defence of the Southern States, for their defence against the very slaves of whom they complain. They must supply vessels and seamen in case of foreign attack. The Legislature will have indefinite power to tax them by excises and duties on imports, both of which will fall heavier on them than on the Southern inhabitants; for the Bohea tea used by a Northern freeman will pay more tax than the whole consumption of the miserable slave, which consists of nothing more than his physical subsistence and the rag that covers his nakedness. On the other side, the Southern States are not to be restrained from importing fresh supplies of wretched Africans, at once to increase the danger of attack and the difficulty of defence; nay, *they are to be encouraged to it*, by an assurance of having their votes in the National Government increased in proportion, and are at the same time to have their exports and their slaves exempt from all contributions for the public service. Let it not be said that direct taxation is to be proportioned to representation. It is idle to suppose that the General Government can stretch its hands directly into the pockets of the people, scattered over so vast a country. They can only do it through the medium of exports, imports, and excises. For what, then, are all the sacrifices to be made? *He would sooner submit himself to a tax for paying for all the negroes in the United States, than saddle posterity with such a Constitution.*

Does that look like making this a "subject of trade" merely? Does that look like "insisting" on a continuance of the slave-trade for twenty years?

But I have said quite enough to show the utter falsity of your assertion that Massachusetts, as the head of the Northern Colonies, "*insisted* that the slave-trade should not be prohibited by Congress until 1808," in order to "*increase the number of slaves, and to widen the basis of slavery.*" A few words now upon the other branch of this assertion, namely, that it was done against the wish of Virginia, as the representative of the Southern Colonies and thus forced upon them.

It is true, and is greatly to her honor, that Virginia did resist the continuance of the slave-trade. She had prohibited that traffic for herself, and urged its prohibition for all the States. But she did not do this as "the head of the Southern Colonies;" she was not acting on their behalf, nor had she their support. On the contrary, she was denounced, and her motives for it assailed then, as they have been since. "As to Virginia," says General Pinckney, "she will gain by stopping the importation. Her slaves will rise in value, and she has more than she wants." This is very much in the vein of South Carolina comments upon Virginia now. It is quite in the spirit of your remarks at Montgomery, in 1858, when you advocated the reopening of the slave-trade, and denounced the "old fogies" of Virginia—Jefferson, Madison and others—who "held opinions on this subject which are now considered sound."

How the other Southern Colonies regarded the proposition to prohibit the slave-trade has been made apparent already. Maryland and Virginia had abolished the traffic. Delaware had none to abolish. The only other Southern Colonies were North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; and they distinctly refused to join the Union, if Congress were clothed with power to prohibit the slave-trade. And it was that threat which induced Massachusetts and the other Northern Colonies to assent to the compromise proposed by the committee.

So much for the manner in which this clause came into the Constitu-

tion. If historical records prove anything, they prove that it was inserted on the demand of the principal Southern Colonies, backed by a threat of secession if it were not granted; and that Massachusetts and the other Northern Colonies conceded it solely and exclusively for the sake of securing the adherence of those colonies to the Union. Gen. Pinckney, in Convention, acknowledged "the liberal conduct" of the Eastern States on this occasion, and was willing to return it by concessions on the subject of commerce. You, on the contrary, attempt to distort it into an endorsement of slavery and an approval of the slave-trade. I submit to the public judgment whether you do not thus convict yourself of being utterly "unscrupulous" in the use of historical facts.

Now I might very well stop here, for what I have already said covers the ground of your letter. It settles the question as to the part taken by the Northern and Southern Colonies respectively in regard to the slave-trade, and the motives by which each section was actuated. But as that was only an incidental point in your speech, permit me to refer to the other branch of your main argument and the practical policy which it was intended to support.

You have been engaged now for several years in the endeavor to secure the repeal of the laws of Congress prohibiting the slave-trade, and to restore the full freedom of that traffic to the Southern States. At the South you are seeking to accomplish that result — precisely as South Carolina and Georgia sought the continuance of the trade in the Federal Convention — by menaces of disunion. At the North you held a different language. You asserted that the Fathers of the Republic, — the framers of the Constitution, — deeming an increase of slavery desirable, provided for it by keeping the slave-trade open until 1808. I have shown how utterly baseless — how wanton a perversion of historical fact — that statement is, so far as Massachusetts and the other Northern Colonies were concerned. I could prove, by a similar array of equally conclusive testimony, that the statement is just as false, so far as it assigns a motive to the action of the other colonies and to the leading statesmen of the whole country. You, probably, are not ignorant of the fact that on the 20th of October, 1774, the Continental Congress passed a preamble and resolutions solemnly pledging themselves, "under the sacred ties of virtue, honor, and love of our country,"

"That we will neither import nor purchase any slave imported after the first day of December next; — after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave-trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels nor sell our commodities or manufactures to those who are concerned in it."

This was the tone and temper of the people at the outset of our national career. It was the policy which the framers of the Constitution desired to adopt. It was the same sentiment which prompted Mason and Morris and Rufus King and Luther Martin to denounce slavery as a curse to the country, and to insist that the General Government should have power to check its growth by prohibiting its increase and stopping the slave-trade at once and forever. But it is unnecessary to quote their declarations or enter upon any further historical inquiry on this subject. You have yourself conceded that the main obstacle which you encounter in your efforts to secure

the reopening of the slave-trade lies in the fact that the fathers of the Republic were opposed to it. I have before me a copy of the speech made by you in the Southern Commercial Convention, held in Montgomery, May, 1858, on the subject of reopening the African slave-trade; and in that speech I find you saying:—

“If it were not for the names of Madison, Randolph, Mason, and others whose names have been quoted in order to frown down the presumption of a young man at this day for pretending to understand this subject, I would even now throw the lance of debate to any gentleman to stand up here and maintain that these laws were constitutional *per se*. I would to God every countryman of mine was disposed to judge of the issues between the North and South for himself, that the opinions of old fogymen could be utterly wiped out. . . . Will my friend (Mr. Pryor) now say that Mr. Jefferson, in his political ethics on slavery, was right? *He cannot say so.* Mr. Jefferson thought it would weaken the South, and, therefore, *he was for the entire prohibition of the slave-trade.* The distinguished, venerable, practical, and philosophical gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Ruffin) knows that *Mr. Jefferson was wrong in his ideas about slavery.* I need not expatiate on that subject, because it is a matter of history known to everybody. If that was the fact, there was among the framers of the Constitution, who were true to us in all the interests of the white man, a sentiment in relation to slavery that is not entertained now.

“Mr. PRYOR. — That is true.

“Mr. YANCEY. — That is all I ask. Then I say that *the old fogies of that day entertained opinions in relation to slavery, which we of this day are unanimously agreed were not sound.* . . . If I could get this body to divest themselves of the shackles that Madison, Jefferson and Mason have thrown about them concerning slavery, and could get them to understand that *South Carolina is against any, even the most limited, prohibition of the slave-trade, I should not fear their unbiased judgment.*”

So much for the historical part of the argument by which you endeavored to convince the people of the North that slavery ought to be increased.

Your next point was to prove by statistics that slavery is a great blessing to the country, because it had made the South much richer than free labor had made the North. And your argument was this: The wealth of any country is measured by its exports, — that is, by the *surplus* of its products after its own wants have been supplied out of them. Now the South exports annually of her products to the amount of two hundred million dollars, while the North exports of hers only a little over one hundred million dollars. Therefore, the South, which depends upon slave labor, is nearly twice as rich as the North, which relies upon free labor. Without entering upon any detailed examination of this point (although the more closely it is examined the more clearly will its sophistry appear), it is enough to say that the fallacy lies in your skilful manipulation of the word *exports*. The exports of the North do really and truly measure the *surplus* products of the North; but the South exports her *whole crop*. She does not consume any of her cotton at home, — or at least not enough to affect the argument; she exports the whole of it. Yet all the supplies which she draws from the North, — her cotton goods, her manufactured woollens, her plantation tools, her tea, silks, and imported luxuries, a very large proportion of her bacon, her beef, and other provisions, — all these are paid for out of the proceeds of her cotton crop, and generally in advance. She sends that crop to market burdened with the debt incurred for these supplies. Before she can claim that crop as *exports*, — that

is, as the *surplus* of her own consumption, — she must deduct that debt. Now you go on to state, in these very speeches, that these domestic purchases made at the North, to supply the wants of the Southern States, amount to nearly two hundred millions of dollars every year. Deduct that amount from the exports of the South, and then see how much you will have left, as the measure of the wealth of the Southern States.

But I shall not extend this letter, likely at best to be much too long, by any further comments upon this point. I send you with it the report of a speech made by me during the canvass at Rochester, in which I have treated it somewhat more fully.

Leaving this branch of the subject, therefore, I propose to say something of the DISUNION MOVEMENT now in progress, of which I consider you, to a greater degree than any other man now living, the author and the head. As I desire to treat it somewhat fully, — more so than the limits left me in this communication will permit, — I shall make it the subject of a second letter.

THE DEBATE IN THE CONVENTION OF 1787, ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE SLAVE-TRADE.

From the Madison Papers, Vol. III., page 1388, et seq.

TUESDAY, Aug. 21.

Mr. L. MARTIN, of Maryland, proposed to vary article 7, section 4, so as to allow a prohibition or tax on the importation of slaves. In the first place, as five slaves are to be counted as three freemen, in the apportionment of representatives, such a clause would leave an encouragement to this traffic. In the second place, slaves weakened one part of the Union, which the other parts were bound to protect; the privilege of importing them was, therefore, unreasonable. And, in the third place, it was inconsistent with the principles of the Revolution, and dishonorable to the American character, to have such a feature in the Constitution.

Mr. RUTLEDGE, of South Carolina, did not see how the importation of slaves could be encouraged by this section. He was not apprehensive of insurrection, and would readily exempt the other States from the obligation to protect the Southern against them. Religion and humanity had nothing to do with this question. Interest alone is the governing principle with nations. The true question at present is, *whether the Southern States shall or shall not be parties to the Union*. If the Northern States consult their interest, they will not oppose the increase of slaves, which will increase the commodities of which they will become the carriers.

Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Connecticut, was for leaving the clause as it stands. Let every State import what it pleases. The morality or wisdom of slavery are considerations *belonging to the States themselves*. What enriches a part, enriches the whole, and the States are the best judges of their particular interest. The old Confederation had not meddled with this point, and he did not see any greater necessity for bringing it within the policy of the new one.

Mr. PINCKNEY, of South Carolina. — *South Carolina can never receive the plan if it prohibits the slave-trade*. In every proposed extension of the powers of Congress, that State has expressly and watchfully excepted that of meddling with the importation of negroes. If

the States be left at liberty on this subject, South Carolina may, perhaps, by degrees, do of herself what is wished, as Virginia and Maryland have already done.

Adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, Aug. 22.

In Convention.—Article 7, Section 4, was resumed.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Connecticut, was for leaving the clause as it stands. He disapproved of the slave-trade; yet, as the States were now possessed of the right to import slaves, as the public good did not require it to be taken from them, and as it was expedient to have as few objections as possible to the proposed scheme of government, he thought it best to leave the matter as we find it. He observed that the abolition of slavery seemed to be going on in the United States, and that the good sense of the several States would probably by degrees complete it. He urged on the Convention the necessity of dispatching its business.

Col. MASON, of Virginia.—This infernal traffic originated in the avarice of British merchants. The British Government constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to it. *The present question concerns not the importing States alone, but the whole Union.* The evil of having slaves was experienced during the late war. Had slaves been treated as they might have been by the enemy, they would have proved dangerous instruments in their hands. But their folly dealt by the slaves as it did by the tories. He mentioned the dangerous insurrections of the slaves in Greece and Sicily; and the instructions given by Cromwell to the Commissioners sent to Virginia, to arm the servants and slaves in case other means of obtaining its submission should fail. Maryland and Virginia, he said, had already prohibited the importation of slaves expressly. North Carolina had done the same in substance. All this would be in vain, if South Carolina and Georgia be at liberty to import. The Western people are already calling out for slaves for their new lands, and will fill that country with slaves, if they can be got through South Carolina and Georgia. Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the emigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen the country. They produce the most pernicious effects on manners. Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country. As nations cannot be rewarded or punished in the next world, they must be in this. By an inevitable chain of causes and effects, Providence punishes national sins by national calamities. He lamented that some of our Eastern brethren had, from a lust of gain, embarked in this nefarious traffic. As to the States being in possession of the right to import, this was the case with many other rights, properly to be given up. He held it essential, in every point of view, that the General Government should have power to prevent the increase of slavery.

Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Connecticut, as he had never owned a slave, could not judge of the effects of slavery on character. He said, however, that if it was to be considered in a moral light, we ought to go further and free those already in the country. As slaves also multiply so fast in Virginia and Maryland that it is cheaper to raise than import them, whilst in the sickly rice-swamps foreign supplies are necessary, if we go no further than is urged, we shall be unjust towards South Carolina and Georgia. Let us not intermeddle. As population increases poor laborers will be so plenty as to render slaves useless. *Slavery, in time, will not be a speck in our country.* Provision is already made in Connecticut for abolishing it; and the abolition has already taken place in Massachusetts. As to the danger of insurrection from foreign influence, that will become a motive of kind treatment of the slaves.

Mr. PINCKNEY, of South Carolina.—If slavery be wrong, it is justified by the example of all the world. He cited the ease of Greece, Rome, and the other ancient States; the sanction given by France, Holland, and other modern States. In all ages one-half of mankind had been slaves. *If the Southern States were let alone, they will probably of themselves*

stop importations. He would, himself, as a citizen of South Carolina, vote for it. An attempt to take away the right, as proposed, *will produce serious objections to the Constitution*, which he wished to see adopted.

Gen. PINCKNEY, of South Carolina, declared it to be his firm opinion that if himself and all his colleagues were to sign the Constitution and use their personal influence, it would be of no avail towards obtaining the assent of their constituents. *South Carolina and Georgia cannot do without slaves*. As to Virginia, she will gain by stopping the importations. Her slaves will rise in value, and she has more than she wants. It would be unequal to require South Carolina and Georgia to confederate on such unequal terms. He said the royal assent, before the Revolution, had never been refused to South Carolina, as to Virginia. He contended that the importation of slaves would be for the interest of the whole Union. The more slaves, the more produce to employ the carrying trade; the more consumption also, and the more of this, the more revenue for the common treasury. He admitted it to be reasonable that slaves should be dutied like other imports; but should consider a rejection of the clause as an exclusion of South Carolina from the Union.

Mr. BALDWIN, of Georgia, had conceived national objects alone to be before the Convention; not such as, like the present, were of a local nature. *Georgia was decided on this point*. That State has always hitherto supposed a General Government to be the pursuit of the central States, who wished to have a vortex for everything; that her distance would preclude her from equal advantage; and that she could not prudently purchase it by yielding national powers. From this it might be understood in what light she would view an attempt to abridge one of her favorite prerogatives. *If left to herself she may probably put a stop to the evil*. As one ground for this conjecture, he took notice of the sect of —, which he said was a respectable class of people, who carried their ethics beyond the mere equality of men, extending their humanity to the claims of the whole animal creation.

Mr. WILSON, of Pennsylvania, observed that if South Carolina and Georgia were themselves disposed to get rid of the importation of slaves in a short time, as had been suggested, they would never refuse to unite because the importation might be prohibited. As the section now stands, all articles imported are to be taxed. *Slaves alone are exempt*. This is, in fact, a bounty on that article.

Mr. GERRY, of Massachusetts, thought we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to slaves, *but ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it*.

Mr. DICKINSON, of Delaware, considered it as inadmissible, on every principle of honor and safety, that the importation as slaves should be authorized to the States by the Constitution. *The true question was, whether the national happiness would be promoted or impeded by the importation*; and this ought to be left to the National Government, not to the States particularly interested. If England and France permit slavery, slaves are, at the same time, excluded from both these kingdoms. Greece and Rome were made unhappy by their slaves. He could not believe that the Southern States would refuse to confederate on the account apprehended; especially as the power was not likely to be immediately exercised by the General Government.

Mr. WILLIAMSON, of North Carolina, stated the law of North Carolina on the subject, to wit: that it did not directly prohibit the importation of slaves. It imposed a duty of five pounds on each slave imported from Africa; ten pounds on each from elsewhere; and fifty pounds on each from a State licensing manumission. He thought the Southern States could not be members of the Union, if the clause should be rejected; and that it was wrong to force anything down not absolutely necessary, and which any State must disagree to.

Mr. KING, of Massachusetts, thought the subject should be considered in a political light only. If two States will not agree to the Constitution, as stated on one side, he could affirm with equal belief, on the other, that great and equal opposition would be experienced from the other States. He remarked on the exemption of slaves from duty, whilst every other import was subjected to it, as an inequality that could not fail to strike the commercial sagacity of the Northern and Middle States.

Mr. LANGDON, of New Hampshire, was *strenuous for giving the power to the General Government. He could not, with a good conscience, leave it with the States, who could then go on with the traffic, without being restrained by the opinions here given, that they will themselves cease to import slaves.*

Gen. PINCKNEY, of South Carolina, thought himself bound to declare candidly, that he did not think South Carolina would stop her importations of slaves in any short time, but only stop them occasionally, as she now does. He moved to commit the clause that slaves might be made liable to an equal tax with other imports, which he thought right, and which would remove one difficulty that had been started.

Mr. RUTLEDGE, of South Carolina. — *If the Convention thinks that North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia will ever agree to the plan, unless their right to import slaves be untouched, the expectation is vain.* The people of those States will never be such fools as to give up so important an interest. He was strenuous against striking out the section, and seconded the motion of Gen. PINCKNEY for a commitment.

Mr. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, of Pennsylvania, wished the whole subject to be committed, including the clause relating to taxes on exports, and to a navigation act. These things may form a bargain among the Northern and Southern States.

Mr. BUTLER, of Georgia, declared that he never would agree to the power of taxing exports.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Connecticut, said *it was better to let the Southern States import slaves than to part with them, if they made that a sine qua non.* He was opposed to a tax on slaves imported, as making the matter worse because it implied they were *property*. He acknowledged that if the power of prohibiting the importation should be given to the General Government, it would be exercised. He thought it would be its duty to exercise the power.

Mr. REED, of Delaware, was for the commitment, provided the clause concerning taxes on exports should also be committed.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Connecticut, observed that that clause had been agreed to, and therefore could not be committed.

Mr. RANDOLPH, of Virginia, was for committing, in order that some middle ground might, if possible, be found. He could never agree to the clause as it stands. *He would sooner risk the Constitution.* He dwelt on the dilemma to which the Convention was exposed. By agreeing to the clause, it would revolt the Quakers, the Methodists, and many others in the States having no slaves. On the other hand, two States might be lost to the Union. Let us, then, he said, try the chance of a commitment.

On the question for committing the remaining part of sections 4 and 5 of article 7: Connecticut, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia — Ay, 7; New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Delaware — No, 3; Massachusetts, absent.

[The whole subject was thus recommitted for the purpose of coming to some compromise.]

From Madison Papers, Vol. III., page 1415.

FRIDAY, Aug. 24.

Gov. LIVINGSTON, of New Jersey, from the Committee of Eleven, delivered the following report:—

“Strike out so much of the 4th section as was referred to the Committee, and insert, ‘The migration or importation of such persons as the several States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Legislature prior to the year 1800.’”

From page 1427.

SATURDAY, Aug. 25.

The Report of the Committee of Eleven being taken up,

Gen. PINCKNEY, of South Carolina, moved to strike out the words, “the year eighteen

hundred," as the year limiting the importation of slaves, and to insert the words, "the year eighteen hundred and eight."

Mr. GORHAM, of Massachusetts, seconded the motion.

Mr. MADISON, of Virginia.—Twenty years will produce all the mischief that can be apprehended from the liberty to import slaves. So long a term will be more dishonorable to the American character than to say nothing about it in the Constitution.

On the motion, which passed in the affirmative, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia—Ay, 7; New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia—No, 4.

Mr. GOVERNEUR MORRIS, of Pennsylvania, was for making the clause read at once, "the importation of slaves into North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, shall not be prohibited, etc." This, he said, would be most fair, and would avoid the ambiguity by which, under the power with regard to naturalization, the liberty reserved to the States might be defeated. *He wished it to be known, also, that this part of the Constitution was a compliance with those States.* If the change of language, however, should be objected to by the members from those States, he should not urge it.

Col. MASON, of Virginia, was not against using the term "slaves," but against naming North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, *lest it should give offence to the people of those States.*

Mr. SHERMAN, of Connecticut, liked a description better than the term proposed, which had been declined by the old Congress, and were not pleasing to some people.

Mr. CLYMER, of Pennsylvania, concurred with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. WILLIAMSON, of North Carolina, said that both in opinion and practice he was against slavery, but thought it more in favor of humanity, from a view of all circumstances, *to let in South Carolina and Georgia on those terms, than to exclude them from the Union.*

Mr. GOVERNEUR MORRIS, of Pennsylvania, withdrew his motion.

Mr. DICKINSON wished the clause to be confined to the States which had not themselves prohibited the importation of slaves, and for that purpose moved to amend the clause, so as to read, "The importation of slaves into such of the States as shall permit the same, shall not be prohibited by the Legislature of the United States until the year 1808;" which was disagreed to, *nem con.*

The first part of the report was then agreed to, amended as follows: "The migration or importation of such persons as the several States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Legislature prior to the year 1808."

New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia—Ay, 7; New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia—No, 4.

MR. YANCEY'S LETTER ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE SLAVE-TRADE.

MR. YANCEY AND HIS ACCUSERS.

From the New York (Sunday) Herald, Nov. 18.

MONTGOMERY, Ala., Nov. 9, 1860.

To the Editor of the Herald:—

Since my return home, my attention has been called to an editorial article in the *New York Times*, of Oct. 27, headed "Mr. Yancey on Matters of Fact—The North and the Slave-trade." The article purports to be a reply to assertions made in my speeches in New York and Boston. Their substance will be found in the following quotations from those speeches. In my speech in New York, I said:—

"Our forefathers were not only slaveholders, but imported slaves from Africa. Virginia wished to suppress the trade, but Massachusetts and other States wished it to be carried on. [Laughter.] Massachusetts and those other States insisted that the slave-trade should not be prohibited by any act of Congress, and resisted all attempts to prohibit it until the act of Congress of 1808 was passed; for, by an article of the Constitution, which was beyond the reach of Congressional amendment, it was provided by our forefathers that no change should be made in the slave-trade until the year 1808. How did that sound with the modern theorists as to the existence of an irrepressible conflict?" [Applause.]

In my speech at Boston, I said:—

"Well, then, your fathers, in demanding that the slave-trade, which existed when the Declaration of Independence was made, should be continued; in demanding that the institution of slavery, which existed when the Constitution was formed, should have a wider basis; in demanding that slaves should be increased in number; in demanding that they should have the privilege of trading in them, of buying them and selling them to our people,—I ask you now candidly, did they not, in demanding all this, demand of their posterity perfect good faith in securing the title to that property?" ["No!" "Yes!"]

The editor of the *Times* asserts that "these statements show that the disunion orator is either very imperfectly read in the history of our country, or very reckless and unscrupulous in the statement of facts." The whole tenor and spirit of the article can be best shown by the following extract:—

"It is true, as he alleges, that Virginia was opposed to the continuance of the slave-trade, and we are sorry to say that this is the only truth contained in the statement."

The editor then proceeds to give garbled extracts from the debates in the Federal Convention, and adds his own weak attempts at argument to sustain his sweeping assertion. As the point made by me is one of some importance in the present aspect of political affairs, I ask the use of your almost universally read columns to spread my reply before the public. Analyze my statements, and they will be found to consist of the following points:—

1. The slave-trade existed when the Declaration of Independence was made.

2. Virginia desired to have that trade suppressed.

3. "Massachusetts and other States wished it to be carried on."

4. No change was to be made in the slave-trade provision in the Constitution prior to the year 1808.

These are the only matters stated as facts, and the truth of each and all, excepting that numbered two, is unqualifiedly denied by the editor of the *New York Times*. I might afford to leave the ignorance or mendacity of the editor of the *Times* to be judged of by the public intelligence as to the first statement made by me; but as I have before me the "Debates in the Federal Convention," from which he has made his quotations, I will simply refer him to the 3d volume of the *Madison Papers*, page 1389, on which will be found Mr. Sherman's (of Connecticut) statement: "As the States are now possessed of the right to import slaves, as the public good did not require it to be taken from them, etc., he thought it best to leave the matter as we find it." In sustaining my position, numbered three and four, I shall cite not merely what was said by certain delegates from some of the States, but also what is far more pertinent to the argument: what the States did; what they voted for and obtained. That is to be taken as the highest evidence of what each State wished to record as its will and decision.

By reference to *Madison's Papers*, vol. 2, p. 1226, the draft of a Constitution will be found as reported by the Committee of Detail. It did not provide for a prohibition or tax on the importation of slaves. On this a debate sprang up. I quote from that debate the views of leading delegates:—

Mr. L. MARTIN, of Maryland, proposed to vary article 7, section 4, so as to allow a prohibition or tax on the importation of slaves. (Vol. 3, p. 1388.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Connecticut, was for leaving the clause as it stands. Let every State

import what it pleases. The morality or wisdom of slavery are considerations belonging to the States themselves. (Vol. 3, p. 1380.)

Mr. SHERMAN, of Connecticut, was for leaving the clause as it stands. (Vol. 3, p. 1390.)

Col. MASON, of Virginia. — He lamented that some of our Eastern brethren had, from a lust of gain, embarked in this nefarious traffic. He held it essential, in every point of view, that the General Government should have the power to prevent the increase of slavery. (3d vol., p. 1390-1.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Connecticut. — He said, however, that if it was to be considered in a moral light, we ought to go further, and free those already in the country. As slaves also multiply so fast in Virginia and Maryland that it is cheaper to raise than import them, whilst in the sickly rice-swamps foreign supplies are necessary, if we go further than is urged, we shall be unjust towards South Carolina and Georgia. Let us not intermeddle. (3d vol., p. 1391.)

Mr. KING, of Massachusetts, thought the subject should be considered in a political light only. . . . He remarked on the exemption of slaves from duty, whilst every other import was subjected to it, as an inequality that could not fail to strike the commercial sagacity of the Northern and Middle States. (3d vol., p. 1394.)

Mr. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, of Pennsylvania, wished the whole subject to be committed, including the clause on imports. These things may form a bargain among the Southern and Northern States. (3d vol., p. 1395.)

The matter was committed. The Committee made report in substance as the section now stands in the Constitution, excepting that the Committee reported in favor of the year 1800.

Gen. PINCKNEY, of South Carolina, moved to substitute 1808 for 1800. (3d vol., p. 1427.)

Mr. GORHAM, of Massachusetts, seconded the motion.

Mr. MADISON, of Virginia. — Twenty years will produce all the mischief that can be apprehended from the liberty to import slaves.

On the motion, which passed in the affirmative, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and three other States, Ay. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Virginia, No. (3d vol., p. 1427.)

The first part of the report was then agreed to as amended, as follows: The migration or importation of such persons as the several States now existing shall think proper to admit shall not be prohibited prior to the year 1808. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Ay. 7. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, No. 4. (3d vol., pp. 1428 and 1429.)

The above extracts of opinions of leading Northern delegates, and the above cited votes of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and other States, prove my statement numbered 3. It proves that the proposition for "prohibition" of the "importation of slaves" came from Maryland, and was warmly supported, on moral grounds, by Virginia, and that Connecticut immediately pronounced: "Let every State import what it pleases;" while Massachusetts ably seconded Connecticut, that it was "to be considered in a political light only," and at once suggested the exemption of imported slaves from duty, however it "struck the commercial sagacity" of the North. He made it a subject for trade, not for moral speculations. Those extracts and votes also prove that when the committee reported the year 1800 as the period within which the trade should not be prohibited, Massachusetts promptly seconded and acted with South Carolina in a successful effort to extend the time for the importation of slaves from Africa to the year 1808.

I now turn to the consideration of the fourth statement made by me, and I continue extracts from the debates in the Federal Convention: —

Mr. GERRY, of Massachusetts, moved to reconsider article 19, namely, "On application of two-thirds of the States in this Union for an amendment of this Constitution, the Legislature of the United States shall call a Convention for that purpose." He said, "Two-

thirds may obtain a Convention, a majority of which can bind the Union to innovations that may subvert the State Constitutions altogether."

On Mr. GERRY's motion, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and six other States voted Ay. (3d vol., p. 1103-4-5.)

It being reconsidered, Mr. RUTLEDGE, of South Carolina, said "he never could agree to give a power by which the articles relating to slaves might be altered by the States not interested in that property, and prejudiced against it." In order to obviate that objection, these words were added to the proposition: "Provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the fourth and fifth sections of the seventh article." On this, which passed in the affirmative, the vote stood thus: Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Ay. Delaware, No. New Hampshire, divided.

These extracts and votes prove my fourth proposition or statement, and that after Massachusetts had seconded and voted for the section to extend the time for importation of slaves, she also called for the reconsideration of the article upon the mode of amending the Constitution, and voted for the clause that no amendment to be made should affect in any way the slave-trade guaranty. I have nothing more to add. Having now corrected the hostile and malignant criticisms of two leading editors in the Black Republican cause, namely, Mr. Thurlow Weed, and Mr. Henry J. Raymond, the first in my speech at Rochester, and the last in this letter, I leave the whole subject of those speeches to the judgment of an intelligent public. I may be permitted to observe, however, that I have not had an opportunity of correcting the reports which were made of them; and there are errors of style and statement in the reports which I should have been glad to have corrected.

Could those papers which have copied the *Times'* article do me the justice to publish my reply, I should be gratified by that act of courtesy, while, at the same time, the cause of truth would be subserved.

Your obedient servant,

W. L. YANCEY.

II. THE MOTIVES AND OBJECTS OF THE DISUNION MOVEMENT.

NEW YORK, Nov. 26, 1860.

In a former letter I corrected the misrepresentations, historical and statistical, by which you endeavored to convince the people of the Northern States that they ought to permit the indefinite *increase of slavery*. I propose now to consider the bearing of that argument upon the present disunion movement.

You are urging the State of Alabama to secede from the Union, — or, if she will not take the lead in secession, to join any other State that may do so. What you advise her to do, you think every slaveholding State should do also, — but you are unwilling to trust the decision of the question to the voice of all those States, assembled in Convention and acting together, — or even to the calm judgment and consenting action of the Cotton States alone. You insist that some one State shall withdraw from the Union by herself, trusting that the community of interest, the pride and the commitments of the other Cotton States will impel them, not only to imitate her example, but to come to her aid, in resisting any armed attempt of the Federal Government to support the Constitution and maintain the integrity of the Union.

I am constrained by the evidence of events to confess that your efforts have been crowned with a startling degree of success. Although the final step has not yet been taken by any State, public sentiment in three or four of them seems quite prepared to take it. The machinery which you organized some years since for the purpose of "firing the Southern heart, instructing the Southern mind, and giving courage to each other," has done its work far more effectually than even you could have anticipated; and that "Proper Moment," when, as you declared in your letter of June 15, 1858, you could "by one organized, concerted action, precipitate the Cotton States into a revolution," seems in very truth to have arrived. Gladly as I would have shut my eyes to so unwelcome a fact, I cannot doubt that an overwhelming majority of the people of South Carolina are prepared for secession, — and that after the blow has once been struck, there is much reason to believe that a majority of the people in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi will rally, in arms if necessary, to her support.

What is likely to be the result of such a movement, I may perhaps consider before I close this correspondence. At present my purpose is rather to examine its motives.

The great mass of the people in the cotton-growing States are imbued with the general conviction that their separation from the Union is desirable, — and the same thing is true, though to a much less extent, of the people in the other slaveholding States. If we were to ask them what are the reasons for such a conviction, — what are the precise wrongs which they have suffered under the Union, and what the advantages they expect to secure for themselves by leaving it, — we should receive very different answers from different States. The motives which influence disunionists in Alabama and South Carolina are not the motives which influence disunionists in Maryland and Virginia. All would agree that their common institution — slavery — is in some way menaced by the government as it now exists, and especially as it will exist after it passes into the hands of the Republican party; but they would differ as to the shape which its perils assume. In order to ascertain the real motive of disunion, therefore, we must go to those few leading minds with whom, like all great movements, it had its origin. Less than two years before the Declaration of Independence was issued, Washington expressed the sentiment of the great body of the people when he declared that the colonies had no thought or desire to sever their connection with the mother country. But Samuel Adams, and James Otis, and John Adams, and Patrick Henry knew, five years before, that independence was the real object and would be the crowning consummation of the current popular protests against English rule.

The disunion movement has been set on foot by a comparatively small number of men in the Southern States. Mr. Calhoun planted the seeds of it in the intellects and the ambition of the most prominent and influential of the rising statesmen of the South. His doctrines found no lodgment in the popular mind. His arguments were too abstract for general appreciation, and the idea of disunion was never popular out of South Carolina during his lifetime. Since his death the apostles of his creed have been untiring in its propagation; and no one man has been more zealous than yourself in this work. You have been, moreover, somewhat bolder and more frank in the

application of his theories to the practical policy of the country; you have been more willing than many of those who were working with you, to avow and advocate the measure which those theories were intended to support. I feel justified, therefore, in regarding you as the best representative of the disunion movement, and in seeking the causes of this movement in your opinions and declarations.

What, then, are *your* reasons for urging a dissolution of the Union?

ELECTION OF A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT.

If I were to ask every disunionist in the South this question, nine-tenths of them would probably reply, the election of Lincoln and the triumph of the Republican party. But you know that in and of itself this constitutes no justification whatever. You claim that secession is strictly a constitutional proceeding. But certainly it is not more so than the election of a President in strict compliance with every form and every requirement of the Constitution. You say he has been elected by a sectional vote. Admit the fact; — that does not make it one whit the less constitutional. The Constitution knows nothing of *sections* in the Union, — either as elements of power or as the claimants of rights. It recognizes only States and People, and it assigns to each their just proportion of power in the election of a President, as in every other function of government. The States have an equality in the Electoral College to the extent of two votes each; and then each State has an additional weight in proportion to its population. This provision, which the Constitution deemed sufficient to secure the individual States from injustice, has been fully complied with. The election of Lincoln involves not the slightest departure from the Constitution in any particular. If secession were equally constitutional, your right to secede would be beyond question.

But he is elected by the Republican party, and by a minority of the popular vote, through the divisions of his opponents. True, — but Republicans are *people*; a constitutional majority, composed wholly of Republicans, is not one whit the less a constitutional majority of the people than if it were composed in part of others; and a *constitutional* majority — not an absolute, numerical majority — is all that is required for the election of a President. It is a maxim of law, moreover, as well as of common sense, applicable to public as well as to private controversies, that no man shall take advantage of his own wrong; and those who are now disunionists in the South, with you at their head, are directly responsible for that rupture of the Democratic party which aided, if it did not cause, the election of Lincoln.

These, you will say, are technical reasons against secession. True, and they are only assigned in answer to technical reasons in its favor. If you stand upon the Constitution, and assert your right under it to secede in case of its violation, I am free to show that no such violation has taken place, and that you have, therefore, no such right.

Nor can you find any pretext for secession in the character of the man thus elected. If you have made yourself at all familiar with it, — as you are bound to do before making it the ground of objection, — you must know that the Union contains no purer, no more upright, no more patriotic citizen; no man more just and fair-minded, more certain to discharge the duties of

his office with scrupulous regard to the rights of all, than Mr. Lincoln. But even if this were not so, I understand you to have expressly waived this as a reason for secession, in your speech at Montgomery, in 1858, where I find you saying: —

“If I understand my distinguished friend from Virginia (Mr. Pryor), the election of a Black Republican President would be an issue for disunion. I understand my learned colleague (Mr. Hillard) to say that upon that issue he would be ready to dissolve the Union. I say with all deference to my colleagues here, *that no more inferior issue could be tendered to the South upon which we should dissolve the Union than the loss of an election.* If in the contest of 1860 for the Presidency, Seward should receive the legal number of votes necessary to elect him, according to the forms of the Constitution and laws, gentlemen say that then will be the time to dissolve the Union. If that is made the cause of disunion, I say to them that I will go with them, but I will feel that *I am going in the wake of an inferior issue*; that there was a banner over me that is not of the kind I would wish.

“When I am asked to raise the flag of revolution against an election under the forms of laws and the Constitution, *I am asked to do an unconstitutional thing*, according to the Constitution as it now exists. *I am asked to put myself in the position of a rebel, of a traitor*; in a position where, if the government should succeed and put down the revolution, *I and my friends can be arraigned before the Supreme Court of the United States, and there be sentenced to be hanged for violating the Constitution and laws of my country.*”

The fact, therefore, that a Republican President has been elected cannot be your reason for disunion. As a symptom and precursor of other events it might have more weight. If there were any substantial reasons for supposing that Mr. Lincoln would aid or countenance any infraction of Southern rights, any trespass upon Southern interests, any attempt to disturb the public peace in the Southern States, you would be quite right in putting the South in an attitude of defence, and of preparation for resistance, to any extent which the injustice, when it should come, might require. But it is scarcely becoming a great and brave people to act upon a mere apprehension of dangers that may never arrive; and in this case you have every assurance which Mr. Lincoln's declared sentiments and which the necessities of his position can give, that no trespass upon Southern rights will be permitted which he has the power to prevent.

You fear that, whatever his personal opinions and purposes may be, he will be governed by the requirements of his party. But you have seen enough of public life to know that seeking power against a party in possession is one thing, and wielding it under all the responsibilities which it involves, is quite another. The Republican party will now have far more interest than any other in preventing renewals of the John Brown raid; in punishing every movement against the peace of a Southern State; in enforcing the laws, suppressing everything like resistance to their execution, and securing that public tranquillity which rests upon justice and equal rights. You mistake the North in supposing that the election of Lincoln indicates any disposition on the part of the people to countenance any infraction of Southern rights. They elected him because they did not believe he had the slightest sympathy with any such purpose, — and because they knew that the public welfare imperatively demanded a change in the spirit and tone of the Federal councils. And if the Republican Administration

should tolerate the least invasion of Southern rights, the very first elections would deprive it of the support of every considerable Northern State.

If, therefore, you had no stronger reason than the election of a Republican President, I am sure you would not urge the secession of the Southern States.

SURRENDER OF FUGITIVE SLAVES.

The refusal to surrender fugitive slaves, — and especially the enactment by several Northern States of Personal Liberty bills, with the apparent intent to prevent their recovery, — is much more generally assigned as a reason for disunion. But this cannot be your motive, nor that of the Gulf States whose action will dissolve the Union, if it is dissolved at all; for they suffer scarcely any practical inconvenience from this source. Out of the eleven hundred slaves who escape from the South annually, I presume that all the Cotton States together do not lose *fifty*. Virginia, Maryland, and Kentucky are the States upon whom this wrong and this loss fall; yet they are Union States. They have so little sympathy with the secession movement that you will not trust yourself in Convention with them, and the disunionists of South Carolina insultingly repel all advice or counsel from them on this subject. You must be aware, moreover, that the Supreme Court has released the States from all obligation to return fugitive slaves by devolving that duty upon the Federal Government; that the law of 1850, in fulfilment of that duty, by its defective provision for proofs of identity, subjects free citizens of Northern States to the danger of being carried into slavery, as has happened once at least since its enactment; and that the professed object of these Personal Liberty bills has been to protect free citizens from that peril, and not to prevent the return of actual fugitives. The injustice which they may work to the owners of fugitive slaves is not greater than the injustice which may arise to free men from the harsh and unguarded execution of the Fugitive Slave Law.

I am not disposed, however, to enter upon any vindication of the general policy of these bills. I have always opposed them as at war, in their spirit, with the constitutional obligation to surrender fugitive slaves, and as calculated needlessly to exasperate the people of the Southern States. Their enactment has been usually due to the race of rival partisans for local popularity. It has been part of the machinery of our political contests; and as a matter of practical importance I presume I am quite right in saying, that all the Personal Liberty bills that have been passed in all the States have never released half-a-dozen fugitives from the service from which they had escaped. I am quite sure that none of the Southern States would dream of secession on account of the actual injury they sustain from these Personal Liberty bills, in the loss of their fugitive slaves; for if that were the motive of secession it would not be most powerful where the injury is the least. In that case, Kentucky, and not South Carolina, would take the lead in the movement of disunion.

You say the passage of these bills is insulting to the South, — an outrage upon her rights, and a mockery of her sufferings. I do not deny it. I admit that there has been a great deal too much that is offensive to Southern feeling in the action of the North upon this subject. But has all the insult been

upon one side in this matter? Have the constitutional rights of Northern men — their right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” — always been respected in the South? I merely suggest this point as worthy your consideration, if you propose to dissolve the Union because you have been insulted. We have quite as much ground of complaint on this score as you have. Neither section has been blameless. Both have steps to retrace and reforms to practice; and I think you will find the North quite ready to meet the South, at least half way in this matter.

THE TERRITORIAL QUESTION

But you claim the right to carry slavery into the territories, and that position, you say, is denied by the Republican party. The assertion of *the right* is one thing, and its exercise is quite another. I think I run no risk of contradiction when I say that the present holders of slaves in the Southern States care nothing about the *exercise* of the right asserted on their behalf. They do not wish to go to the territories themselves, — still less to take their slaves with them. There are no territories now belonging to the Union into which slaves could be carried without a prodigious sacrifice of their value. What slave-owner in Alabama will take slaves, worth from one thousand to one thousand five hundred dollars there, into Kansas, or New Mexico, where they are not worth, either for sale or for hire, one-half of that amount, — to say nothing of the risk of losing them? Mr. Gauden, of Georgia, was quite right when he told the Charleston Convention that the *South had no slaves to send into the territories*, — she had not enough to supply the demand for labor at home. She needs on her own plantations all the slave labor she can possibly command; and any attempt to send slaves into the territories would only diminish her product of cotton, weaken her domestic strength, and add nothing to her wealth elsewhere. Nor are the political considerations which the question involves likely to change her action. For if she should send slaves into any territory in order to make it a slave territory, she must draw additional supplies from Maryland, Delaware, or Virginia, and thus do all in her power to convert them into free States. The South never can colonize the territories with slaves, until she can be at liberty to increase her supply by importation from abroad.

There was a time when the question of slavery in the territories was the paramount political question of the day. I think that time has passed; and that it can never come up again, as a practical question, until after the African slave-trade has been reopened. The Gulf States will send no slaves to Kansas or New Mexico so long as they command such enormous prices at home; nor will Virginia or Kentucky send slaves thither so long as their prices rule three times as high in the markets at their doors. Slaveholders who emigrate into new regions first sell their slaves, and thus take their property with them in the shape of cash. As you clearly expressed it in your Montgomery speech: —

“Slaves are too valuable to be risked in a contest with Free-Soil-dom in any of our new territories. The consequence is that this species of property is kept in the States which protect it, and where there is a demand for it.”

Practically, therefore, we shall hear nothing more of the territorial question until the greater question which lies behind it, and gives it all its importance, shall have been decided. And this, I think, is the general conviction of the reflecting portion of the people of the North, even among the Republican party. Mr. Seward, you will remember, in one of his campaign speeches, said he considered it settled that there would be no further extension of slavery into the territories until the African slave-trade should be restored; and it cannot have escaped your observation that the Republican Convention at Chicago held language on this point very different from that used at Philadelphia in 1856. As things now stand, I believe the North would lose nothing whatever by leaving the whole subject of extending slavery into the territories entirely untouched; and in the absence of any further causes of irritation from the South, I think it not at all unlikely that the North would consent that the question should be decided by the course of events and the natural influences of climate and emigration. If I held any official position, or any post which would involve any party in the responsibility for these opinions, I might not hazard such an expression of them. But I give it as my own judgment, based upon the grounds I have already mentioned.

But suppose this to be true. Suppose the incoming administration should decide to leave this whole matter precisely where it stands at present, making no attempt to prohibit by law the extension of slavery into the territories, conceding that the inhabitants may, when they come to form a State Constitution, and not before, admit or exclude slavery in their own discretion, and agreeing to admit the State into the Union in either case; would the South accept that as a final adjustment of the differences between the two sections? Would you, — and those who are acting with you in the disunion movement?

I think you would reply: “Yes, if you will concede it as a matter of *right*, of principle, with whatever logical consequences that principle may involve. But if it is offered on grounds of expediency alone, — as a practical solution of an embarrassing question, — *No.*” What the South contends for is the *principle* that her slaves are property in the view of the Constitution, — to be held, treated, and in all respects regarded by the Federal Government as property, and nothing else, precisely like horses, cattle, and other movable chattels. It is the absolute, indefeasible *right* itself, and not the *exercise* of the right, which the South would demand as the price of her remaining in the Union.

STATE EQUALITY AND THE SLAVE-TRADE.

Now, why do you make this distinction? Why would you refuse the privilege of carrying slaves into the territories, unless you could secure at the same time the absolute *right* to do so? Because the former would be valueless without the latter; because you have no slaves to take into the territories, — and you need the *right*, and the principle on which it rests, in order to get them, and thus render the concession itself of any practical value. In other words, you require the restoration of the African slave-trade, in order to extend slavery into the territories. The recognition of the

principle you contend for will give you both; while the bare concession of the extension itself will secure you neither.

The principle you assert is the absolute equality of the States in regard to the tenure of property, — that each State shall be allowed to make its own laws concerning property, — the ownership of persons or of things, — and that any right of property which any State may see fit thus to create, shall be recognized by the Federal Government as absolute and indefeasible.

This is what you understand by the equality of the States. You will concede, I think, that I do not state the claim too broadly. Any restriction of it, — anything less than is included in it, — defeats the purpose for which it is put forward. But suppose it to be conceded. It follows, of course, that any person may do what he pleases with his property. He may hold it, or buy and sell it, wherever the jurisdiction of the Constitution extends, and the Federal Government is bound to protect him in so doing. Whatever I may do with broadcloth, you may do with a negro slave, — anywhere within the jurisdiction of the Federal Constitution, — if that Constitution, as you contend, puts the two upon the same footing. All the property of all the States, whatever any State chooses to make property by her local laws, — becomes property in the eye of the Federal Constitution, and consequently becomes the subject of commerce, — domestic, or foreign, at the will of its owner, — subject only to such uniform laws as may be adopted for all property, in the regulation of commerce, between the States or with foreign nations.

How far the practical application of this principle would affect the general subject of property, the purpose of this correspondence does not lead me, nor do its limits permit me, to inquire. It would evidently *put the whole matter of property under the control of any one State*, and each State would be sovereign, *quoad hoc*, not only over its own affairs, but over the affairs of all the other States. That the principle would involve the restoration of the foreign trade in slaves, if any State should choose to enter upon it, you will not deny, nor have I the slightest doubt. Indeed, in your Montgomery speech you took precisely this ground, and denounced the laws of Congress prohibiting the slave-trade as unconstitutional, because they denied and destroyed this principle of the equality of the States. You say: —

“The laws prohibiting the foreign slave-trade are in violation of the spirit of the Constitution, and are unjust and an insult to the South, and ought to be repealed. . . . *What right has this government to discriminate against one of the States in the Union that has equal rights in the Union? Where will you find the right in the Constitution? Nowhere. Will my friend from Virginia (Mr. Pryor) find in any clause of the Constitution any enactment against the slave-trade? No, he will not find it there. What will he find in that Constitution? He will find simply this: ‘Congress shall enact no law prohibiting the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States may see fit to admit before the year 1808.’ What do you call that? Why, that is one of the constitutional guaranties of the slave-trade. . . .*

“In 1807 a law was enacted, making it a misdemeanor to import a slave from abroad. Now I ask every sensible man in this Convention, *was not that statute a violation of the spirit of the Constitution? What was the spirit of the Constitution? It was that African slavery within our dominions was legal, and that we stood upon an equal footing with all the rest of the States with reference to this species of property. And what became of our equality when the law was passed that said, you of the South shall not import negroes from Africa, though*

you of the North may import jackasses from Malta? *What became of our equality then?* A blow was struck against it when this government passed a law discriminating against the slave labor of the South. . . *The law struck at the equality of the South.* If so, it follows as plainly, as that two and two make four, that the law is an *unconstitutional law.*

"Is there any gentleman here prepared to maintain that we are not *equal in the Union* according to the Constitution? If so, then I shall be able to understand his argument against the African slave-trade, and in favor of the constitutionality of these enactments. . . . If it is right to buy slaves in Virginia, in what consists the wrong of buying slaves in Cuba, Brazil, or upon the coast of Africa? . . .

"It is a law that *discriminates against Southern property*; no such discrimination is right. It is a law that *discriminates against Southern labor*; no such discrimination can be made, *and our equality in the Union be yet recognized.* I therefore invoke the principle of free-trade here, the principle of State-rights, the principle of strict construction, and the *great fundamental principle of our right and equality in this Union,* and consequently of our right to erase from our statute-book every evidence of our *inequality* that has been put there by the dominant and antagonistic class that has fed upon our very life-blood."

I might greatly multiply these extracts; but I have given enough to show what you mean by the *principle* of State Equality, and for what purposes you demand the recognition of your absolute *right* to take your slaves, as your property, into the territories. I do not suppose that the great mass of the Southern people hold these views of the principle, or join in demanding its recognition, with any such purpose. Neither did they dream in 1850 that the enactment of the Compromise measures contained a principle which would involve the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. But when they were told in 1854 that it did, they united in claiming the benefit of all the consequences of that principle, just as loudly as if they had been provided for at the outset. A man may have no thought of seizing his neighbor's farm; but show him that he has color of title, and he will speedily commence proceedings for its recovery. You and your associates in the organization and conduct of this movement know very well that, if you can establish the principle to-day, you can claim all the consequences that may flow from it to-morrow.

CAUSES OF THE DISUNION FEELING.

And this brings me to what I regard as the real motive of the disunion movement. That motive has taken precise and definite form, probably, in the minds of a comparatively small number of those who are most active in the movement itself. The great mass of those who sympathize with it and give it their aid are governed by the vague but powerful feeling that the South, as a section, having peculiar institutions and peculiar necessities, *is gradually growing politically weaker and weaker in the Union*; that the North is rapidly gaining a preponderance in the Federal Councils; and that there is no hope that the South can ever regain the ascendancy, or even a political equality, under the Constitution and within the Union. The election of Lincoln is regarded as conclusive proof that Northern supremacy is a fixed fact; and it is on this account that it has so concentrated and intensified the resentment of the Southern States. No community ever sinks down willingly into a position of inferiority. Its instinct is to struggle against it, and the struggle will be violent in proportion to the magnitude of the evils

which inferiority is believed to involve. All the sectional excitements and political paroxysms of the last twenty years have been but the strenuous resistance of the South to what she has felt to be the inevitable tendency of events. The annexation of Texas, — the claim to California, — the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, — the fight for Kansas, — the filibustering in Central America, — the clamor for Cuba, have been only the straws at which the slaveholding section has clutched, in the hope to save itself from being engulfed in the rising tide of Northern power. To them it was not the steady and silent rising of a peaceful sea. Its roar came to their ears upon the stormy blasts of anti-slavery fanaticism, — and sounded to them like the knell of destiny, — the precursor of degradation and ruin to their homes and their hopes.

I do not wonder at this alarm. I cannot blame it, or deny that it has its origin in just and patriotic sentiments. I do think that the leading intellects of the Southern States — those to whom as in every community the great mass of the people look for guidance, and by whom they are guided, whether they know it or not — ought to have foreseen this result, and made up their minds long ago to act *with* the laws of Nature, rather than against them, — to yield to the spirit of the age, the tendencies of civilization and Christianity, instead of resisting them; to make allies instead of enemies of those great moral principles which are proving too powerful for the mightiest monarchies of the earth, and before which it is idle to hope that despotism can make a permanent stand upon this continent. The fathers of our Republic did so. They framed the Constitution upon such a basis, and in the belief that it would be administered in such a spirit. They gave the government they created power over the slave-trade, not doubting that, after a few years, that power would be exercised with the general assent of all the States, and that all would feel, as they felt, the necessity of providing for the gradual disappearance of slavery itself. And for a series of years the event justified this expectation. The prohibition of the slave-trade in 1807, recommended by Jefferson, was enacted with the unanimous consent of all the States North and South, and down to 1830 there was a constant and hopeful tendency towards emancipation in nearly all the slave-holding States. But since that time the leading intellects of the South have turned back the whole current of Southern sentiment upon this subject. In your own words, “an entirely new idea has sprung up, and is now universal in the South, upon the great question of slavery, in its operation upon mankind and labor.” Mr. Calhoun taught the South that slavery was, and must always be, the sole basis of its prosperity, and that the leading aim of the South must be to fortify, to increase, and to make it perpetual. You and others have inherited his opinions, and devoted yourselves to their propagation. And in due process of time you have come into direct collision on this subject with the spirit and the letter of the Constitution which our fathers framed; and you now find that you cannot reach the object at which you aim, without destroying that Constitution, and breaking up the Union which it created.

The people of the South sympathize with the disunion movement from a keen sense of the growing superiority of the North. How that superiority can be overcome within the Union they do not perceive, nor have they

any definite idea of any policy by which it can be contested, after the South shall have seceded. You, on the contrary, have very definite ideas on both points. You trace the growing inequality of the two sections, in material development and consequent political power, to the *discrimination of the Federal Government against the South in regard to the supply of labor*, — which is in every community the great element of growth and of wealth. The North is permitted to increase indefinitely its supply of labor by immigration, — by inviting labor from abroad, — while the South is forbidden to seek a similar increase by importations of the peculiar kind of labor on which, most unwisely, it has come entirely to rely. When the price of labor rises in the North it invites and secures an additional supply from abroad, and when the supply is excessive, it overflows into the new territories, and, planting there new and free States, swells the political power of the North. At the South the enactments of Congress have arrested this natural operation of the law of supply and demand. When the price of labor rises at the South, there is no such resource for increasing the supply; there is no way of lowering the price, and of securing a surplus to send into the new territories. And this is the reason, in your opinion, why the South falls behind the North in material development and in political power. These laws forbidding the slave-trade operate upon the South precisely as laws forbidding emigration would operate upon the North. *And the remedy you propose, is to be sought in the repeal of those laws*, — in permitting every State to import such labor as it requires. Then, as you say: —

“The whole matter will be left to the operation of the law of supply and demand, precisely as the mule, the horse, the corn, and the cotton-trade are governed now, and I insist that *there should be no more discrimination by law against the slave-trade than against the nutmeg-trade of New England. Let it be governed by the law of supply and demand alone. If we do not want the negroes, then we do not have them; if we do want them, then we can get them. I think this ought to be governed by that rule.*”

This, then, is your ground of discontent with the Federal Government, — that it *prevents the increase of slavery*. And I believe it to be at the root of the disunion feeling now so prevalent in the cotton-growing States. Probably not one in ten of the mass of the Southern people — perhaps not one in five of those who are to-day in favor of secession — would declare themselves in favor of reopening the slave-trade. Nor is it your policy to press the subject upon their attention, or even to allow it to be made a topic of discussion, while the issue of secession is pending. You have made up your mind that your object cannot be attained within the Union. “I do not expect,” you said at Montgomery, “that the North, which has the majority, will ever vote for the measure, — therefore *these laws will never be repealed.*” You are therefore for secession. But it would not be safe to trust the issue, either before or after that event, to the general action of all the slaveholding States, — for several of them are known to be utterly hostile to it. As you declared at Montgomery, it is the interest of Virginia to have negroes scarce, because they will command a high price, — while it is for the interest of Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama to have them numerous, in order to have them cheap. You propose, therefore, to exclude the Frontier States

from all consultation upon this subject, — and from all agency in the formation of the new Confederacy which you propose to establish. “Virginia and the other Frontier States,” says the Charleston *Mercury*, the organ and mouthpiece of your party, “may as well at once understand their position with the Cotton States. *The Southern States will disregard their counsel.* They intend to secede from the Union, and construct a Union *among themselves*, and will be glad to find Virginia and other Border States in counsel with them *after this great revolution.*” And other journals in the disunion interest deprecate the discussion of the slave-trade issue as certain to divide public sentiment, and weaken, if not destroy, the entire secession movement.

At present it is your policy to accumulate arguments for disunion, rather than to sift and define them. You can command far more support for that measure by declaiming on the growing power and preponderance of the North, and the steadily waning influence of the South, in the federal councils, than by tracing them to their cause and fixing public attention upon the remedy you propose to apply. But the time will come when specific measures must be proposed, — and then foremost among them will be the restoration of the African slave-trade.

I think you are quite right in believing that the Federal Government will never consent to the reopening of that traffic. The North will never concede that point, — nor lay the foundation for its concession, — directly or indirectly, under any circumstances, nor for any consideration which you can offer as an equivalent. They will meet you on this issue upon any field you may select. They will accept the hazard of disunion a thousand times, rather than that as its alternative.

III. SECESSION UNCONSTITUTIONAL, AND IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT WAR.

NEW YORK, Dec. 10, 1860.

You will see from my last letter that I have no faith in the validity or sincerity of the reasons assigned for a secession of the Southern States. The motive for that movement is neither the failure of the North to surrender fugitive slaves, nor the enactment of Personal Liberty bills, nor the practical inability of Southern slaveholders to take their slaves into the territories of the United States. If you could have full and sufficient guaranties upon every one of these points, you would be just as zealous, though not perhaps so sanguine, an advocate of secession as you are now. What you and your associate conspirators seek is the restoration of the African slave-trade. To use your own words, “We of Alabama *want slaves to be cheap*; — we want to buy, not to sell them. It is a Virginia idea that slaves ought to be high. Virginia wants one thousand five hundred dollars each for her negroes: — *we want to get them cheaper.*” “CHEAP NEGROES” is the grand consummation at which you aim, — the mighty motive which rouses you to the task of destroy-

ing a government which was formed to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

You will not understand me as implying that this is the motive of all whom you have enlisted in the secession movement. If it were, you would not persist so vehemently in excluding all but the Cotton States from your counsels. You would have admitted Virginia and Tennessee and Kentucky to a share in the conduct of your conspiracy. If this were a movement in the interest of all the slaveholding States, it would have been decided in a general convention of them all. But you know very well that in such a convention it would be impossible to conceal your real motive,—and that its exposure would be fatal to the scheme. Virginia is now, as she has been from the earliest moment of her independent existence, opposed to the slave-trade:—South Carolina, therefore, gives her formal notice that her aid is not desired, and that her advice will not be heeded, in the movement of secession. Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland,—all the Frontier States,—would set their faces like a flint against reopening the African slave-trade. They are to have no voice, therefore, in the decision of the question: it is only after the Revolution shall have been accomplished that they will be "permitted" to join your new Confederacy. Even in South Carolina you deprecate a discussion of the subject. For you know that the more intelligent and considerate portion of the people, even in the Gulf States, are opposed to this cardinal feature of your policy. They believe, as we do, that we have negroes enough on this continent already. They know that whatever may be their relations to society,—whether slave or free,—they are a drawback upon our civilization,—a clog upon the refinement and Christian culture of the community into which they are thrust.

This subject, therefore, is to be kept out of sight until disunion shall have been accomplished. The great mass of the people in the slaveholding States are to be moved by other considerations. Their pride, their local jealousies, their fears, have been practised upon by way of preparation for the "proper moment," when they are to be precipitated into revolution. Once out of the Union, their destinies will be in the hands of the boldest and the strongest of their leaders. The Gulf States are first to organize the new government,—and determine the fundamental basis on which it shall rest. Absolute free trade in "negroes from Africa as in mules from Malta," will be the cornerstone of this new temple. Each State will be permitted to trade in whatever it may prefer,—to import negroes or nutmegs, at its own discretion. And the Frontier States will be offered this alternative,—either to join the new Confederacy upon these terms; to join the North, with the certainty of being compelled to emancipate their slaves; or to stand between the two, and receive the blows and the buffetings of both.

It is by no means impossible that this ingenious, double conspiracy, against the Union and the frontier Slave States, may meet with at least a partial and temporary success. But even if you should establish an independent Confederation or consolidation of the Cotton States, can you suppose for a moment that you would be permitted by the civilized nations of the world to reopen the African slave-trade and efface the brand which all Christendom has combined to fix upon it? All the great powers of the earth have entered into treaties, or have made laws, by which that trade is declared to be

piracy, and have pledged their united strength for its extinction. Do you expect them to abrogate these treaties at the demand of your Southern Confederacy? Do you expect them to relax their vigilance in enforcing them? By what inducements would you bring about such a result? Part of your scheme is to extend your conquests into Mexico and Central America, — to add control of the Caribbean Sea to your supremacy over the Gulf, — to bring Cuba into your Southern Union. Are these designs likely to meet the views and enlist the sympathies of either England or France? You rely, perhaps, on the favor with which the Apprenticeship system has been regarded by France, and the indications that it may be tolerated even by England. But you must remember that these measures are resorted to only for the supply of their own necessities, not for the building up of rival States, and that the principle has been insisted on by both nations, as indispensable, that the emigration shall be voluntary, — that the service stipulated shall be for a term of years and be paid for, and that the most perfect security shall be given for a full compliance with these conditions, and for discharging and returning the laborers at the expiration of the stipulated term. Even in this form, it is by no means certain that England and France will enter upon the system. But would such a system answer your purposes? You want *slaves*, — not apprentices, — slaves for life, — who shall be property, — not persons, — incapable of consent or stipulation of any kind, — who shall have no rights which white men will be bound to respect, — with whom no bargain is binding, and whose children and children's children shall thus be mere property, absolutely and to the remotest generation. Anything short of this, any limitations or conditions upon the traffic, would introduce into the system of slavery, as it now exists among you, elements fatal to its continuance. You must be strangely insensible to the moral sentiment of the age, — to the ideas which are steadily advancing to supremacy over the Christian world, — if you expect ever to gain the assent of any civilized nation on the face of the earth to such a scheme.

The first result of successful secession would be to increase immensely the vigor and vigilance of the great naval powers in suppressing the slave-trade. Nothing has paralyzed those efforts hitherto half so much as the unwillingness of our Federal Government to offend the South by any special zeal in this direction. It has been made, to some extent, an American question, and has been complicated by considerations of naval rights and of national honor. Our refusal to concede a mutual right of search, and the hesitation of England to enforce upon Spain the fulfilment of her treaty stipulations, lest she should become involved in a war which might end in the transfer of Cuba to the United States, have done more than all other causes combined to prevent or embarrass the suppression of the slave-trade. Both these obstacles would be removed by secession. The North will have no motive for further hesitation. The mutual right of search will be conceded. The slave-trade, if prosecuted at all, will be prosecuted just as piracy is, — under the ban and outlawry of the world. The moral sentiment of this country will be released from the shackles which the Constitution, and the Union with the slaveholding South, have imposed upon it, and the slave-trade will lose the only shadow of toleration it has hitherto enjoyed.

Even if you secede, therefore, and establish your new Slave Empire, you will be no nearer the object you seek than you are at present.

THE QUESTION OF SECESSION.

And now let us consider this subject of secession. What is it? On what basis does it rest? Under what form, and by what means, do you propose to achieve it?

In the first place, you claim that secession is a constitutional right — that this Confederacy being the result of a compact between sovereign States, each State has a right to withdraw from it at pleasure. When a State, therefore, declares itself out of the Union, the Federal Government has no right to coerce it into remaining. It has no power to make war on a State. The President of the United States holds this opinion, — that is, he comes as near holding it as he does to holding any opinion on this subject.

Now, I do not propose to discuss the question whether the Constitution is or is not a "compact." That may be an important point to settle, but it seems to me quite immaterial to the present issue. For even if it is a compact, and nothing more, I can see no reason why one of the thirty-two parties to it should have the right to break it at discretion. A compact implies a mutual obligation. It is binding upon all who become parties to it. It is so alike in private and in public transactions. If two men form a partnership, unlimited in its term, that partnership can only be dissolved by mutual consent, or by appeal to a common arbiter. In the lowest form of private compacts, no one party to a bargain has the right to repudiate it at pleasure, — to absolve himself from the obligations and responsibilities which it involves, and resume the position which he held before he entered into it. Nor can States or nations claim any exemption from this law of common morals. Nothing is more firmly established in the laws of nations and the usages of the world than the principle that a deliberate repudiation of treaty obligations is a just cause of war. Even if the Union, then, be only a treaty, — a compact between the States, — it is nevertheless binding upon them all. Each one is bound to abide by all its engagements, — to discharge faithfully the obligations into which it has entered.

You may say they are sovereign, and, therefore, sole masters of their own acts, — judges of their own obligations, — and subject to no common and controlling tribunal. Even if they were so once, they ceased to be so when they parted with a portion of their sovereignty and agreed to accept a common arbiter. No nation can be so absolutely sovereign as not to be bound by its own obligations.

Suppose we take the opposite position, — that any State has a right to secede at will: where will it land us? If one State may secede, another may. Suppose all resolve upon secession: What becomes of the Federal Government? What becomes of its obligations, — of its debts, — its common property, — of its engagements entered into with foreign powers? What becomes of its flag, its army, its navy? All these things, you say, are to be matters of future arrangement. But that does not settle the question of legality. If secession is a matter of constitutional right, — then there must be some constitutional provision, direct or inferential, for the emergencies

which grow out of it. All these obligations are to be annulled:—but then, you say, they may be renewed if the thirty-two parties to the old compact see fit to renew them. But what if they do not? What would foreign creditors of the United States say to such a scheme? What would foreign nations say to such a mode of disposing of the engagements and undertakings into which they have entered with the Republic?

THE GOVERNMENT DEALS WITH INDIVIDUALS, AND NOT WITH STATES.

But it seems to me that this question has been involved in a great deal of needless confusion, by the use of the term *secession*. “Words are things,” and in this instance, as in many others, the adroit substitution of one word for another has created an issue entirely foreign to the case. The Federal Government is under no necessity of discussing the question of secession. The only point it has to decide is *the right and the duty of enforcing obedience to its own laws*.

The Constitution gives Congress power to make certain laws for the people of the United States. It is the duty of every citizen of the United States to obey those laws, provided they are constitutional, and to refer that point to tribunals created for the purpose of deciding it. Has the Federal Government the right and the power to enforce such obedience upon its citizens? No one can doubt it. You do not deny it. The government has used the Army and the Navy to enforce the fugitive slave law in Massachusetts, and you have never denied or questioned the constitutionality of that proceeding. It has precisely the same right to use the Army and the Navy to enforce upon a citizen of South Carolina the payment of duties which Congress may impose upon the importation of merchandise abroad. The *State* has nothing to do with the matter. The law does not take effect upon the State; the Constitution does not even recognize the existence of the State, in connection with the duty of obedience to the laws of Congress, except to forbid its effective interference. The only way in which the State can be brought into the case at all, is by claiming the right to release its citizens from the duty of obedience to the Federal law. Congress says that the citizen of South Carolina shall pay duties upon all merchandise he may import into Charleston. The State of South Carolina assumes that she has a constitutional right to release him from that obligation, — and to say that he may import that merchandise *without* paying duties. The only question that can arise is, Has South Carolina any such right? Let the Constitution itself reply:—

“This Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, ANYTHING IN THE CONSTITUTION OR LAWS OF ANY STATE TO THE CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING.”

This is the whole case. There is no question of coercing a State — or of “making war” on a State. The laws of Congress are not made for States, — but for individuals. All that is required of the States is that they shall not release their citizens from the duty of obedience. Indeed, they cannot do so. South Carolina may declare herself out of the Union twice a year, if

she pleases, and pass as many nullification laws as her statute-books will hold; but she cannot impair in the slightest degree the duty of every individual within her borders to obey the laws of Congress. It is the duty of the President of the United States to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed;" and, as Mr. Buchanan very justly remarks in his message, "no human power can release him from the performance of that duty."

THE STATES HAVE NO POWER TO RELEASE THEIR CITIZENS FROM THE DUTY OF OBEDIENCE.

The only question which can arise, therefore, in this matter of secession is, whether the Federal Government will permit citizens of South Carolina or Alabama, or any other State, to refuse obedience to the laws of Congress on the plea that they have been released from such obedience by the action of that State. So far as the matter of right is concerned, the question scarcely requires an answer. Unless we have made up our minds to abandon our national existence altogether, we have no choice in the premises. For if the principle is once conceded that a State may nullify the action of the Federal Government, and release its citizens from the duty of obedience to Federal law, neither South Carolina nor the Slave States will be left alone in the exercise of that right. Every Northern and Western State will at once enact Personal Liberty bills of the most stringent character. New York has a hundred fold more to gain by releasing her citizens from the payment of federal duties on imports than any Southern State.

But you urge that ours is a voluntary government, — and must depend on the voluntary assent of its people, and not on force, for its preservation. Properly understood, this is perfectly true, — but its practical importance depends on the manner of its application. If a constitutional majority of the people become dissatisfied with the government, or with its administration, they have a right to change it. If any considerable portion of the people become dissatisfied, they have a right to demand amendments. If they consider themselves aggrieved or oppressed, they may seek redress in the Courts of law. And back of all these rights is the right of revolution, for which no provision can ever be made, — which, indeed, can never be recognized in any Constitution or form of government, because it is simply the right of appealing to force against a government which is found to be hopelessly oppressive. But our government is not a voluntary government in any such sense as that individual citizens are left to their voluntary choice whether to obey the laws or not, — or that communities, large or small, organized or unorganized, have a constitutional right to repudiate the obligations of the Constitution. Such a government would be no government at all. It would have none of the functions, none of the powers, none of the stability which are inseparable from the very idea of government. All government implies force, — the right of coercion. And the consent on which our government rests is the voluntary consent of the people that force may be used, if necessary, to constrain obedience to law.

I concede fully that as the laws depend for their vitality and practical validity upon the co-operation of the governed, they should never outrage the principles, the interests, or the sentiments of the people among whom they

are to be enforced. A disregard of this principle, might, under aggravated circumstances, and in default of all other redress, justify revolution, — a local protest in arms against the execution of the obnoxious law. It is by overlooking entirely this principle that the fugitive slave law has been rendered at once so odious and so inoperative. A law of Congress guaranteeing freedom of speech on slavery to a Northern Abolitionist, in the heart of a slaveholding State, though it might be strictly constitutional, would be not only ineffective, but would rouse the most bitter hostility of the community whose safety it would seriously endanger.

But you will urge that this doctrine converts the Federal Government into a consolidated despotism. Not so, — for this federal sovereignty extends only to those matters which are expressly delegated to it. It is restricted by the Constitution which creates it and prescribes the scope of its activity. But up to the limit of those restrictions the sovereignty of the Federal Government is just as complete as is that of the States over all the matters which are reserved. You say this sovereignty was delegated by the States themselves, and may, therefore, be resumed. On the contrary, even if that were true, the fact that it was delegated proves that it *cannot* be resumed. Its derivation cannot alter its character or impair its force. If the States gave it, they parted with what they gave, and they cannot recall the gift. They clothed the Federal Government with power to make laws, on certain subjects, which should be of binding obligation upon the individual inhabitants of the United States, — and with the right to enforce obedience to those laws by the armed power of the country, if that should be necessary. So far were they from reserving to themselves as States the right of releasing their citizens from the duty of obedience, that they required all their State officers, governors, legislators, and judges, to take a solemn oath that they would enforce those laws, and they stipulated moreover that nothing in the Constitution or laws of any State should derogate in any degree from the absolute supremacy of the laws of Congress. Those laws, according to the “compact,” even if the Constitution be nothing more, are to be the “supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Any claim, therefore, on the part of a State of a constitutional right to release its citizens from the duty of obeying the laws of Congress, made in pursuance of the Constitution, is simply preposterous and absurd.

Any exercise of such an asserted right, any attempt to prevent the Federal Government from executing those laws by State legislation, is merely a nullity. Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina may pass as many laws as they please forbidding their citizens to pay duties to the Federal Government, to obey process of Federal courts, or to regard the Federal law prohibiting the slave-trade. Every one of them will be null and void. Must the Federal Government, then, you may ask, “*make war*” on Alabama or South Carolina for enacting such laws? Not at all, — simply because it is needless, the laws being themselves a nullity, and because, moreover, the Federal Government has nothing to do with States as such. It has no right to say what bills they shall pass and what they shall not. It deals with individuals, and requires *them* to obey its laws. If they refuse, it may compel obedience. If the State interposes, and resists such attempted compulsion,

then the State "makes war" upon the Federal Government, — not a war that can be recognized as such by independent powers, — because it is not a war between such powers, — but a war of rebellion, — a war of revolution. And the only question that remains is, whether the Federal Government has a right to put down rebellion, — to suppress insurrection against its authority. And that question seems to me equivalent to asking whether it is a government at all, or only a sham, — a pretence of government, without any of its real powers or faculties.

I have no doubt, therefore, that the Federal Government has the right, under the Constitution, to do what you would style "compelling a State to remain in the Union" — that is, to compel every citizen within the jurisdiction of the United States to obey the laws of Congress. Nor have I the slightest hesitation in saying that it is its duty to do so, — and that any President, Senator, or member of Congress who refuses to aid, in doing so, violates his oath of office, and makes himself an aider and abettor of treason and rebellion. As to the *mode* and *time* of compulsion, — the means of bringing stress to bear upon rebellious communities, and the measure of force to be used, — these are very different questions, to be decided on other grounds, and by the wise discretion of the Federal Government. That government may deem it most expedient, because most likely to prove effective, to postpone all resort to force to the latest possible moment, — to abstain from all appearance of coercion, — and to trust to the moral compulsion of time, of reflection and experience, rather than a hasty resort to material power. But it cannot surrender the *right*. It cannot acknowledge the power of any State to release its citizens from the duty of obedience to the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Such an acknowledgment would be simply an overthrow of the Constitution.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF PEACEABLE SECESSION.

South Carolina is on the eve of "withdrawing from the Union," — as she phrases it, — that is, of enacting State laws releasing her citizens from the duty of obeying the laws of Congress, organizing herself into an independent sovereignty and preparing to resist, by force of arms, any attempt of the present government to enforce obedience to its laws upon her citizens. Her first attempt, — as it will be her first necessity, — will be to *obtain a recognition of her independence from the Federal Government*. Have you the slightest idea that she will succeed? The President has no power to grant such a recognition. Congress has no power under the Constitution to grant it. Where is such recognition to come from? Clearly it can only come from the people of the United States, meeting in convention as they met in 1787 for the purpose of dissolving one confederacy and substituting another in its place. We must go through precisely the same process as our fathers did when they abrogated the old Confederation, and created the "more perfect Union," which during the seventy years of its existence has given us more peace, prosperity, and national greatness than have ever been achieved by any other nation on the face of the earth. We are now called upon to destroy that Union. Why? Because it has failed to "provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to

ourselves and our posterity"? No; but because it has *not* failed. Because it does not permit the countenance of the African slave-trade;—because it does not recognize slaves as “property,”—to be guaranteed to their owners wherever its jurisdiction may extend;—because its tendencies are not towards strengthening slavery, and making it perpetual and permanent in the Federal Government, but rather the other way. You cannot expect the people of the United States by consent to abolish the Union and repeal the Constitution for such reasons as these. And yet that is what they must do, if they recognize the independence of South Carolina.

If South Carolina could be dealt with singly in this matter, — if she could be released alone from the Union without conceding principles which would release every State from its allegiance, abolish the Constitution, and blot out the Republic from its place among the nations, there would be very little difficulty in adjusting the matter. She would go out of the Union with the unanimous consent of the other States. One of her own writers, in the *Southern Quarterly Review*, has asserted that a majority of her inhabitants were Tories in the Revolution, and were opposed to independence. Their descendants have inherited their political sentiments. South Carolina has never had a particle of sympathy with the fundamental principles which lie at the basis of our Republican institutions. From the very outset she has been at war with the dominant ideas of the Confederacy. She has done more to embroil the country in controversy, to disturb the public peace, and sow the seeds of disloyalty and strife than all the other States. And if there were any warrant in the Constitution for secession, I should favor the immediate secession of all the other States from any confederacy in which she might have a place. But this cannot be done. Nor can we ignore the fact that she does not intend to go out alone. We are asked to permit her withdrawal merely as preliminary to that of all the cotton, possibly of all the slaveholding, States.

What we have to decide, therefore, when we are asked to recognize the independence of South Carolina, is, whether we will consent to the disruption of our Union for the sake of creating a Southern Confederacy, — or rather a Military Despotism, resting possibly on Democratic forms like that of France (for that is the shape your new government would probably take), upon our Southern border. You and your confederates in disunion seem to think we would. You must base such a sentiment upon a serious over-estimate of our disinterestedness and good nature, or upon an equally serious under-estimate of our intelligence and good sense.

DISUNION MEANS WAR.

I put aside for the present all considerations connected with the character of your proposed government; the fact that slavery is to be the basis of its existence, and the interest of slavery the paramount aim of its policy. Setting aside the certainties of constant contentions and wars between two great nations thus widely separated in principle, in feeling and purpose, and by no material barriers to keep them apart, — look at the position in which we should be placing ourselves with reference to the future. We should be surrendering to a foreign and a hostile power more than half of the Atlantic

seaboard, the whole Gulf, the mouth of the Mississippi, with its access to the open sea, and its drainage of the commerce of the mighty West, all the feasible railroad routes to the Pacific, all chance of further accessions from Mexico, Central America, or the West India Islands, and all prospect of ever extending our growth and national development in the only direction in which such extension will ever be possible. We should be limiting ourselves to that narrow belt of the continent which would be bounded by the British Colonies on the north, the slave empire on the south, and the Rocky Mountains on the west. Have you seen any indications which encourage the hope of so magnificent a self-sacrifice on the part of our people? What is there in our past history to lead you to consider us thus reckless of national growth and national grandeur? Is it the millions we have expended in the purchase of Florida, and Louisiana, and Texas? Is it the hundreds of millions we expended in a war with Mexico for the conquest of Texas and California? Is it the seven millions we paid for the Messilla Valley and the acquisition of feasible railroad routes to the Pacific Ocean? We have a few men among us, dreamers rather than statesmen, who would cast all these considerations aside, and accept any degree of national humiliation in order to rid their consciences of what they regard as their "responsibility for the sin of slavery." But they are very few and very powerless. Nine-tenths of our people in the Northern and North-western States would wage a war longer than the war of Independence, before they will assent to any such surrender of their aspirations and their hopes. There is no nation in the world so ambitious of growth and of power, so thoroughly pervaded with the spirit of conquest, so filled with dreams of enlarged dominion, as ours. In New England these impulses have lost something of their natural force under the influences of culture and the peaceful arts. But in the Centre and the West, this thirst for national power still rages unrestrained.

To this consideration are to be added others of still greater weight with other classes of our community. Your Southern Empire, resting upon slavery as its basis, must be conformed more and more to the spirit and the forms which slavery requires. A standing army will be your first necessity; and the rigor with which your slave population are kept in subjection must increase from year to year. You will have less and less of education, more and more of brute force; and your slaves will sink lower and lower in the scale of creation with every succeeding year. You know enough of Northern character to estimate the effect which this would have upon the minds of the conscientious portion of our Northern people, and how thoroughly it would alienate them from their new neighbors. You could not count upon their forbearance or their sympathy in the slightest degree. Every little misunderstanding that might arise would swell the hostility of the two peoples, and bring them into inevitable and deadly collision.

Even, therefore, if at the outset the impulses of our people should prompt an assent to your secession, it could not be permanent. Just now the feeling of the North seems to be in favor of letting you go. This is the first prompting of the genuine kindness that pervades the popular heart, — an indisposition to do injury to any section, — a hope that both may go along peacefully and prosperously without collision or strife of any kind. But a very little reflection will show the futility of such expectations. The thing is impossi-

ble. The only condition of our remaining at peace is that we remain one. Disunion means war; a war of conquest, a war of subjugation on the one side or the other. You may say it would be hopeless to attempt to subjugate the South. Possibly; but this is a point which nations never take for granted in advance. It is not the conviction of the masses of our people. They believe the South to be comparatively weak; and this belief, whether just: or not, will do all its mischief by leading to the beginning of war. What the end will be the future alone could show.

South Carolina must not expect, therefore, to be recognized by the Federal Government as an independent State, *without a war*. Any such recognition by an administration, as a mere legislative act, would be treason to the Constitution, and would justify a revolution. It can only be done through an amendment of the Constitution; by a formal dissolution of the nation, and the creation of another upon its ruins. To that the people, who constitute the nation, will never consent. You must win your independence, if you win it at all, just as every other nation has done — by the sword.

NO AID FROM FOREIGN POWERS.

But you count upon the assistance of foreign powers; especially of France and England. This seems to me the wildest dream that ever misled the minds of desperate or oversanguine conspirators. How has Louis Napoleon kept his imperial throne, but by taking his people into alliance with him, by representing in his person and policy their sentiments, their ideas, their passion especially for making themselves the champions of freedom in other lands? The French idea of liberty is freedom to make others free. The Italian war was popular, because it was a war to liberate the enslaved Italians. The first indication of a possible desertion of that cause, and an alliance with the princes who had oppressed them, shook the imperial throne. How long would he hold that throne if he were to wage a war in support of Austria, either in Italy or in Hungary? Now, any interference of France on your behalf would be an interference on behalf of slavery. And these same considerations are still stronger when applied to England. The people of England are fanatical in their hatred of negro slavery. And no ministry that should give the slightest hint of favor to a movement for slavery in any form could hold its place a week.

Nor can you presume at all upon the hatred of free institutions which prevails among the governments of Europe. That hatred does not pervade the people; nor can it, therefore, to any considerable extent, influence the action of the governments, especially of England and France, where the popular will has controlling weight. England's dominant purpose just now, moreover, is to secure the alliance of the United States, in preparation for the great struggle between free and absolute governments, which she thinks is impending. Besides all this, the great interest of both England and France, so far as this country is concerned, is *commerce*. Whatever promotes their trade with us brings them all the advantage they can ever expect to reap from their relations with us. And whatever promotes our prosperity, and our ability to sell and buy, builds up that trade. Neither of these countries has the slightest interest in our disunion, or in any differences which shall

retard our growth. They may deprecate the imitation of our example in their own countries. They may declaim against us, and point out our weaknesses and faults to prevent their own people from introducing universal suffrage, the vote by ballot, and annual parliaments. But they have no wish for our downfall, as they have no interest in it. Neither of them could sustain any heavier blow than the destruction of our commerce would involve.

Nor will either of them recognize the independence of any seceding Southern State until that independence shall have become an established fact, by the recognition of our own government, or by such demonstration of its ability to maintain it by force of arms as shall leave no room for doubt. Precisely the same course will be pursued in this case as was pursued in that of Texas, and as is pursued in every case under similar circumstances. Any attempt on the part of any foreign power to aid in the rebellion of a Southern State, would be an act of open and flagrant hostility to the government of the United States, and would be resented as such. Whatever might be the disposition of our government towards secession, we should never permit a foreign power to interfere in a matter so purely of domestic concern.

If you enter upon this matter of secession, you must enter upon it alone. You will have no help from any foreign power — neither troops, nor ships, nor arms. You cannot borrow money anywhere, because you have nothing whatever to pledge for its security. You have neither credit nor the means of gaining credit abroad. The only one of the slaveholding States which has ever tried the faith of foreign creditors to any extent has, by her shameless repudiation, — her steady breach of faith, — branded the whole section to which she belongs with the ineffaceable marks of disgrace and distrust; — and the example of Mississippi will be a perpetual warning to every capitalist in Europe against lending a dollar to any Southern State. You cannot call upon your own people for supplies, for their sole wealth consists in negroes and lands, which, in case of war, will fall to a tithe of their present value. Nor can you conceal from yourselves any more than from the rest of the world the dreadful danger you would incur, of an insurrection of slaves from one end of the South to the other, the moment they shall see you engaged in a war against States which are seeking, as you have taught them to believe, to effect their emancipation. All these accumulated horrors you must face alone, — relying upon your own resources, without a word or a thought of sympathy from any nation on earth, — under the frown of all Christendom, — with the settled conviction in the breasts of half your own people that you are fighting against every impulse of humanity, every tendency of the Christian civilization of the age which shall witness this strange, this horrible contention!

THE COTTON ARGUMENT.

You rely on cotton to save you from all this. “The world must have our cotton,” you say. “England must have it, or her looms will stop — her workmen will be thrown out of employment — riots, starvation, and civil war will desolate her realm. She will open our ports, if the Federal Government shall persist in closing them.” If you rely upon such a hope to sustain you through the dread ordeal of revolution, you are destined to a rude disenchant-

ment. You can no more prevent either England or the North from procuring your cotton, if you find leisure from war to raise it, than you can prevent water from running to the sea. The laws which regulate the currents of trade are just as fixed and unchangeable as the laws which govern matter. We may not understand them so thoroughly, but we know enough of them to know that we can no more withstand or change their operation than we can that of the laws of gravity. Of what avail were the Berlin and Milan decrees, though backed by a million men in arms? Upon whom fell the weight of the old embargo which you are threatening to renew?

You may make as many laws as you please, — you can never prevent your cotton from finding its way to the market where it commands the highest price; and if you could, your own people would be the first to perish under the operation. For why do you raise cotton but to sell it? You can neither eat it, nor drink it, — nor feed your slaves with it, — nor wear it until you have sent it abroad or to the North to be manufactured. Even now you buy from the North every year a hundred and fifty millions of dollars' worth of food and utensils of labor and other necessaries of life; — which you must have, and which you cannot get unless you pay for them with your only great product, — your sole reliance, — the cotton which you raise. You could distress England if you could withhold your cotton; but it would be at the cost of starvation and ruin at home. The manufacture of cotton is but one branch of British industry; but the selling of cotton is the only reliance of the Southern States. Blot that out, and you blot out the prosperity and even the existence of Southern industry. You not only ruin the planter, and drive his slaves to starvation or insurrection; but you kill the business of every Southern railroad, the traffic of every Southern river, the labor of every Southern city. In such a contest of physical and financial endurance, which would hold out longest, England or the Southern States? Which would repent soonest, the English mill-owner or the Southern planter?

You expect to invite the ships of the world to your ports by making them free. This is your main reliance for ruining the commerce of the North and turning its wealth into your own channels. You must remember, in the first place, that you can have no free trade until you have achieved your independence. But waiving that obstacle for the moment, you must know that such a policy on your part would be met, whenever it should become necessary to meet it at all, by a corresponding policy on ours. Charleston, Baltimore, Savannah, New Orleans, could not be free ports many months before Boston, New York, and Philadelphia would be free ports also. With the advantages we should have at the outset, — our enormous mercantile marine, our trained and hardy sailors, our skill in ship-building, and our capital already invested in commerce, can you doubt the result of such an unequal race? You rely on the manufactories of New England and Pennsylvania to prevent such a result. And even so sensible a man as Mr. Stephens predicts universal anarchy at the North as the effect of disunion. He has much to learn of the temper and spirit of the North if he anticipates any such result. Undoubtedly great interests in both these sections would suffer serious injury from the adoption of a free-trade policy; but other interests would gain just as much, and the versatility of our people is so great that they would very speedily adapt themselves to the changed necessities of the case. If New

York were a free port her commerce would be doubled in ten years. In spite of everything the South could do, — in spite of tariffs, attempted prohibitions and bounties upon commerce, the North, through her manufactures, or her commerce, would supply, as she does now, every plantation in every Southern State with every article of luxury which would be needed from abroad.

I pass over in this place all considerations of the domestic difficulties you would encounter in your enterprise, — your differences as to the form of government to be established; — the clashing of interests between the several sections of your own Confederacy; — the heavy direct taxation by which, under a free-trade policy, all the expenses of your government must be met; — the fundamental and fatal question on what kinds of property and in what proportions that tax should be levied; — your exposure to the hostility of the whole civilized world, and the impossibility of your raising a navy wherewith to meet it; — all these and many other practical difficulties, which would obstruct your progress at every step, may safely be dismissed, in the present discussion, with this bare reference to them.

These, then, are the reasons which lead me to believe that you will not succeed in your enterprise of destroying this Union and erecting a new slaveholding and slave-trading empire on its ruins. I have still to consider the duty of the north and the true policy of the South in the political crisis which you have brought upon the country. But that I must reserve for a concluding letter.

IV. THE PRECISE NATURE OF THE PENDING ISSUE — THE DUTY OF THE NORTH AND THE TRUE POLICY OF THE SLAVEHOLDING STATES.

NEW YORK, Tuesday, Dec. 25, 1860.

HON. W. L. YANCEY, — *Sir* : In my last letter I gave you my reasons for regarding Secession as simply Revolution, and for believing that it can neither be peaceful nor successful. I propose now to state my understanding of the nature of the contest, and my reasons for hoping that it will not be compromised nor postponed, but finally *settled*, by whatever process and through whatever tribulations may be necessary.

I do not mean to say that I am opposed to measures of conciliation in the present crisis. I am not. I regard the present excitement at the South as artificial, or, at least, as feverish and unnatural. It has been produced by temporary stimulants, and unfits the Southern people from making and meeting the real issue on its merits. You and your confederates have filled the Southern mind with the most perilous misrepresentations concerning the Republican party. You have taught them to regard it as an Abolition party, and have assured them that its advent to power would be the signal for a violent crusade against the rights of the Southern States and the peace of Southern society. The past five years have been devoted, with the utmost

zeal and assiduity, by all the leading politicians of the South, to the inculcation of this fearful falsehood. Men of all parties there have joined in it; not because they believed it, but because they had objects of political or personal ambition which could not be accomplished without it. They have done their work thoroughly and effectually. The whole Southern mind is pervaded with this baseless belief. On every plantation, by every fireside, in every negro hut, the general talk is of coming emancipation. Lincoln and the Republicans are talked about at the South as if they were a horde of black and bloodthirsty savages, eager to feast on Southern sorrows, and to plunge Southern society into anarchy and insurrection. You have closed the gates of the South against all efforts to correct these false impressions. No journal that protests against them is permitted to circulate among the mass of the Southern people. No man who knows their falsehood and their danger dare lift his voice to remonstrate. The delusion, fatal as it is false, is hugg'd to the Southern bosom as if it were the anchor of their hopes, and the only ground of their salvation.

The result of all this is an inflammation of the public mind, which renders all chance of rational treatment for the moment hopeless. The first thing to be done is to allay that inflammation,—to bring the South into a sane and healthy mood,—to prevent her, if possible, from inflicting upon herself some rash and iusane blow while the access of the fever is on, and thus obtain time and opportunity for a more sensible and radical treatment of the case. And for this purpose I am willing to resort to any emollients that may be useful. But, as the Republican party has no power, as yet, to *act* in the premises, as its foes, your confederates, are still entrenched in the citadel of Federal power; all we can do is to use the language of conciliation, and make verbal protest against the fundamental falsehood which is working all this wrong.

But this is only a temporary and preliminary process. It leaves the real difference unadjusted; and this the interest of the whole country forbids. We have reached a point in our political history when the welfare of both North and South requires that we should understand distinctly the basis on which our government rests; the spirit which is to guide its administration; the *relations it is to hold to the institution of slavery*. The election of Mr. Lincoln marks an era in the political history of the country; and his administration is to decide the issue and bring the conflict to a close.

SENTIMENTS AND POLICY OF THE FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION CONCERNING SLAVERY.

No unprejudiced person can study the history of the formation of the Constitution of the United States, without perceiving that the founders of the Republic had certain clear opinions concerning slavery; and, in spite of its inherent difficulties and embarrassments, a distinct and definite policy in regard to it. Those opinions were expressed more or less fully in their public debates, and in their private correspondence, to which in part the lapse of time has given us access; and their policy was embodied in the Constitution itself.

There is neither doubt nor controversy on the point that the fathers of the Republic regarded slavery as an evil; as retarding both the material and the moral progress of the society which tolerated it, as an element of weak-

ness to particular States, and of opprobrium to the whole country. They did not consider slaveholding to be a sin, nor did they regard a slave-owner as necessarily less moral, less Christian, or less estimable, than other men. They did not favor immediate emancipation, because they knew that such a step would be fatal to the negroes themselves, and highly dangerous to the whole fabric of society. But, with scarcely an exception, they all desired that some policy might be adopted looking towards its *ultimate* extinction. These were their sentiments on the general subject. The action of conventions and of legislatures, the speeches of statesmen, the correspondence of public men of every grade, and of every section at that early day, abound in evidence of this fact, which is as clearly and as fully established as any fact of history can possibly be.

With these opinions they came to form a Constitution for the future Republic, — “not for a day but for all time,” — one which should not merely provide for immediate exigencies, but lay the basis of that great Union which it created, and give permanent direction to its growth and government. And they embodied in that Constitution just such practical provisions concerning slavery as their opinions prompted, and as the end aimed at required. The *first* and most conspicuous feature of that policy was to leave to the several States all jurisdiction over the subject, as being purely one of local authority, ignoring it entirely as a matter of Federal responsibility. The *second* step was to provide for two exigencies which might arise from its disappearance in some States, and its continued existence in others, namely, the suppression of insurrections, and the return of fugitives. And its *third* was to clothe the General Government with power to prevent the increase of slavery by prohibiting the importation of slaves after 1808. No person who is entirely disinterested and candid in this matter can read the Constitution and the history of its formation, without perceiving that this is its general scope and drift. Nor will he doubt for a moment that the universal expectation of that day was, that under this policy slavery would gradually die out; that one State after another would take steps to abolish it, and to substitute free labor in its place; and that thus in the course of time it would cease to exist in the whole country. This purpose was repeatedly declared in Convention and elsewhere; and no one raised his voice against it. Not even South Carolina, nor Georgia, the States which had the largest interest in slavery, even expressed a wish that it should be made perpetual; and still less did they demand that the Federal Government should guarantee its permanence. Not a voice was raised against the policy of ultimate extinction, which was openly avowed, and which the Constitution was so framed as to encourage and favor. The utmost of their claim was, that within their own limits it should be left solely and exclusively to their own control. And that claim was conceded to the fullest extent.

This policy thus embodied in the Constitution was accepted by the whole country with alacrity, and the active measures of the government were all framed with a view to carry it into full effect. Through all the successive administrations of the next quarter of a century the tendency was in the same direction, and with such occasional exceptions as circumstances rendered unavoidable, its action was towards emancipation. The ordinance of 1787, re-enacted by Congress at the very outset of its career, prohibited

slavery from the North-west Territory. The repeated requests of Indiana to be relieved from this prohibition were refused. In the act organizing the Louisiana Territory, then newly acquired by purchase from France, specific provisions were made, forbidding the introduction of slaves except from other States, and then only natives thereof. In 1807, Congress exercised its power, which had been restrained by the Constitution until that time, and under heavy penalties prohibited the importation of slaves from abroad. Not a voice was raised in Congress against the act. Even the members from Georgia and Carolina concurred in its wisdom and policy; and the only question that was raised related to the penalties for its violation, and to the manner of disposing of the Africans who might be brought to the country in defiance of law. *Pari passu* with this action of the General Government for the prevention of the increase of slavery, was that of the State Governments to promote its abolition. Massachusetts, Vermont, and Ohio had already prohibited its existence within their limits, and six other States had passed laws providing for gradual and prospective emancipation. Abolition societies existed in most of the States, and delegates from the South attended regularly at the annual meeting held in Philadelphia. The same general sentiment which had existed at the formation of the Constitution continued to pervade the whole country. Even Mr. Early, the member of Congress from Georgia, whose views on the subject were, perhaps, more ultra than those of any other member, said, in the debate on prohibiting the slave-trade, that, although a large majority of the people in the Southern States did not consider slaveholding as a *crime*, many deprecated it as a political evil, and that "reflecting men apprehend incalculable evils from it at some future day." And Mr. Holland, of North Carolina, in the same debate, said that "slavery was generally considered a political evil, and that *in that point of view* nearly all were disposed to stop the trade for the future."

This was the sentiment of the whole country, and it continued to animate and guide its action. The Federal Government had gone as far as it had any constitutional power to go in the matter, and the rest was left to the wise discretion of the State Governments, whose control of the subject was conceded to be full and exclusive. And the whole country rested peacefully under this state of things. There was nothing like fanaticism in either section, or among the partisans of either side. Very many men had very strong convictions of hostility to slavery on moral grounds, but they did not bring those hostilities to the political discussions of the subject. And on the other hand very serious distrust of the free negroes was growing up in those Southern States where the slaves were most numerous, and in some of them it was found necessary to fix such checks on emancipation as should afford some security for the good behavior of those who should be set free. As early as in 1796 North Carolina had forbidden emancipation except for meritorious services. In 1800, South Carolina had required the consent of a justice of the peace, and of five disinterested freeholders to the emancipation of any slave; and even Virginia and Kentucky seriously restrained the liberty of free negroes within their respective limits.

It is not necessary to trace in detail the progress of the change which came over the sentiment of the Southern States on this subject. Owing primarily, without doubt, to the increased culture of cotton, slave labor became more

and more profitable, and the States in which cotton grew became more and more averse to emancipation. Every step away from that original policy of the country led to a corresponding anxiety on the subject in the North. Still the general tendency was towards emancipation. By slower and slower steps, and against increased hostilities, but steadily, nevertheless, the movement made its way southward. As late as in 1832 the State of Virginia discussed the subject; and her ablest men boldly and fearlessly pressed upon the people the evils, material, moral, and social, which were inseparable from the institution, and urged the absolute necessity of its removal. Our present minister in France, Mr. Faulkner, used language in that convention in denunciation of slavery, for which you will find no parallel now, except in the heated harangues of the abolitionists of the present day. "The idea of a *gradual emancipation* and removal of the slaves from this Commonwealth," said he, "is coeval with the declaration of your own independence from the British yoke."

THE NEW THEORY OF SLAVE PROPERTY IN THE CONSTITUTION.

Down to this period whatever differences existed on the subject of slavery, there was but one opinion as to its relations under the Constitution to the Federal Government. Mr. Calhoun introduced a new theory on the subject. He brought forward the doctrine that the Constitution recognized slaves as property; that, indeed, slaves were the *only* property which was expressly recognized and guaranteed by the Constitution, and that the slaveholder must therefore be protected in its enjoyment by the power of the Federal Government, wherever he might go within its jurisdiction and under its authority. Upon this principle he must not only have liberty to take his slaves into any territory of the United States, but must be enabled to hold them there as slaves, by virtue of the Constitution, in spite of any law of Congress or of the territories which should attempt to forbid it. And that is the principle for which you are contending to-day. At the outset it had very few supporters. No political party, either at the North or South, took ground in its favor. The Democratic party everywhere scouted it. The people in every section of the country repudiated it with indignation. In spite of the progress it had made in the minds of Southern politicians, even so lately as last spring, the Democratic party of the Union suffered itself to be severed, dispersed in convention, and defeated at the polls, rather than give it their assent.

Here is the "irrepressible conflict." It is between the Constitution as our fathers made it, and the *new* Constitution which you are seeking to put in its place. You are not content with that instrument as it stands, unless you can engraft upon it the new principle, utterly unknown to its framers, or rather distinctly and intentionally excluded from it by them, that, namely, of absolute and indefeasible *property* in slaves.

Hitherto you have been contending that this principle is actually embodied in the present Constitution. We ask you where? Point to the section which contains it. You say it is in that section which provides for their representation in Congress. But does the fact that they are *represented* make them property, — or imply that they are property? On the contrary, it im-

plies that *they are not*: — for property is not represented anywhere in our government. It is one of our boasts that this is a government of *persons*, and not of *property*, — that it is in the hands of the people, — that the representatives who make its laws and wield its power are the agents and representatives of persons, and not of property. If this clause, then, constitutes an exception to this general rule, you must show it by something in its language, or by something in the circumstances of the case which leaves no room for doubt. But the language of the clause is directly in the teeth of your claim. The representation specified is that of “three-fifths of all other *persons*,” — besides those mentioned in the previous portion of the sentence. The fact that they are described as persons is at least presumptive evidence that they are not regarded by the Constitution as property; and there is nothing in the circumstances of the case to overthrow that presumption. You may say your local law regards them as property, — and the Federal Constitution must, therefore, regard them in the same light. Not at all; your local law cannot control the intent of the Constitution, for if it could, all you would have to do in order to change the Constitution would be to change your local law. You may say that though entering into the representation of the country they have no vote, — no voice, no will, in its government, — and that this fact affords a fair implication that they are represented as property. Not at all; for on such a basis your women and children — who have no vote, and are nevertheless represented — would be property also. But they are taxed, you say, and therefore they are property. No; they are not taxed, but are only made a means of determining the *ratio* of taxation. Taxation by the Constitution, although paid by property, falls upon property, not according to its amount, but according to population; and when three-fifths of the slaves are counted, therefore, as a basis of taxation, it is only to determine the taxable population and not at all to fix the amount of taxable property.

I can find nothing whatever in this clause, therefore, which gives any show of justice to your claim.

You refer me next to that clause which permits the importation of slaves until 1808, — as proving that they were regarded as subjects of commerce, and therefore as property. The language used does not sustain the assumption. The permission granted is for “the migration or importation of such *persons* as any of the States now existing may think proper to admit.” Now this applies just as strongly to the migration or importation of Germans or of Irishmen as of negroes. There is nothing in the language used by which you could determine which were meant. Yet you would scarcely pretend that it was meant that Irishmen “imported” under that permission became thereby *property*; yet the presumption in the one case would be just as strong as in the other.

Finally you cite the fugitive slave cause as conclusive proof that slaves are property in the intendment of the Constitution. That clause simply declares that “persons held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another,” shall be delivered up. They are *called* persons; in what word or phrase do you find the implication that they are regarded as property? Does the fact that they are “held to service or labor” make them property? Certainly not, — for apprentices, minors, and day-

laborers are held to service or labor, — and yet they do not thereby become property. Does the fact that they are to be “delivered up,” make them property? Certainly not, — for fugitives from justice are also, by a preceding clause, to be delivered up, — and yet nobody pretends that this fact makes *them* property.

Now these are all the clauses of the Constitution in which slaves are referred to in any way, — and there is nothing in any one of them which gives the least countenance to your claim. They are represented as persons, and not as property; they were imported as persons, and not as property; they are to be delivered up, when they escape, as persons, and not as property.

THE REAL ISSUE AND THE NECESSITY OF DECIDING IT.

The real question at issue between the North and South (using these terms as convenient designations of the two opposing parties) turns upon this point, — which involves all others, — *Are slaves property*, in the meaning and intendment of the Constitution? *Do they stand in the view, and under the provisions, of that instrument, on the same footing as other property?* You answer Yes; we answer No. And you are threatening to dissolve the Union unless we will also answer Yes. Nay, more, — you are already endeavoring to dissolve it, because we persist in answering No!

This is the question which I think should be finally settled now. I think the whole country is of the same opinion. Undoubtedly there are a great many persons in both sections who deprecate joining issue upon it. They prefer that it should be evaded or compromised. Some of them dread the disturbance — the damage to business — the alienation of feelings — the possible perils and devastations of war to which a final settlement of the question may give rise. Others underrate its importance, and see no reason why the great current of our national prosperity should be interrupted, in order to settle an abstract point of constitutional interpretation. But I think the great body of the reflecting portion of the people regard it in a different light. They know that the issue is one of principle, — that it takes hold on the fundamental conditions of the national life, — and that until it is distinctly and decisively settled, by a final and authoritative judgment, in which the whole country shall come to acquiesce, we can have no hope of peace and no chance of escape from these constant and disturbing agitations. If the difference were trifling in its nature, or temporary in its effect, there would be no such necessity. It might then be compromised. But it is vital. Its decision stamps the character of our government, and gives a direction to its policy which it must keep to the end of its existence. If your demands be complied with, slavery becomes one of the essential, ineradicable elements of our national life — just as vital and as permanent in it as the principle of Republicanism, as freedom of speech, trial by jury, or freedom of religious worship. Your aim is, in the sharp, clear phrase of the day, to *nationalize slavery*, — to make it a national instead of a local institution, — not necessarily for the purpose of carrying *slaves* into every part of the country, but to make the supreme law of every part *slave law*. You demand that slavery shall no longer stand as an exceptional institution, ignored by the General Government, frowned upon by civilization, and under the ban of Christendom; but that it shall take its fixed place as only one form of the eternal institu-

tion of property; that, as the law of real estate, and the law of chattel property, are recognized as fixed and enduring parts of the great code of the world, so the law of slave property shall have its place, equally stable and equally honorable, wherever the flag of the United States, and the power which that flag symbolizes and represents, can compel its recognition.

Now this is not a point to be compromised. It never has been compromised, nor will it ever be — because it is, in its nature, incapable of compromise. Our country must be one thing or the other. Our Constitution must either thus recognize slavery, or it must not. All our compromises hitherto, numerous and important as they have been, have evaded this great central point of the whole subject. They have all turned on questions of temporary and local expediency; whether slavery should exist in this place or in that; by what forms and by whose agency fugitive slaves should be recaptured; into which sectional scale the political weight of this or that new State should be thrown; whether we should make this or that addition to our national territory, even at the risk of increasing the area of slavery. All these issues have arisen and have been settled on the basis of compromise. But none of them involved the great point at which nevertheless all of them aimed. They were the approaches to the citadel, — tentative demonstrations towards conquering the Constitution; but every one of them might have been yielded without actually giving up that still unconquered Malakoff of liberty. But now you have brought your batteries to the central tower, and we are summoned to surrender. That question does not admit of compromise. It must be settled. The flag of liberty must still float from the ramparts of the Constitution, or you must take it down. This is the “irrepressible conflict.” We do not make it — nor invite it; but if you insist upon it, we shall not shrink from its issues.

WHAT IS SLAVERY IN THE CONSTITUTION?

But this, you say, is making war upon slavery; this discards and ignores all the constitutional guaranty of slavery; this is an open declaration of hostility to the institutions of the Southern States. Not at all. You are putting an interpretation upon it growing out of your own theories, — based upon your own assumptions, — not warranted by the fact. We are perfectly willing to take the Constitution as it stands, — to leave slavery upon the basis which it provides for it, and to fulfil every obligation, express or implied, which it imposes. And in determining what those obligations are, we look first for a *constitutional definition of slavery*, — as the treatment of the subject must depend upon its nature; and we find that definition, in just such clear and precise terms as the Constitution always employs, in the following clause: —

“No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.”

We regard this as the definition which the Constitution gives to the word slave, — or, which amounts to the same thing, as the phrase which the fram-

ers of the Constitution employed as, in their judgment, synonymous with that word. And it establishes these points:—

1. A slave is a PERSON.

2. The characteristic feature of his condition, that which distinguishes him from other persons, is that he is “held to service or labor,” not by contract, but by law.

3. The legal holding to service or labor is in a *State*,—and “under the laws thereof;” that is, — the condition of a slave is created and maintained only by the law of the locality or State in which he is “held,”—not by any law common to all localities, or all States.

4. Under ordinary circumstances, and in the absence of any provision to the contrary, whenever the slave shall leave that State in which, and “under the law” of which, he is “held,”—he might be discharged from his “service” in, and by the law of, the new locality into which he should enter. The Constitution provides, therefore, that he shall not be thus discharged on two conditions,—(1) that this new locality be another State, and (2) that he has “escaped” into it.

There is the “slave-code” of the Constitution. That is the basis on which slavery rests, so far as the Constitution of the United States is concerned. If slavery anywhere implies anything more than this, it must be by virtue of some local law. If slavery in Georgia or South Carolina is something more than this, it must be by force of some law of Georgia or South Carolina. This is all that the Federal Constitution knows about a slave—the full extent to which it goes in recognizing his slave-condition. The language is perfectly clear and unmistakable, so far as its definition of slavery, in its relations to the Federal Government, is concerned. In its positive provisions for “delivering up” the fugitive slave, it becomes ambiguous. It leaves in doubt the points by what authority, and under what forms, the fugitive is to be “delivered up,” whether by federal authority, or by State authority, or under the provisions of the common law. Upon these points there is room for doubt, and possibly a necessity for greater explicitness; but that explicitness, if it be afforded, must conform to the previous definition— not violate or overthrow it.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

You are in the habit of charging the North with having produced all the sectional discontent that now prevails by departing from the Constitution. I will not say that there is no truth in the allegation. Possibly we have, in some particulars, been less rigid in adhering to that instrument than we should have been. But none of these deviations on our part will compare with that great change which you demand in its essential elements and character. Nor have they caused your discontent. As I have already shown in these letters, it is not our Personal Liberty bills, nor our failure to surrender fugitives, nor the practical inability of slaveholders to take their slaves into the territories, that creates the difficulty. *That difficulty has grown out of your determination to make a new Constitution.* It is due primarily, and therefore entirely, to your departure from the policy of the Fathers of the Republic, as that policy was embodied in the Constitution,—as it

stands revealed in the language of that instrument, and interpreted by the opinions and sentiments of the men who made it. You demand that principles shall be engrafted upon it which they carefully and intentionally excluded from it. As you stated in your Montgomery speech, "*an entirely new idea has sprung up in the South*" on the subject of slavery, — and you demand that this new idea shall be embodied in the Constitution. Hitherto, to be sure, you have sought this end by construction, — by legislation, — by the language of party platforms, — by decrees of the Supreme Court, rather than by open and direct amendments. But now you insist upon the reconstruction of the Constitution itself, and the adoption into its language of the ideas and principles for which you contend. The "irrepressible conflict" is, therefore, not between the North and the South, — but between the South and the Constitution. You have found the present Constitution, so far as your purposes are concerned, a failure. Unless, therefore, it can be overthrown by *amendments*, you are determined to overthrow it *by force*. I do not think you will succeed in either.

THE DUTY OF THE NORTH.

Now what is to be done? You have brought the issue to its present point. As a matter of necessity and of policy, you seek to throw the whole blame of the controversy upon the North. If we had not resisted your claims, there would have been no sectional contest. That is perfectly true; and it is also true, that if you had not made these claims, we should not have resisted them. But since you *have* made them, and since we *do* resist them, the conflict must go on until one party or the other recedes, or is defeated. I see no possible way of avoiding this. But a great deal may be done towards creating a conciliatory disposition on both sides — towards inducing each party to lay aside something of its passion, something of its obstinate adhesion to its own views on minor matters, and to canvass the grounds of the controversy in the light of principle, of the Constitution, of the highest good of the whole country and of all its parts, — instead of the prejudices, the arrogance, and the pride of any section. So far as my experience and reading go, they teach me that very few controversies between communities or individuals have ever arisen, that did not rest *au fond* on a misunderstanding, — and that did not grow into formidable proportions more from the introduction into them of minor exasperations from alien causes, than from any inherent impossibility of agreeing on the precise point involved. I think it is so to some extent in the present case; and that the first duty of each section is first to adjust or sweep away all minor points of difference, — to calm the fever of passion, to open wide the door to a mutual knowledge of each other's real sentiments, wants, and purposes, and to bring to the council-board a real wish to find the path of honor and safety for both. What, then, is the duty of the North in this respect?

Its first duty, in my judgment, is to manifest its desire to accommodate the rational and conservative men of the South by whatever concessions and compromises their actual necessities may require, and which can be given without surrendering the vital principle which is involved. In regard to the Fugitive Slave law, for example, the North should unquestionably fulfil the

obligation which the Constitution imposes, — in its letter, where that is possible, and in its spirit, where nothing more can be accomplished. Every fugitive from service should be delivered up; and where, from violence, or any other cause for which the North or any portion of its people are clearly responsible, this endeavor is defeated, they should compensate the person to whom the service or labor of the fugitive was due, for the pecuniary loss he may have sustained in consequence of that default. You may say this is not a fulfilment of the obligation; that the Constitution requires the absolute surrender of the fugitive, at all hazards; and that any scheme of compensation is only an evasion. But you would not apply this unbending rule to any other subject. All laws are to be obeyed literally; but in case of their violation or default, the law itself, as well as common sense, accepts damages as the equivalent. The object of the Fugitive Slave law is to protect the slaveholder from loss on account of the escape of the person “owing him service or labor” into another State; and if this object cannot be attained by the literal delivery of the fugitive, compensation is all that remains. A railroad company is bound to transport its passengers in safety; it contracts to do so. But if it breaks a passenger’s leg, it responds in damages, and is held acquitted. Even if slaves were property, this would be all you could claim in law or in equity.

So in regard to invasions of the Southern States; the North is in duty bound to give such practical guaranties as the case admits against them. The duty of the North on this point is very clearly and emphatically set forth in the fourth article of the platform of the Republican party adopted at Chicago, — in these terms: —

“That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment, EXCLUSIVELY, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; — and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the GRAVEST OF CRIMES.”

This is the doctrine of the Administration which comes into power on the 4th of March next. It pledges the Republican party to practical measures for the suppression of such invasions; and I think it is the duty of that party to bring forward a law in Congress which shall make every such attempt to overthrow the sovereign authority of any State, by armed invasion from any other State, a grave crime against the Federal Government, and to punish it accordingly. As the law now stands, such invasions are offences only against the States invaded. John Brown and his associates were tried and executed under the laws of Virginia. The crime was primarily against that State; but it ought also to have been a crime against the Federal Government, which exists in part for the very purpose of promoting the general tranquillity. I would not have Congress go so far as was proposed by Senator Douglas last winter, to punish any conspiracy in one State to entice away slaves from any other, — for this, besides encountering still more formidable objections, would involve an unwarrantable and dangerous extension of Federal power into the domestic concerns of the individual States. But any armed invasion from one State, for the purpose of overthrowing the laws

and contesting the sovereignty of any other, ought to be suppressed and punished by the Federal authority.

So also, should the North make full provision for the suppression of negro insurrections in any Southern State. The Constitution imposes upon the General Government the duty of suppressing insurrection, and no one doubts that servile insurrections are included in the obligation. Undoubtedly the duty rests in the first instance upon the State of enforcing its own laws; but where its power should prove inadequate, especially in presence of so formidable and horrible a form of danger as a rebellion of slaves involves, it should receive the aid of the Federal arm. Southern writers are in the habit of speaking of Northern communities as eager to plunge the South into the horrors of servile war, — as indifferent to the nameless deeds of butchery and outrage which such a war would involve, and to the general ruin which it would bring in its train. There could be no more serious error. The great mass of the people of the North look upon such contingencies with the same shuddering horror that moves the South. Their sympathies are with their brethren of the same race, and they would lend their aid promptly and cheerfully, if it should be needed, to defend them from such catastrophes. If there are any misgivings on the part of the South on this subject, which judicious action of the Federal Government could allay, I have no doubt that the North would readily assent. We have no interests to be served, — no resentments to be gratified, — no aims to be promoted by the forcible overthrow of Southern society or the violent rupture of Southern institutions. On the contrary, whatever helps the South helps us. Whatever builds up her prosperity builds up ours. We share her success, her burdens, and her shame. And we should never stand by and see her peace assailed, and her existence threatened, by foreign or domestic foes, without coming to her aid.

THE TERRITORIAL QUESTION.

Now here are three points which touch most nearly the interests and the safety of the slaveholding States, — especially of those which lie along the Northern border; and on each of them I think the North would readily agree to do what all must concede to be substantially just and right.

Another point of difference arises in regard to the territories, into which men from both North and South may wish to emigrate. They are the property of the United States, and the people of each State have an undivided, and *pro rata* an equal, interest in their ownership. It is clearly right that every citizen who goes into them should stand there upon an equal legal footing with every other citizen; that whatever one may lawfully take into them, another may; and that if one is prohibited from taking any special thing, every other citizen should be prohibited from taking the same thing also. So long as this rule is observed, it would not seem possible that any complaint of inequality could be made, — for inequality of rights implies that some things are conceded as rights to one class of persons, and denied to another class. Nothing of this sort obtains in this case. A Southern man can take into the territories whatever a Northern man can, and when there both stand on an equal footing.

There is no difficulty in recognizing this perfect equality of rights that obtains between the two, so long as the question is thus limited to specific

things; it is only when some general term is used which includes many *different* things, that doubts and differences arise. Every one can see that the Southern man may take into the territories a horse, a half-cagle, a carriage, or a cart, and that a Northern man may take precisely the same things, both thus standing upon precisely the same footing. But when you ask if each may take his *property* with him, you employ a term that needs defining; and when you analyze it you find that it embodies two separate and distinct ideas: first, the thing itself, and, second, the legal relations of that thing. Thus, if two men go to Kansas, each accompanied by a negro, the first question that arises on their arrival is, what is the relation of each to the negro who is with him? One of the two asserts that his negro is his *property*, because the law of Alabama from which he came made him so. The claim, therefore, is that he brings with him not only the negro, but also the *local law* of the State from which he comes, and on which he relies to establish their relations. The man from Vermont can claim no such right, because he has no such local law to bring. The inequality of their condition, therefore, grows entirely out of the inequality in the laws of the States from which they come; and the real question is, *whether that inequality shall be transferred to the territories*, or whether both shall leave behind them their discordant State laws, and submit to the uniform and equal laws which the Sovereign Authority, whatever it may be, may enact for the government of the territories.

You say your local law has vested in you an absolute right of property in your slaves, and that you have the right, therefore, to take the creations of that law with you. But you would not apply the principle to any other form of property. A State law may give you a vested property right in a bank charter, a lottery, a railroad, or a steamboat charter; but that right would be valid only within the geographical jurisdiction of that law. No law can give rights beyond the boundaries of its own authority. You say the Constitution of the United States recognizes that vested right, and thus gives it universality. Upon that point we join issue. We deny that there is any such recognition; and the grounds of that denial I have already stated in the preceding part of this letter. But, you say, this is depriving us of our *property*, or of the right to take our property with us into the territories. Not at all. It only deprives you of the right to take your property in a particular, exceptional *form*—given to it solely by your local law. You can convert it, while under the operation and protection of that local law, into another, a larger, universal form, and thus take it with you wherever you wish to go. You can sell your slaves and take with you the money, which as property is their equivalent.

The whole difference in regard to the territories thus turns on the point whether the absolute *right of property* in slaves is, or is not, recognized in the Constitution. Indeed, this is the entire scope, the real heart and marrow, of the whole controversy between the North and South. And upon this point I see no possibility of compromise. I do not believe that, under any circumstances, the North will ever concede the *right* to take slaves *as property under the Constitution* into the territories. I do not believe they will ever consent to engraft upon the Constitution a recognition of slave property, which the framers of that instrument carefully excluded from it. On

this point I think the great mass of the people of the Northern States are immovable; and, in my judgment, they could not be otherwise without running upon evils of the most perilous magnitude. You are in the habit of insisting upon this recognition as a matter of small importance; as intended merely to give you an equal right to the enjoyment of the territorial property of the common Union, and as so palpably just, that it can only be denied from a motive of contempt for the Constitution and for your rights under it. But you know that this is not so. You know very well that, if the Constitution be so amended as to recognize this absolute, indefeasible right of property in slaves, these consequences will follow:—

1. Any man may take a slave into any *territory*, and hold him and his posterity there as slaves forever, and the Federal Government must protect him in so doing.

2. Any man may take a slave into any *State*, and hold him and his posterity as slaves there forever, under the protection of the Federal Government; for the Constitution provides in express terms that no citizen shall be deprived of his property except by due process of law; and this provision, like all others in the Constitution, is to be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

3. No slaveholding State will have any right to provide by law for the emancipation of its slaves, without the consent of every owner, for that would be a direct, unconstitutional interference with the right of property.

4. Slaves, being thus made property by the Constitution, must become the subjects of commerce, domestic and foreign, on the same footing as other property, and subject only to the same regulations and restrictions as may be applied to all property alike. The laws of Congress, prohibiting the importation of slaves, being inconsistent with this constitutional provision, become inoperative and void.

To indicate these results of the principle you wish us to recognize is sufficient, without further argument, to show why it can never be admitted by the Constitution, either by express amendment or by legislation that will imply its existence. And this is one of the reasons, perhaps the controlling one, why the people of the North will never consent to the extension of slavery into the territories as a matter of right.

I do not mean to say that they might not, under the pressure of circumstances, and in presence of some great necessity, assent to some compromise on this subject, which would leave some portion of the Federal territory open to slavery. But any such assent must rest wholly on grounds of expediency, and not upon the claim of constitutional right.

It is a general impression at the South that the motive of the North in resisting the extension of slavery is a desire to "pen it up," to confine it within a small area, and let it there "sting itself to death;" in other words, become so dangerous to society as to compel its abolition as a measure of self-defence. Undoubtedly this is a motive with many men; but I do not believe it to be a controlling motive with the North. I do not believe there are five States in the Union a majority of whose people would vote for an immediate, unprepared emancipation of the Southern slaves, if that emancipation depended exclusively on their votes. And still less would they vote

to compel that emancipation by measures which must involve Southern white society in disaster and ruin.* Our people do not seek to restrict slavery in order to suffocate it. Their hostility to its practical extension rests on a regard for the welfare of the territories,—an unwillingness to increase the political power of slavery,—and a determination to do nothing which shall make it perpetual and paramount in our Federal Councils. But if the time should ever come when the South, for its own safety, needs an outlet for its surplus slave population, I do not believe the North would oppose such migration into some territorial region adapted to it. Indeed, most men at the North who reflect upon the subject at all look to the gradual drifting of slavery southward, both within and without the present limits of the Union, as the only way in which it can ever be removed.

But whenever this is done, it must be done solely as a measure of expediency, and not as a matter of constitutional right. Nor, in my judgment, will the people ever consent that the Federal Government shall protect slave property in any territories regardless of the will of their inhabitants, or that any amendments shall be made to the Constitution changing the basis of slavery, or substituting any new definition of the *status* of a slave. In other words, I do not believe that threats of disunion, attempts at disunion, or even the complete accomplishment of disunion, would induce the North to give slavery any clearer recognition, or any higher place, in the Federal Constitution, than it has at present. We ask you to abide by that Constitution. We demand nothing more. Take it as our fathers made it. They yielded much for the sake of the Union; but you have no reason to believe that they would have yielded more even from that high motive. No man then dared or desired to propose that property in slaves should be recognized and stand on the same footing, in all Federal and constitutional relations, as any other species of property; and if he had made the demand you cannot believe it would have been conceded. The Union is less essential now to our national greatness and prosperity than it was then. The people are stronger and have more confidence in their strength, and they will not concede now what would never have been conceded then.

THE NORTHERN DENUNCIATIONS OF SLAVERY—HOW THEY CAN BE SILENCED AND SUPPRESSED.

But there still remains one grievance against which you demand security: the *denunciations of slavery in the Northern States*. You complain that they are dangerous and offensive, that they violate the comity which should obtain between members of the same Union, and that they wound the pride and the self-respect of the South. And you insist that they shall be stopped. The press, the pulpit, the high places of political power, members of Congress and State Legislatures, governors, lecturers, school-books, poetry, history, novels, all forms of literature and of speech, are regarded as offenders in this respect. All breathe a tone of hostility to slavery incompatible with its peaceful existence, and destructive of all friendly relations between the States.

The complaint finds some warrant in the facts of the case. But if you seek a practical remedy you must look to the origin and the nature of the

disease. Some few of your publicists are insane enough to suppose that it can be cured by legislative coercion. The result of the experiment which you made in 1835 upon the Right of Petition, one of the smallest features of the general tendency, and one, moreover, which Congress had under its complete control, must show the folly of such a hope, even if all history and all philosophy were not eloquent against it. You would find it infinitely easier to reduce every Northern State to the condition of an abject provincial dependency of South Carolina, than to expel this habit of free speech from the Northern mind. Menaces of displeasure, threats of disunion, acts of retaliation, simply heap fuel on the raging flames. You may exhort, remonstrate, and reason with us on the subject. You may appeal to our sense of justice and of fair-dealing, and we will listen to the plea, either acquiescing in its equity or exposing its weakness. You have it in your power to make the appeal availing; and it lies in the direction of *removing the causes and provocations* of the hostile censures of which you complain. I do not mean by this that you must abolish slavery, though unquestionably while slavery exists it will be denounced. But if you would silence these hot and blistering censures of the world, you must reform the system, and relieve it of many of its present features.

You do not seem to be at all aware of the character and tendencies of the civil society you are building up in the Southern States. It is not the mere *fact* of slavery that constitutes its distinguishing feature, — but the *kind* of slavery, and the influence it is exerting over the legislation, the morals and manners, the thoughts and opinions of Southern society. When you read, a few years ago, Mr. Gladstone's revelations of the nature of the government of Naples, — how all freedom of speech was suppressed, — how men were imprisoned or exiled for uttering thoughts of liberty, or censures of official acts, — how all free participation in public affairs was denied, and political activity rigidly restricted to the tools of the tyranny that ruled, — how the forms of justice were abused to the purposes of oppression, and all society was subjected to the authority of force, aiming only at the absolute and perpetual supremacy of a single, selfish interest; you had no difficulty in predicting the ruin of such a system, and the utter overthrow of the power on which it rested. You judge of the security of all foreign governments by the degree to which they enlist the favor and friendly support of their subjects. When the welfare of the masses is consulted and their rights respected, — wherever the supreme authority makes the people its allies and aids, the government is safe, because it has disarmed those who are liable to become its enemies. But when the heavy hand of power is the only weapon used, — when justice means simply the welfare and the will of the dominant authority, you know perfectly well the fate which must overtake it. You can read the coming doom of Austria in Venetia in the character of the sway she has established there. You can see how idle it is to ask that the people of Piedmont, enjoying freedom themselves, should not denounce and execrate the despotism that crushes life and hope from the hearts of their immediate neighbors. What fatal delusion blinds you to the same sad lesson, when it glares at you from the pages of your own legislation?

THE TENDENCIES OF SOUTHERN CIVIL SOCIETY.

The worst tyranny of the worst government which ever existed is fairly paralleled in the current history of the Southern States. No man within your borders dare canvass fairly and publicly the wisdom of the leading feature of your own society. In this Republican government, where the people choose their rulers, no man dare to-day avow openly in the Southern States that he voted for the man who has been elected President of the Republic. Freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, freedom of political action, are more thoroughly stifled and extinguished in the South than in Austria, or Russia, or the most absolute despotism on the face of the earth. And a still worse feature of the case is, that this violence does not even think it necessary to clothe itself in the forms of law. It is not by legal tribunals, — not by ministers of justice, — not even under pretence of legality, that these awful outrages on the spirit of liberty are perpetrated. In all other lauds despotism puts on the robes of legal form. It clothes itself in the outward garb of law, even when it perpetrates the worst outrages upon its spirit. But in the South it repudiates all restraint, — all form, — all respect for the opinions of the world. It stalks abroad like a hideous savage, — scornful of civilization, obeying only the impulse of its brutal nature, and lording it over courts and magistrates as imperiously as over the meaner subjects of its rule. You say these lawless outrages are perpetrated only by the mob, the scum and ruffianism of the community. But where are the orderly, the respectable, the civilized, and law-abiding portion of your people? Either they approve of these acts, or they submit to them from stern necessity, and because they dare not oppose them. In either case the result is the same. They are silent and powerless. They have no voice in the government of their own society. And unless all history is false, nothing is more certain, than that they will become victims of that savage despotism which they are powerless to withstand, against which they dare not even protest. Every year their danger becomes more imminent, because the causes which create it become more potent. They have surrendered the authority which they ought to wield with prudence, with wisdom, and with due regard to the tendencies and influences of the age, into the hands of brutal, reckless force, — which ignores all equity, scoffs at all moral influences, and tramples like a beast upon everything that stands in the way of its will.

One immediate practical result of this policy is, that the great mass of your people perform their most important political duties in utter ignorance of the facts most essential to their just and intelligent discharge. Take the recent Presidential canvass as an example. Mr. Lincoln was a candidate for the Presidency. You asserted throughout the South that he was in favor of the abolition of slavery; that he regarded the negro as the equal of the white man, and was in favor of giving him equal social and political rights; that he and the party which supported him were pledged to open and deadly hostility against the South, and that his success would be the signal of your ruin. The truth of these assertions was the most important point involved in the contest, especially to the people of the Southern States. Did you allow it to be freely and fairly canvassed? Your local journals echoed the assertion, and closed their columns to anything that would discredit it. Your postmasters — or rather the Federal postmasters upon your soil — re-

fused to deliver journals that denied and refuted it. You ignored or confiscated and destroyed the public speeches of Mr. Lincoln himself, by which its truth or falsehood could have been decisively tested. You admitted from abroad no newspapers but those which echoed and reaffirmed the abominable slander, and you lynched every man at home who ventured to dispute it. The effect of all this may be illustrated by a single incident.

I received a private letter not many days ago from an intelligent, upright, fair-minded, and influential gentleman, — holding high public station in the State of Mississippi, — in which he closed some remarks on the election by saying: “And when I say that I would regard death by a stroke of lightning to Mr. Lincoln as just punishment from an offended Deity for his infamous and unpatriotic avowals, *especially those made on a presentation of a pitcher by some free negroes to Gov. Chase, of Ohio*, you may judge how less just and temperate men feel.” Now, I have it on authority which you would not question, that “Mr. Lincoln never saw Gov. Chase in his life; that he never attended a meeting of negroes, free or slave, in his life; and that he never saw a pitcher presented by anybody to anybody.” But the statement was published, originally, so far as I know, in the *New York Herald*, and circulated throughout the South. No denial or correction was allowed to follow it. What people or what nation can exercise the right of self-government with judgment or justice, when they are thus shut up without defence to the power of systematic falsehood? You fastened upon us the epithet of *Black Republicans*; you have circulated the falsehood that our candidate for Vice-President has negro blood in his veins; you might have asserted with the same impunity that we were all negroes, — for you would have found Northern journalists and politicians base enough to countenance the lie, and your domestic regulations would have prevented its effectual contradiction among the masses of the people in the Southern States. Do you believe that such a political system is consistent with safety?

CHARACTER AND TENDENCY OF THE SYSTEM OF SLAVERY.

I have referred thus far solely to the tyranny exercised over the white portion of Southern society as one of the causes which provoke the denunciations of which you complain. I know very well, however, that it grows out of, and is inseparable from, the system of government you have adopted for your slaves. I have no wish to enter upon the details of that system. My object is merely to designate its leading features, and I make no enumeration, therefore, of the countless illustrations of the system afforded in the every-day life of the Southern plantation. The whole system rests on the assumption that the negro is not a man, — that he is, if not absolutely a brute, at best a link between the human and the brute creation; and that his place in society is that of absolute subjection to the will not only of a master, but of an owner; and that all the arrangements of society must be such as will keep him and his descendants forever in that position. This assumption repudiates everything like *rights* in connection with the negro. He has no right to his wife or to his children any more than to himself. He has no right to any degree of freedom, either in action, in speech, or in hope. He has no right to instruction, — to moral culture, — to the development of whatever faculties

he may possess, or even to physical support and comfort. Whatever he may enjoy of any of these things is the voluntary gift of his owner, — prompted either by his own interest, by his humanity, or his personal sense of obligation, not conceded at all as a matter of right on the part of the slave. And the tendency of this system in its practical workings is steadily towards greater and greater rigor. The arm of power becomes muscular and heavy by being used. The regulations for slaves become more and more severe, as their severity provokes open or sullen discontent. The privileges accorded to them become less and less. State laws are becoming more and more common prohibiting their emancipation. Masters who are indulgent become more and more objects of suspicion and hostility. They are felt to be out of place in the system, — incongruous with its spirit and dangerous to its permanent existence. The grand point to be established in its theory and in its practical working is, that *the will of a white man*, — without any regard to the thing willed, — without regard to its justice, its right or wrong, its humanity or barbarity, its necessity or its uselessness, — the *bare will* of the white is to be, in all cases and under all contingencies, *the absolute, supreme law for the negro*, against which it is treason to rebel, and resistance to which may be punished with whatever tortures the authority that makes the law may see fit to inflict. This is the essence of the American slave system as it exists in theory, and in law, in the Southern States. I do not say that there are no departures from that theory in practice. There are departures from it, — not only in isolated cases, but in whole communities, and in many entire States. But there are also States in which the practical workings of the system have already come closely up to its theory. And the *tendency* is steadily in that direction. The despotism over the whites, of which I have already spoken, is designed to crush out all these exceptional cases, and to make American slavery in practice and in fact what it is in the theory on which it rests.

You must not understand me as implying that the Federal Government, or that we of the North, have any right to interpose our power against this tendency in the slaveholding States. You are sovereign over your own domestic affairs, of which this is one. But you are demanding the sanction of the Federal Government for it all. You are seeking to graft upon the Constitution the principle which lies at the bottom of it all, — out of which it all grows just as naturally as a forest of oaks grows out of a single acorn, — namely, that *a slave is property and nothing else*. And you are demanding also that we of the North shall cease denouncing or censuring a system under which these things are possible, — nay, under which, according to your own excuse for them, they are necessary and inevitable. For this is your plea in their defence. Without them, you assert slavery is impossible, — because no system less rigid, less exacting, less despotic, could keep the slaves in subjection.

THE CERTAINTY THAT SUCH A SYSTEM MUST FAIL.

Now if this plea is true, it affords the most conclusive demonstration that the system is doomed to speedy destruction, and the only question that remains is, whether that destruction shall come amid the nameless enormities of a wholesale slaughter, or in some less formidable shape. If you will sep-

arate yourself from all connection with it, and look upon it as you would upon any other social problem or phenomenon in which you had no personal concern or preconceived opinion, I think you would have little difficulty in seeing, and little hesitation in saying, that such a system in North America, and in this advanced age of civilization, could not possibly be made permanent. Upon some remote island in some distant sea, — far removed from all contact with the sentiments, the movements, the active moral and material agencies of the world, — a weak tribe of ignorant savages might be thus permanently held under the supreme will of a dominant race. But under no other conditions is it possible. The same powers, visible and invisible, which have changed the face of other communities, must have sway in the South. The railroad, the telegraph, the steamboat, printing, public discussion, inventions, — these are among the agencies which have given so great an impulse to the principle of liberty all over the world within the last half century. The general effect of them all is to rouse the mind to action; to stimulate the moral energies, and the self-asserting elements of character, in every community which they pervade. No man can live for years in full sight of a railroad, and witness daily the power which its operations indicate, without being changed in some of the most essential elements of his character. It shames his weakness; it widens the circle of his thoughts; it gives dignity and a larger scope to his aspirations and his aims. So is it with all the great agencies of civilization. Now you have all these things in the Southern States, and you must continue to have them. They all symbolize power, freedom, the unchecked development of human energy, and they all point to loftier hopes and endeavors. Do you suppose that your slaves can be shut out from these influences, or that they can be exposed to them, and remain the same tame beasts of burden which they were at the outset? Take especially that great agency of popular education, the political discussions of the day. Do you suppose your negroes go through such a campaign as the one just closed with no new ideas — no fresh impulses — no other hopes and longings than they had before? Can they hear you discuss the great themes of liberty and labor, the stirring questions of peace and war, the issues of tariffs and home-stead bills and railroads, the importance of cotton and sugar and rice to the movements of the world, the relations of the races, the possibilities and prospects of emancipation, the views and sentiments of the different political parties upon all these topics, and yet be in thought, in feeling, and in character precisely what they were before the campaign commenced? Do you observe no difference in the spirit, the intelligence, and the temper of those slaves who live in large towns and have been brought in constant contact with all these influences, and those who live on the remote plantations of the back country, seeing and hearing of nothing but their daily task? And has it not occurred to you that the causes of this difference are operating steadily and irresistibly upon the great masses of the people, slaves included, everywhere, and that sooner or later they will transform them into something very different from what they find them?

In the policy of Repression and Force, which is the policy to which the South seems inclined to commit its destiny, she is making precisely the mistake which has ruined every despotism on the face of the earth, — against which History and Philosophy alike protest, and which can have but one

result, — the ruin and destruction of all concerned. You can see this in foreign societies; why are you so utterly blind to it in your own? One after another the dominations that rest on Power alone break through the thin and fragile crust, and disappear forever. To the careless eye their foundation seems solid and seamless as the ice that congeals and covers the lake. But steadily and silently decay works upon the under surface, and the gale of a night sweeps away the last vestige of what seemed adamant the day before. What is to make the South an exception to this universal law? Is it that the slaves are black? So were those of St. Domingo. Is it that black blood and brain have no capacity to plan revolt? Even if this plea were true, the white blood mingling with the black blood of the South is rapidly giving them leaders for every emergency. It gives eyes and thought to the blind Polyphemus that seems to be lying helpless and prone. Is it that your power is too compact, — your supremacy too thoroughly established, — your measures of repression too vigorous and comprehensive to permit such a catastrophe? Alas! so thought the King of Naples, — so thinks every despot down to the very hour that precipitates his doom.

No power on earth is adequate to the permanent suppression of the moral forces that sway the world. You may divert the force, but you cannot suppress it. And the course upon which the South has entered, if steadily pursued, is just as certain to end in ruin, as fastening down the safety-valve of a steam-boiler is to end in an explosion. It may not come in five, or in ten, or in fifty years; but it is just as inevitable as Fate. You may not live to be its victim, but your children will.

I am not in this predicting what I wish should happen. Far from it. I am only stating the necessary result of an irresistible law. Nor am I claiming any authority on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with it. The Constitution has given control of it exclusively to your own States. All that the Federal Government can do is to look on, — sadly and with a clear foresight of the certain issue, — and when the catastrophe comes, interfere on your behalf and for your protection. But you cannot expect or ask us to look on in silence. You cannot expect us to utter no warning, to put forth no remonstrance, to feel and express no indignation at a blindness so obstinate and so fatal. If you would silence the Pulpit and the Press of the North, you must disarm them. You must remove the causes which justly provoke their denunciations. I know no other way of attaining the object you seek. Possibly they *ought* to desist without these conditions. I doubt not you think they should, and deem it discourteous and hostile that they will not. But the fact remains. Just so long as you continue to affront the instinctive sense of justice and humanity by a policy which imitates and transcends the worst illustrations of despotism the world has ever seen, just so long will you rouse the resentment, and incur the censure, not only of the North, but of every nation of Christendom. If it be your object, therefore, to secure immunity from these didactic hostilities; if you wish practically to escape, and silence these denunciations, and not merely to make out a case against those who utter them, — you will at least canvass the wisdom of changing the policy on which you have entered.

THE TRUE POLICY OF THE SOUTH.

I do not say that you must abolish slavery. That is a matter for your own people to decide. But you must *permit your own people to decide it*, and to discuss it freely, in order to decide it wisely. I think I know enough of sentiment at the South to be aware that it is not the largest, the wealthiest, or the most important slaveholders who have initiated this new policy of making slavery perpetual and paramount in their social system, and who are now pushing the attempt to its final issue. Nor is it the best minds, the most sagacious statesmen, the wisest thinkers of the South who have enlisted in it. It is rather the policy of the unthinking masses, — the great body of non-slaveholding whites, without property, without intelligence, — with nothing but the bare fact of freedom to raise them above the slave, and who see no other way of maintaining that supremacy but by perpetuating the negro slavery on which it rests. It is this class who have nothing to lose, led on by that large class of reckless politicians who have everything to gain by ministering to the dominant passion of their society, and by excessive zeal on behalf of a system which no man is permitted to assail, who have pushed the issue to its present extreme position. It is they who have silenced freedom of speech — who frown on freedom of opinion — who trample on freedom of inquiry in regard to slavery.

And the first and paramount duty of every Southern statesman, — every man of thought, of culture, and of courage in the Southern States is, to *emancipate Southern white society from this fatal thralldom*. Men of this class must assert and exercise the right of canvassing the subject of slavery fully and freely as a matter of paramount practical importance to themselves and their posterity. You know very well that there are thousands of men in the Southern States who have grave and serious doubts, to use no stronger phrase, as to the wisdom and good policy of making negro slavery the corner-stone of Southern society. There are many who desire a broader foundation for the material prosperity of their section than the culture of cotton, and a higher moral rank among the nations than slavery can give them. Why should they not discuss among themselves these great questions of social and political economy? Why should they be silenced in presence of the gravest questions that can engage the attention of statesmen and of States? Would such freedom of inquiry be dangerous to the "institution"? Then by that very fact the institution is already proved to be dangerous to the State.

But I am not prepared to believe that the peril is so imminent as to make discussion dangerous in the Southern States. On the contrary, I believe it to be the only safeguard of Southern society. It is the only condition of deliverance from the perils which hang over it. Let the strong, independent minds of the South grapple with this subject as they grapple with every other. Let them look slavery in the face, and canvass fully and fearlessly its true relations to the welfare of society and the growth and prosperity of the Southern States. Do you fear such a discussion? That fear is equivalent to a surrender of the argument. Do you oppose it on the principle that slavery is too sacred a thing to be thus canvassed and cross-examined? It is the only institution, then, human or divine, on the face of the earth, for which you would claim such immunity. Do you say it would be playing into the

hands of your enemies? It would disarm and silence them. They would lose all motive for meddling with subjects in which they had no direct concern when they saw them freely and conscientiously canvassed by those whose personal, social, and political interests were all involved.

But such discussion you think would tend towards Emancipation. In certain sections of the South, I presume it would, — and in others, I think it would not. But even if it did, it could only be by proving that Emancipation in some form, and at some time, — the prospect and the hope of *ultimate* Emancipation, — would promote the highest and the best interests of the Southern States. If it did not prove that, — then it would tend to fortify slavery instead of abolishing it. My own impression is that it would show the wisdom of modifying the present system of American slavery in certain important respects, — taking into view the substantial interests of all concerned. I think it would establish certain facts concerning the negro race which you are in danger of forgetting, and which you cannot forget or ignore with any more wisdom than a builder can forget or ignore the laws of gravity, or than an engineer can forget the explosive nature of steam. It would show that, however degraded, however ignorant, however brutal he may be, the negro has in him the seeds of humanity, and that, like all other pain and pleasure, physical and moral, like other seeds they will inevitably *grow*; that he feels like other men; that he has a *will*, — a faculty of choice, — a susceptibility to motive, like any other *person*, and in spite of all laws that declare him to be merely *property*; — that he has emotions and affections, — that he loves and hates, — that he hopes and fears, — that he yields to kindness and rebels inwardly against cruelty, — just like other men, and not at all like other “chattels.” And when these facts should come to pervade the public mind, as sooner or later they must if they are facts, unless that mind is kept sealed against all access of them, they would lay the foundation for a policy on the subject of slavery which would calm the public mind, and restore the old relations between the States and sections of the Union, as nothing else can ever do.

There are one or two leading principles which must be recognized in the practical working of every society, if that society is to rest on any firm and sure foundation. One is, that every subject of government must feel that he is under the control and guardianship of *LAW*, — that mere caprice or whim, — the interest or the passion of another, — is not the highest authority for him in any of his relations. Another is that labor becomes valuable in proportion as it becomes intelligent. And a third is that the laborer must have something to *hope for*, as a result of his labor, or he will never put forth the best effort of which he is capable. I am persuaded that the Southern States would feel it infinitely to their advantage to incorporate these principles into their slaveholding economy. I do not believe there is a slave on any Southern plantation, who would not become more valuable by becoming more intelligent. There is not one who would not be more contented, if he could be surrounded by something of the guaranties against wrong which are essential to all society; if he could feel that he had some place in the domestic and social economy of the world, — that his wife and children were his by law, and that no man's passion or avarice was above the law which made them so. And if every slave, thus shielded from wrong, were told that

something of added good should come to him or his from increased devotion to his master's service; that reward should wait upon fidelity, as punishment upon evasion and crime; that his good works should pass to the credit at least of his posterity, and that some one or more of his children should be lifted up towards freedom by his exertions on their behalf, in faithful service of their common master, — if such a system of methodized and justly modulated rewards and penalties could be interwoven with the negro slavery of the Southern States, I make no doubt that augmented peace and security would be its immediate reward, and that in twenty years the whole slaveholding country would rejoice in the prospect of a degree of prosperity and power of which hitherto it has never dreamed. It is in that direction, and in that direction only, in my opinion, that safety for the slaveholding States can be found. They may tread that path however slowly, — with whatever hesitations and misgivings, — against whatever reluctances of prejudice and pride may be inseparable from the circumstances of the case; the world will make allowance for all this, and will cheer and aid the well-meant effort, however feeble and halting it may be. All the moral influences of the age; all the motives and promptings of civilization and Christianity; all the laws of social and civil science, will be working in your behalf, and no longer for your destruction. Here are problems worthy your noblest statesmen. Here are fields where the most gifted and ambitious intellects of your States may win salvation for their country and renown for themselves. How much nobler would it be for such men as you have among you, to launch out, not rashly, but with calm and courageous wisdom, upon this broad and inviting though stormy sea, — as yet untempted by the most daring prow, — than to sit down in sullen despair and hopeless inaction upon the grim and cheerless shore!

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE SOUTH.

But again I must protest that I am speaking of things over which the Federal Government has no shadow of authority. I am only telling you what I believe to be the path of safety, of honor, and of glory for the Southern States. It is for them and their statesmen to say whether they will tread it or not. Not one word have I uttered from any other motive than a profound desire for the promotion of your welfare. You will fling from you in scorn the proffered friendship, and shout execrations against us, as you plunge onward, in all the reckless insolence of offended pride, into the great darkness that lies before you. You do not know the great heart of the free North, if you believe that it holds the honor and the welfare of the South in lower esteem than its own. You underrate the justice of the North, if you believe it would trample on one of your rights. You underrate its magnanimity, if you fear it would not stand by you in any extremity of danger, and wage war upon your foes as fiercely and as gladly as if they were its own. But you underrate also its courage and its power, if you expect to coerce it, by menaces or by blows, into disloyalty to the Constitution which our fathers made, or to the fundamental principles of liberty on which its foundations rest.

The North asks but one thing at the hands of the South, and that is that they shall no longer cling to the Constitution of Mr. Calhoun, in preference

to the Constitution of the United States. We ask them to abide by the principles and the policy of the fathers of the Republic, as they read them in their speeches and their letters, and in the language and the spirit of the Constitution itself. Let us return to the sentiments, the aspirations, and the hopes of Washington and Jefferson, and Madison and Mason, — Southern men and slaveholders all, — and adapt our policy and the development of our institutions, State and national, to their high and just ideals. Give us the slightest ground to hope for this, and we will make haste to purge ourselves of all offence; to disarm every just censure you can urge against us, and to perform, with eager and scrupulous fidelity, every constitutional and fraternal obligation that devolves upon us.

Our government is approaching its final and decisive test. The party which represents the sentiments—just, conservative, and free—of the Northern States, is soon to come into possession of the executive power of this Republic. Mr. Lincoln, its chosen representative, becomes President of the United States on the 4th of March. You may search the country through, and you will find no more sagacious intellect, no more loyal and patriotic heart, no more sensitively and courageously just and right-meaning man than he. His whole character breathes the very spirit of our American life. His public career and his private history are alike unstained by any act, or by any word, of wrong to any man or to any State. He knows no law for his public conduct but the Constitution of his country, and he recognizes no country as his but that Union, one and indivisible, which the Constitution creates. You are preparing to meet him as an enemy. You are withdrawing all the States which you and your confederates can control into a compact and a hostile camp. Repudiating the Constitution, — repelling the supremacy of the Federal Government, — you propose to employ the intervening months before his advent in preparations to resist the constitutional authority which he will represent and wield. South Carolina has already pitched her alien tent, and raised her hostile flag. Georgia, and Alabama, and Mississippi, and possibly half-a-dozen more States, will imitate her example. You have an ally in the faithless and disloyal man who degrades the high place which Washington and Jackson made equal in dignity to any throne upon the earth. Whatever may be his motive, whether he be wicked or only weak, you will have all the aid he can give you, — full impunity to perfect your plots, and all the material strength he can place within your reach. And I am quite prepared to see, on the 4th of March, a solid phalanx of fifteen States, — not all, it may be, claiming to be outside the Union then, but all consenting and ready to meet the incoming administration of Mr. Lincoln with a peremptory demand that SLAVES SHALL BE DISTINCTLY AND UNEQUIVOCALLY RECOGNIZED AS PROPERTY BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, as the only condition on which they will remain, or again become, members of the American Union.

And I have only to add that, in my judgment, *that demand will never be conceded.* We shall stand then, as now, upon the Constitution which our fathers made. We shall not make a new one, nor shall we permit any human power

to destroy the old one. Long before that day shall come the people of the Northern States will stand together as one man — forgetful of all past differences and divisions — to preserve the American Union, and crush any revolution which may menace it with destruction. We seek no war, — we shall wage no war except in defence of the Constitution and against its foes. But we have a country and a Constitutional Government. We know its worth to us and to mankind, and in case of necessity we are ready to test its strength. You must not misunderstand our hopes of peace, our wish for peace, — or our readiness to make concession, for its preservation. Even if we were to concede everything you ask, we should only postpone the conflict to a later day, and throw upon our children duties and responsibilities which belong to us. I think, therefore, that the controversy should be settled now, and I have faith enough in the American people to believe that, in spite of difficulties and discouragements, by wisdom and prudent forbearance, mingled with justice and courage, on the part of their rulers, it will eventually be settled in conformity with the principles of the Constitution, and so as to promote the highest welfare of this great Republic.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY J. RAYMOND.

APPENDIX D.

THE PHILADELPHIA ADDRESS :—1866.

[The Address and Declaration of Principles adopted at the National Union Convention in Philadelphia, August 14, 1866, — written by Henry J. Raymond, — were as follows :—]

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES :

Having met in convention, at the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, this 16th day of August, 1866, as the representatives of the people in all sections, and from all the States and Territories of the Union, to consult upon the condition and the wants of our common country, we address to you this declaration of our principles, and of the political purposes we seek to promote.

Since the meeting of the last National Convention, in the year 1860, events have occurred which have changed the character of our internal politics, and given the United States a new place among the nations of the earth. Our government has passed through the vicissitudes and the perils of civil war, — a war which, though mainly sectional in its character, has, nevertheless, decided political differences that from the very beginning of the government had threatened the unity of our national existence, and has left its impress deep and ineffaceable upon all the interests, the sentiments, and the destiny of the Republic. While it has inflicted upon the whole country severe losses in life and in property, and has imposed burdens which must weigh on its resources for generations to come, it has developed a degree of national courage in the presence of national dangers, a capacity for military organization and achievement, and a devotion on the part of the people to the form of government which they have ordained, and to the principles of liberty which that government was designed to promote, which must confirm the confidence of the nation in the perpetuity of its Republican institutions, and command the respect of the civilized world.

Like all great contests which rouse the passions and test the endurance of nations, this war has given new scope to the ambition of political parties, and fresh impulse to plans of innovation and reform. Amidst the chaos of conflicting sentiments inseparable from such an era, while the public heart is keenly alive to all the passions that can sway the public judgment and affect the public action; while the wounds of war are still fresh and bleeding on either side, and fears for the future take unjust proportions from the memories and resentments of the past, — it is a difficult but an imperative duty which, on your behalf, we who are here assembled have undertaken to perform.

For the first time after six long years of alienation and of conflict, we have come together from every State and every section of our land, as citizens of a common country, under that flag, the symbol again, of a common glory, to consult together how best to cement and perpetuate that Union which is again the object of our common love, and thus secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

I. In the first place, we invoke you to remember always and everywhere, that the war is ended and the nation is again at peace. The shock of contending arms no longer assails the shuddering heart of the Republic. The insurrection against the supreme authority of the nation has been suppressed, and that authority has been again acknowledged, by word and act, in every State, and by every citizen within its jurisdiction. We are no longer required or permitted to regard or treat each other as enemies. Not only have the acts of war been discontinued, and the weapons of war laid aside; but the state of war no longer exists, and the sentiments, the passions, the relations of war have no longer lawful or rightful place anywhere throughout our broad domain. We are again people of the United States, fellow-citizens of one country, bound by the duties and obligations of a common patriotism, and having neither rights nor interests apart from a common destiny. The duties that devolve upon us now are again the duties of peace, and no longer the duties of war. We have assembled here to take counsel concerning the interests of peace — to decide how we may most wisely and effectually heal the wounds the war has made, and perfect and perpetuate the benefits it has secured, and the blessings which, under a wise and benign Providence, have sprung up in its fiery track. This is the work, not of passion, but of calm and sober judgment, not of resentment for past offences prolonged beyond the limits which justice and reason prescribe, but of a liberal statesmanship which tolerates what it cannot prevent, and builds its plans and its hopes for the future rather upon a community of interest and ambition than upon distrust and the weapons of force.

II. In the next place, we call upon you to recognize in their full significance, and to accept with all their legitimate consequences, the political results of the war just closed. In two most important particulars the victory achieved by the National Government has been final and decisive. *First*, it has established beyond all further controversy, and by the highest of all human sanctions, the absolute supremacy of the National Government, as defined and limited by the Constitution of the United States, and the permanent integrity and indissolubility of the Federal Union as a necessary consequence; and, *second*, it has put an end finally and forever to the existence of slavery upon the soil or within the jurisdiction of the United States. Both these points became directly involved in the contest, and the controversy upon both was ended absolutely and finally by the result.

III. In the third place, we deem it of the utmost importance that the real character of the war and the victory by which it was closed should be accurately understood. The war was carried on by the government of the United States in maintenance of its own authority and in defence of its own existence, both of which were menaced by the insurrection which it sought to suppress. The suppression of that insurrection accomplished that result. The government of the United States maintained by force of arms the

supreme authority over all the territory, and over all the States and people within its jurisdiction, which the Constitution confers upon it; but it acquired thereby no new power, no enlarged jurisdiction, no rights either of territorial possession or of civil authority which it did not possess before the rebellion broke out. All the rightful power it can ever possess is that which is conferred upon it, either in express terms, or by fair and necessary implication, by the Constitution of the United States. It was that power and that authority which the rebellion sought to overthrow; and the victory of the Federal arms was simply the defeat of that attempt. The government of the United States acted throughout the war on the defensive. It sought only to hold possession of what was already its own. Neither the war, nor the victory by which it was closed, changed in any way the Constitution of the United States. The war was carried on by virtue of its provisions, and under the limitations which they prescribe; and the result of the war did not either enlarge, abridge, or in any way change or affect, the powers it confers upon the Federal Government, or release that government from the restrictions which it has imposed.

The Constitution of the United States is to-day precisely as it was before the war, the "supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding;" and to-day, also, precisely as before the war, "all the powers not conferred by the Constitution upon the General Government, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the several States, or to the people thereof."

This position is vindicated, not only by the essential nature of our government, and the language and spirit of the Constitution, but by all the acts and the language of our government; in all its departments, and at all times from the outbreak of the rebellion to its final overthrow. In every message and proclamation of the Executive it was explicitly declared that the sole object and purpose of the war was to maintain the authority of the Constitution and to preserve the integrity of the Union; and Congress more than once reiterated this solemn declaration, and added the assurance that, whenever that object should be attained, the war should cease, and all the States should retain their equal rights and dignity unimpaired.

It is only since the war was closed that other rights have been asserted on behalf of one department of the General Government. It has been proclaimed by Congress that, in addition to the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution, the Federal Government may now claim over the States, the territory, and the people involved in the insurrection, the rights of war,—the right of conquest and of confiscation, the right to abrogate all existing governments, institutions, and laws, and to subject the territory conquered and its inhabitants to such laws, regulations, and deprivations, as the legislative department of the government may see fit to impose. Under this broad and sweeping claim, that clause of the Constitution which provides that "no State shall, without its consent, be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States," has been annulled, and ten States have been refused, and are still refused, representation altogether in both branches of the Federal Congress. And the Congress in which only a part of the States and of the people of the Union are represented has asserted the right thus to exclude the rest from representation, and from all share in making their

own laws; or choosing their own rulers, until they shall comply with such conditions, and perform such acts, as this Congress thus composed may itself prescribe. That right has not only been asserted, but it has been exercised, and is practically enforced at the present time. Nor does it find any support in the theory that the States thus excluded are in rebellion against the government, and are therefore precluded from sharing its authority. They are not thus in rebellion. They are, one and all, in an attitude of loyalty toward the government, and of sworn allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. In no one of them is there the slightest indication of resistance to this authority, or the slightest protest against its just and binding obligation. This condition of renewed loyalty has been officially recognized by solemn proclamation of the Executive Department. The laws of the United States have been extended by Congress over all these States and the people thereof. Federal Courts have been reopened, and Federal taxes imposed and levied. And in every respect, except that they are denied representation in Congress and the Electoral College, the States once in rebellion are recognized as holding the same position, as owing the same obligations, and subject to the same duties, as the other States of our common Union.

It seems to us, in the exercise of the calmest and most candid judgment we can bring to the subject, that such a claim, so enforced, involves as fatal an overthrow of the authority of the Constitution, and as complete a destruction of the Government and Union, as that which was sought to be effected by the States and people in armed insurrection against them both. It cannot escape observation, that the power thus asserted to exclude certain States from representation, is made to rest wholly in the will and discretion of the Congress that asserts it. It is not made to depend upon any specified conditions or circumstances, nor to be subject to any rules or regulations whatever. The right asserted and exercised is absolute, without qualification or restriction, not confined to States in rebellion, nor to States that have rebelled; it is the right of any Congress in formal possession of legislative authority, to exclude any State or States, and any portion of the people thereof, at any time, from representation in Congress and in the Electoral College, at its own discretion, and until they shall perform such acts, and comply with such conditions, as it may dictate. Obviously, the reasons for such exclusion, being wholly within the discretion of Congress, may change as the Congress itself shall change. One Congress may exclude a State from all share in the government for one reason; and, that reason removed, the next Congress may exclude it for another. One State may be excluded on one ground to-day, and another may be excluded on the opposite ground to-morrow. Northern ascendancy may exclude Southern States from one Congress; the ascendancy of Western or of Southern interests, or of both combined, may exclude the Northern or the Eastern States from the next, improbable as such usurpations may seem, the establishment of the principle now asserted and acted upon by Congress will render them by no means impossible. The character, indeed the very existence, of Congress and the Union is thus made to depend solely and entirely upon the party and sectional exigencies or forbearances of the hour.

We need not stop to show that such action not only finds no warrant in the

Constitution, but is at war with every principle of our government, and with the very existence of free institutions. It is, indeed, the identical practice which has rendered fruitless all attempts hitherto to establish and maintain free governments in Mexico and the States of South America. Party necessities assert themselves as superior to the fundamental law, which is set aside in reckless obedience to their behests. Stability, whether in the exercise of power, in the administration of government, or in the enjoyment of rights, becomes impossible; and the conflicts of party, which, under constitutional governments, are the conditions and means of political progress, are merged in the conflicts of arms to which they directly and inevitably tend.

It was against this peril, so conspicuous and so fatal to all free governments, that our Constitution was intended especially to provide. Not only the stability, but the very existence, of the government, is made by its provisions to depend upon the right and the fact of representation. The Congress, upon which is conferred all the legislative power of the National Government, consists of two branches, the Senate and House of Representatives, whose joint concurrence or assent is essential to the validity of any law. Of these, the House of Representatives, says the Constitution (article 1, section 2), "shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States." Not only is the right of representation thus recognized as possessed by all the States, and by every State without restriction, qualification, or condition of any kind, but the duty of choosing representatives is imposed upon the people of each and every State alike, without distinction, or the authority to make distinctions among them, for any reason or upon any grounds whatever. And in the Senate, so careful is the Constitution to secure to every State this right of representation, it has expressly provided that "no State shall, without its consent, be deprived of its equal suffrage" in that body, even by an amendment of the Constitution itself. When, therefore, any State is excluded from such representation, not only is a right of the State denied, but the constitutional integrity of the Senate is impaired, and the validity of the government itself is brought in question. But Congress at the present moment thus excludes from representation, in both branches of Congress, ten States of the Union, denying them all share in the enactment of laws by which they are to be governed, and all participation in the election of the rulers by which those laws are to be enforced. In other words, a Congress in which only twenty-six States are represented, asserts the right to govern, absolutely and in its own discretion, all the thirty-six States which compose the Union; to make their laws and choose their rulers, and to exclude the other ten from all share in their own government until it sees fit to admit them thereto. What is there to distinguish the power thus asserted and exercised from the most absolute and intolerable tyranny?

IV. Nor do these extravagant and unjust claims, on the part of Congress, to powers and authority never conferred upon the government by the Constitution, find any warrant in the arguments or excuses urged on their behalf. It is alleged, —

First. That these States, by the act of rebellion and by voluntarily withdrawing their members from Congress, forfeited their right of representa-

tion, and that they can only receive it again at the hands of the supreme legislative authority of the government, on its own terms and at its own discretion. If representation in Congress and participation in the government were simply privileges conferred and held by favor, this statement might have the merit of plausibility. But representation is, under the Constitution, not only expressly recognized as a right, but it is imposed as a duty; and it is essential in both aspects to the existence of the government and to the maintenance of its authority. In free governments fundamental and essential rights cannot be forfeited, except against individuals by due process of law; nor can constitutional duties and obligations be discarded or laid aside. The enjoyment of rights may be for a time suspended by the failure to claim them, and duties may be evaded by the refusal to perform them. The withdrawal of their members from Congress by the States which resisted the General Government was among their acts of insurrection — was one of the means and agencies by which they sought to impair the authority and defeat the action of the government; and that act was annulled and rendered void when the insurrection itself was suppressed. Neither the right of representation nor the duty to be represented was in the least impaired by the fact of insurrection, but it may have been that, by reason of the insurrection, the conditions on which the enjoyment of that right and the performance of that duty for the time depended could not be fulfilled. This was, in fact, the case. An insurgent power, in the exercise of usurped and unlawful authority, had prohibited within the territory under its control that allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the United States which is made by that fundamental law the essential condition of representation in its government. No man within the insurgent States was allowed to take the oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and, as a necessary consequence, no man could lawfully represent those States in the councils of the Union. But this was only an obstacle to the enjoyment of the right and to the discharge of a duty; it did not annul the one nor abrogate the other; and it ceased to exist when the usurpation by which it was created had been overthrown, and the States had again resumed their allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Second. But it is asserted in support of the authority claimed by the Congress now in possession of power, that it flows directly from the laws of war; that it is among the rights which victorious war always confers upon the conquerors, and which the conqueror may exercise or waive in his own discretion. To this we reply, that the laws in question relate solely, so far as the rights they confer are concerned, to wars waged between alien and independent nations, and can have no place or force, in this regard, in a war waged by a government to suppress an insurrection of its own people, upon its own soil, against its authority. If we had carried on successful war against any foreign nations, we might thereby have acquired possession and jurisdiction of their soil, with the right to enforce our laws upon their people, and to impose upon them such laws and such obligations as we might choose. But we had, before the war, complete jurisdiction over the soil of the Southern States, limited only by our own Constitution. Our laws were the only national laws in force upon it. The government of the United States was the only government through which those States and their people had relations with foreign nations, and its flag was the only flag by which they were

recognized or known anywhere on the face of the earth. In all these respects, and in all other respects involving national interests and rights, our possession was perfect and complete. It did not need to be acquired, but only to be maintained; and victorious war against the rebellion could do nothing more than maintain it. It could only vindicate and re-establish the disputed supremacy of the Constitution. It could neither enlarge nor diminish the authority which that Constitution confers upon the government by which it was achieved. Such an enlargement or abridgment of constitutional power can be effected only by amendment of the Constitution itself, and such amendment can be made only in the modes which the Constitution itself prescribes. The claim that the suppression of an insurrection against the government gives additional authority and power to that government, especially that it enlarges the jurisdiction of Congress, and gives that body the right to exclude States from representation in the national councils, without which the nation itself can have no authority and no existence, seems to us at variance alike with the principles of the Constitution and with the public safety.

Third. But it is alleged that in certain particulars the Constitution of the United States fails to secure the absolute justice and impartial equality which the principles of our government require; that it was in this respect the result of compromises and concessions, to which, however necessary when the Constitution was formed, we are no longer compelled to submit, and that now, having the power, through successful war, and just warrant for its exercise in the hostile conduct of the insurgent section, the actual government of the United States may impose its own conditions, and make the Constitution conform in all its provisions to its own ideas of equality and the rights of man. Congress, at its last session, proposed amendments to the Constitution, enlarging in some very important particulars the authority of the General Government over that of the several States, and reducing, by indirect disfranchisement, the representative power of the States in which slavery formerly existed; and it is claimed that these amendments may be made valid as parts of the original Constitution, without the concurrence of the States to be most seriously affected by them, or may be imposed upon those States by three-fourths of the remaining States, as conditions of their readmission to representation in Congress and in the Electoral College.

It is the unquestionable right of the people of the United States to make such changes in the Constitution as they, upon due deliberation, may deem expedient. But we insist that they shall be made in the mode which the Constitution itself points out; in conformity with the letter and the spirit of that instrument, and with the principles of self-government and of equal rights which lie at the basis of our Republican institutions. We deny the right of Congress to make these changes in the fundamental law without the concurrence of three-fourths of all the States, including especially those to be most seriously affected by them; or to impose them upon States or people, as conditions of representation or of admission to any of the rights, duties, or obligations which belong under the Constitution to all the States alike. And with still greater emphasis do we deny the right of any portion of the States excluding the rest of the States from any share in their councils, to propose or sanction changes in the Constitution which are to affect perma-

nently their political relations, and control or coerce the legitimate action of all the members of the common Union. Such an exercise of power is simply a usurpation, just as unwarrantable when exercised by Northern States, as it would be if exercised by Southern, and not to be justified or palliated by anything in the past history, either of those by whom it is attempted, or of those upon whose rights and liberties it is to take effect. It finds no warrant in the Constitution. It is at war with the fundamental principles of our form of government. If tolerated in one instance, it becomes the precedent for future invasions of liberty and constitutional right, dependent solely upon the will of the party in possession of power, and thus leads, by direct and necessary sequence, to the most fatal and intolerable of all tyrannies, — the tyranny of shifting and irresponsible political factions. It is against this, the most formidable of all the dangers which menace the stability of free government, that the Constitution of the United States was intended most carefully to provide. We demand a strict and steadfast adherence to its provisions. In this, and in this alone, can we find a basis of permanent union and peace.

Fourth. But it is alleged, in justification of the usurpation which we condemn, that the condition of the Southern States and people is not such as renders safe their readmission to a share in the government of the country; that they are still disloyal in sentiment and purpose, and that neither the honor, the credit, nor the interests of the nation would be safe, if they were readmitted to a share in its councils. We might reply to this : —

1. That we have no right, for such reasons, to deny to any portion of the States or people rights expressly conferred upon them by the Constitution of the United States.

2. That so long as their acts are those of loyalty, — so long as they conform in all their public conduct to the requirements of the Constitution and laws, — we have no right to exact from them conformity in their sentiments and opinions to our own.

3. That we have no right to distrust the purpose or the ability of the people of the Union to protect and defend, under all contingencies and by whatever means may be required, its honor and its welfare.

These would, in our judgment, be full and conclusive answers to the plea thus advanced for the exclusion of these States from the Union. But we say further, that this plea rests upon a complete misapprehension or an unjust perversion of existing facts.

We do not hesitate to affirm, that there is no section of the country where the Constitution and laws of the United States find a more prompt and entire obedience than in those States and among those people who were lately in arms against them; or where there is less purpose or less danger of any future attempt to overthrow their authority. It would seem to be both natural and inevitable, that, in States and sections so recently swept by the whirlwind of war, where all the ordinary modes and methods of organized industry have been broken up, and the bonds and influences that guarantee social order have been destroyed; where thousands and tens of thousands of turbulent spirits have been suddenly loosed from the discipline of war, and thrown without resources or restraint upon a disorganized and chaotic society; and where the keen sense of defeat is added to the overthrow of am-

bition and hope,—scenes of violence should defy for a time the imperfect discipline of law, and excite anew the fears and forebodings of the patriotic and well disposed. It is unquestionably true that local disturbances of this kind, accompanied by more or less of violence, do still occur. But they are confined entirely to the cities and larger towns of the Southern States, where different races and interests are brought most closely in contact, and where passions and resentments are always most easily fed and fanned into outbreak; and even there they are quite as much the fruit of untimely and hurtful political agitation, as of any hostility on the part of the people to the authority of the National Government.

But the concurrent testimony of those best acquainted with the condition of society and the state of public sentiment in the South, including that of its representatives in this convention, establishes the fact that the great mass of the Southern people accept, with as full and sincere submission, as do the people of the other States, the re-established supremacy of the national authority; and are prepared, in the most loyal spirit, and with a zeal quickened alike by their interest and their pride, to co-operate with other States and sections in whatever may be necessary to defend the rights, maintain the honor, and promote the welfare of our common country. History affords no instance where a people, so powerful in numbers, in resources and in public spirit, after a war so long in its duration, so destructive in its progress, and so adverse in its issue, have accepted defeat and its consequences with so much of good faith as has marked the conduct of the people lately in insurrection against the United States. Beyond all question, this has been largely due to the wise generosity with which their enforced surrender was accepted by the President of the United States, and the Generals in immediate command of their armies, and to the liberal measures which were afterwards taken to restore order, tranquillity, and law to the States where all had for the time been overthrown. No steps could have been better calculated to command the respect, win the confidence, revive the patriotism and secure the permanent and affectionate allegiance of the people of the South to the Constitution and laws of the Union, than those which have been so firmly taken and so steadfastly pursued by the President of the United States. And if that confidence and loyalty have been since impaired; if the people of the South are to-day less cordial in their allegiance than they were immediately upon the close of the war, we believe it is due to the changed tone of the legislative department of the General Government toward them; to the action by which Congress has endeavored to supplant and defeat the President's wise and beneficent policy of restoration; to their exclusion from all participation in our common government; to the withdrawal from them of rights conferred and guaranteed by the Constitution, and to the evident purpose of Congress, in the exercise of a usurped and unlawful authority, to reduce them from the rank of free and equal members of a Republic of States, with rights and dignities unimpaired, to the condition of conquered provinces and a conquered people, in all things subordinate and subject to the will of their conquerors,—free only to obey laws in making which they are not allowed to share.

No people has ever yet existed whose loyalty and faith such treatment long continued would not alienate and impair. And the ten millions of Americans

who live in the South would be unworthy citizens of a free country, degenerate sons of an heroic ancestry, unfit ever to become guardians of the rights and liberties bequeathed to us by the fathers and founders of this Republic, if they could accept, with uncomplaining submissiveness, the humiliations thus sought to be imposed upon them. Resentment of injustice is always and everywhere essential to freedom; and the spirit which prompts the States and people lately in insurrection, but insurgent now no longer, to protest against the imposition of unjust and degrading conditions, makes them all the more worthy to share in the government of a free commonwealth, and gives still firmer assurance of the future power and freedom of the Republic. For whatever responsibility the Southern people may have incurred in resisting the authority of the National Government and in taking up arms for its overthrow, they may be held to answer, as individuals, before the judicial tribunals of the land; and for that conduct, as societies and organized communities, they have already paid the most fearful penalties that can fall on offending States in the losses, the sufferings, and humiliations of unsuccessful war. But whatever may be the guilt or the punishment of the conscious authors of the insurrection, candor and common justice demand the concession that the great mass of those who became involved in its responsibility acted upon what they believed to be their duty, in defence of what they had been taught to believe their rights, or under a compulsion, physical and moral, which they were powerless to resist. Nor can it be amiss to remember that, terrible as have been the bereavements and the losses of this war, they have fallen exclusively upon neither section and upon neither party; that they have fallen, indeed, with far greater weight upon those with whom the war began; that in the death of relatives and friends, the dispersion of families, the disruption of social systems and social ties, the overthrow of governments, of law and order, the destruction of property and of forms and modes and means of industry, the loss of political, commercial, and moral influence, — in every shape and form which great calamities can assume, the States and people which engaged in the war against the government of the United States have suffered tenfold more than those who remained in allegiance to its Constitution and laws.

These considerations may not, as they certainly do not, justify the action of the people of the insurgent States; but no just or generous mind will refuse to them very considerable weight in determining the line of conduct which the government of the United States should pursue toward them.

They accept, if not with alacrity, certainly without sullen resentment, the defeat and overthrow they have sustained. They acknowledge and acquiesce in the results, to themselves and the country, which that defeat involves. They no longer claim for any State the right to secede from the Union; they no longer assert for any State an allegiance paramount to that which is due to the General Government. They have accepted the destruction of slavery, abolished it by their State Constitutions, and concurred with the States and people of the whole Union in prohibiting its existence forever upon the soil or within the jurisdiction of the United States. They indicate and evince their purpose, just so fast as may be possible and safe, to adapt their domestic laws to the changed condition of their society, and to secure by the law and its tribunals equal and impartial justice to all classes of their inhabitants.

They admit the invalidity of all acts of resistance to the national authority, and of all debts incurred in attempting its overthrow. They avow their willingness to share the burdens and discharge all the duties and obligations which rest upon them, in common with other States and other sections of the Union; and they renew, through their representatives in this convention, by all their public conduct, in every way, and by the most solemn acts by which States and societies can pledge their faith, their engagement to bear true faith and allegiance, through all time to come, to the Constitution of the United States, and to all laws that may be made in pursuance thereof.

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN: We call upon you, in full reliance upon your intelligence and your patriotism, to accept, with generous and ungrudging confidence, this full surrender on the part of those lately in arms against your authority, and to share with them the honor and renown that await those who bring back peace and concord to jarring States. The war just closed, with all its sorrows and disasters, has opened a new career of glory to the nation it has saved. It has swept away the hostilities of sentiment and of interest which were a standing menace to its peace. It has destroyed the institution of slavery, always a cause of sectional agitation and strife, and has opened for our country the way to unity of interest, of principle, and of action through all time to come. It has developed in both sections a military capacity, an aptitude for achievements of war, both by sea and land, before unknown even to ourselves, and destined to exercise hereafter, under united councils, an important influence upon the character and destiny of the continent and the world. And while it has thus revealed, disciplined, and compacted our power, it has proved to us beyond controversy or doubt, by the course pursued toward both contending sections by foreign powers, that we must be the guardians of our own independence, and that the principles of Republican freedom we represent can find among the nations of the earth no friends or defenders but ourselves.

We call upon you, therefore, by every consideration of your own dignity and safety, and in the name of liberty throughout the world, to complete the work of restoration and peace which the President of the United States has so well begun, and which the policy adopted and the principles asserted by the present Congress alone obstruct. The time is close at hand when members of a new Congress are to be elected. If that Congress shall perpetuate this policy, and, by excluding loyal States and people from representation in its halls, shall continue the usurpation by which the legislative powers of the government are now exercised, common prudence compels us to anticipate augmented discontent, a sullen withdrawal from the duties and obligations of the Federal Government, internal dissension, and a general collision of sentiments and pretensions which may renew, in a still more fearful shape, the civil war from which we have just emerged. We call upon you to interpose your power to prevent the recurrence of so transcendent a calamity. *We call upon you in every Congressional district of every State, to secure the election of members, who, whatever other differences may characterize their political action, will unite in recognizing the RIGHT OF EVERY STATE OF THE UNION TO REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS, AND WHO WILL ADMIT TO SEATS, IN EITHER BRANCH, EVERY LOYAL REPRESENTATIVE FROM EVERY STATE IN ALLEGIANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT, WHO MAY BE FOUND BY EACH HOUSE, IN THE EXER-*

CISE OF THE POWER CONFERRED UPON IT BY THE CONSTITUTION, TO HAVE BEEN DULY ELECTED, RETURNED, AND QUALIFIED FOR A SEAT THEREIN.

When this shall have been done the government will have been restored to its integrity, the Constitution of the United States will have been re-established in its full supremacy, and the American Union will have again become what it was designed to be by those who formed it, — a Sovereign Nation, composed of separate States, each, like itself, moving in a distinct and independent sphere, exercising powers defined and reserved by a common Constitution, and resting upon the assent, the confidence, and co-operation of all the States and all the people subject to its authority. Thus reorganized and restored to their constitutional relations, the States and the General Government can enter in a fraternal spirit, with a common purpose and a common interest, upon whatever reforms the security of personal rights, the enlargement of popular liberty, and the perfection of our Republican institutions may demand.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

The National Union Convention, now assembled in the City of Philadelphia, composed of delegates from every State and Territory in the Union, admonished by the solemn lessons which, for the last five years, it has pleased the Supreme Ruler of the Universe to give to the American people, profoundly grateful for the return of peace, desirous, as are a large majority of their countrymen, in all sincerity, to forget and forgive the past, revering the Constitution as it comes to us from our ancestors, regarding the Union in its restoration as more sacred than ever, looking with deep anxiety into the future as of instant and continuing trial, hereby issues and proclaims the following Declaration of Principles and Purposes, on which they have with perfect unanimity agreed : —

I.

We hail with gratitude to Almighty God the end of war and the return of peace to our afflicted and beloved land.

II.

The war just closed has maintained the authority of the Constitution, with all the powers which it confers and all the restrictions which it imposes upon the General Government, unabridged and unaltered, and it has preserved the Union with the equal rights, dignity, and authority of the States perfect and unimpaired.

III.

Representation in the Congress of the United States and in the Electoral College is a right recognized by the Constitution as abiding in every State, and as a duty imposed upon its people, — fundamental in its nature and essential to the existence of our Republican institutions; and neither Congress nor the General Government has any authority or power to deny this right to any State, or withhold its enjoyment under the Constitution from the people thereof.

IV.

We call upon the people of the United States to elect to Congress, as members thereof, none but men who admit this fundamental right of representation, and who will receive to seats therein loyal representatives from every State in allegiance to the United States, subject to the constitutional right of each House to judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

V.

The Constitution of the United States, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are "the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." "All the powers not conferred by the Constitution upon the General Government, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, or the people thereof;" and among the rights thus reserved to the States is the right to prescribe qualifications for the elective franchise therein, with which right Congress cannot interfere. No State or combination of States has the right to withdraw from the Union, or to exclude, through their action in Congress or otherwise, any other State or States from the Union. The Union of these States is perpetual, and the authority of its government is supreme within the limitations and restrictions of the Constitution.

VI.

Such amendments to the Constitution of the United States may be made by the people thereof as they may deem expedient, but only in the mode pointed out by its provisions; and in proposing such amendments, whether by Congress or by a Convention, and in ratifying the same, all the States of the Union have an equal and an indefeasible right to a voice and a vote thereon.

VII.

Slavery is abolished and forever prohibited; and there is neither desire nor purpose on the part of the Southern States that it should ever be re-established upon the soil or within the jurisdiction of the United States; and the enfranchised slaves in all the States of the Union should receive, in common with all their inhabitants, equal protection in every right of person and property.

VIII.

While we regard as utterly invalid, and never to be assumed or made of binding force, any obligation incurred or undertaken in making war against the United States, we hold the Debt of the Nation to be sacred and inviolable; and we proclaim our purpose in discharging this, as in performing all other national obligations, to maintain unimpaired and unimpeached the honor and faith of the Republic.

IX.

That it is the duty of the National Government to recognize the services of the Federal soldiers and sailors in the contest just closed, by meeting promptly and fully all their just and rightful claims for the services they have rendered the nation, and by extending to those of them who have survived, and to the widows and orphans of those who have fallen, the most generous and considerate care.

X.

In Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, who in his great office has proved steadfast in his devotion to the Constitution, the laws, and inter-

ests of his country, unmoved by persecution and undeserved reproach, having faith unassailable in the people and in the principles of free government, we recognize a Chief Magistrate worthy of the nation, and equal to the great crisis upon which his lot is cast; and we tender to him in the discharge of his high and responsible duties our profound respect, and assurances of our cordial and sincere support.

APPENDIX E.

AN ADDRESS.

DELIVERED BEFORE THE ASSOCIATE ALUMNI OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT, AT BURLINGTON, AUGUST 6, 1850, BY HENRY J. RAYMOND.

GENTLEMEN, — ALUMNI OF THE UNIVERSITY: We have assembled to-day in a peculiar character, and for a peculiar purpose. Laying aside the engagements, the sympathies, and the active relations which identify us with the mass of our fellow-men, we have come up to these seats of learning by ourselves, wearing the badge of our scholarship, to commemorate this anniversary of the day which sent us forth as scholars to mingle in the scenes, to share the toils, and to meet the responsibilities of active life. The character in which we have come, the purpose of our coming, and the interests which, for the hour, we have left behind us, suggest the remarks by which I shall endeavor to discharge the duty which your invitation has imposed upon me. I propose to speak to you, briefly as the occasion requires, and crudely as the necessities of my position compel me to do, of the relations which we sustain, as scholars, to the country and the age in which God has been pleased to cast our lot; of the peculiar duties which certain aspects of American society devolve upon us, and of the spirit and the temper in which those duties should be performed.

The object of study is the acquisition of mental and of moral power. It is to sharpen our vision, to strengthen our faculties, to enable us to seize upon the vital principles of nature and society, and to wield them for the production of marked and essential results. He is a scholar who has acquired, through his studies, this power; and it is his duty, when he goes forth into active life, to use it, with all his energy, to improve the condition and advance the well-being of his fellow-men. There is a tendency on the part of scholars to isolate themselves, to withdraw from the struggling activities of life, and become solitary worshippers of the studies which have enlisted their love; and this disposition is sometimes justified upon the attractive principle that knowledge must be pursued for its own sake; that it is degrading science to make it subservient to utilitarian ends, and that he only is a true scholar who finds in scholarship alone his best reward. There is truth in the position, but not in the practical conduct which it is made to sanction. Knowledge is degraded, science is debased, when made the tools of sordid selfishness; and that man has never entered into the essential spirit of scholarship who becomes its devotee merely for the gratification it brings to his own ambition, or to his selfish craving for power and snpre-

acy over his fellow-men. But the selfishness of science is as ignoble and unjust as the selfishness of power or of wealth. The scholar who acquires knowledge simply to hoard it up, or who studies merely for the gratification which study affords, is as truly a *misér* as the man who heaps up gold for the pleasure which its acquirement and its glitter confer. A life of contemplation — of secluded study and thought — is often commended as alone worthy of a noble and ingenuous mind. Scholars are exhorted to hold themselves aloof from the struggling passions and contending interests of the world, — to lift themselves above the mists and smoke of earth, and to get themselves up to the serene mountain-tops of meditation, — leaving the world to its blindness and its warfare, and dwelling themselves, “like the stars, apart.” But, however flattering it may seem to philosophy, the counsel is false to truth, false to the interests of humanity, and false to the spirit of the Christian faith. The essential element of Christianity is the abnegation of self, and devotion to the welfare of our fellow-men; and it should enter into the scholarship of the time, as well as into every other form of influence and of power. “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” is a Divine injunction as wide as humanity in its scope, — as comprehensive as the interests of humanity in its application. We have no more right to heap up vast treasures of knowledge, without using them for the good of others, than we have to amass enormous wealth while our neighbors starve. The scholar has far less right than the poorest drudge to stand aloof from the great battle of social life, to withdraw his hand from the great work of progressive redemption which the human race requires. “Power to do good,” says Lord Bacon, “is the true and lawful end of all aspiring. For good thoughts (though God accept them), yet towards men are little better than good dreams, except they be put in act. And men must know, that in this theatre of man’s life it is reserved only for God and angels to be lookers-on.”

It is the duty and the destiny of the human race to improve its condition and its character. That it has done so in the ages that are past, history affords decisive evidence. That the millions of our fellow-men who now live upon the earth are happier, wiser, and better than those who lived upon it a thousand years ago; that they possess the means of greater outward comfort; that their knowledge of the world around them is larger and more correct; that they have better command of the elements of power which exist in nature upon every side; that they more truly understand, and more justly observe, their relations to each other and to God, — that in these and in all other respects by which progress and improvement can be determined, the race has gone forward, and is still advancing, is a belief which none of us would willingly relinquish. The most philosophic of living statesmen has defined progressive civilization to consist of two elements, — the improvement of society and the development of individual character; the “melioration of the social system and the expansion of the mind and faculties of man.* Judged by either of these tests, it seems impossible to doubt that human history has been characterized by human progress. There is not a community on the face of the earth, of which the life has continued in full vigor, which is not marked by growth; which does not exhibit evidences of higher civ-

* *Guizot*. — History of the Civilization of Europe, chap. i.

ilization, of more general and complete culture, than it did a thousand or a hundred years ago. Progress in the outward conditions of social life seems, indeed, to be an inevitable result of that impulse of the individual to improve his own condition, which is universal, and never wholly unsuccessful. As the individual members of society advance in comfort, in wealth, in manners, in morals, society advances with them. As they become wiser and better, and more intelligent and more powerful; as they come to apprehend with more clearness the true end of their social existence, and to strive with more energy for its attainment, the society which they compose must occupy higher ground, and come nearer to that standard of perfection which may be unattainable, but at which, nevertheless, the inherent nature of man compels him to aim. Nor is this advancement confined; as is sometimes urged, to material ends. Progress, indeed, in the outward relations which men sustain, involves or compels a corresponding progress in their character and their faculties. The great inventions of modern times — even those which seem most purely mechanical in their nature, and most exclusively material in their ends — have not only changed the outward form of social life, but have expanded the intellect, developed the faculties, and improved the character of the great masses of the human race. The invention of gunpowder has produced results no less important in the cabinet councils and on the popular character of nations than on the actual field of battle. It has modified national ambition, softened national animosity, and infused into national sovereignties greater regard for the interests and the rights of those who live beneath their sway. The invention of printing — the most purely mechanical of all devices — has done more to improve individual character, to make men wiser and better, to inspire society with love of truth and regard for right, and thus to promote that general well-being in which true progress consists, than all the speculations of all the philosophers of the ancient world. No man doubts that in what are sometimes called the practical sciences, — in chemistry, astronomy, navigation, engineering; in medicine, surgery, mechanics, and kindred branches of human knowledge; in all that implies insight into the principles and essential powers of nature, and which arms man with new faculties, and enables him to accomplish greater results, — the last five hundred years have witnessed more advancement, more actual visible progress, than the entire antecedent history of the world's existence. Nor will it be less evident to the careful and unprejudiced student, that this progress of society has led to a corresponding progress of intelligence and morality; that the life of individuals has become more refined and virtuous; that the intellect of individuals has become more expanded, their intelligence wider, their purposes nobler, their motives worthier, their conduct more correct, and their character in all respects better, just in proportion to this advancement in their social condition, and this progressive dominion over nature. Man not only now enjoys means of outward comfort and material happiness which were unknown a thousand years ago, but he is a being of a larger intellect, of wider vision, of higher impulses, and of nobler ambition now than he was then. Individuals, it may be, then existed superior in intellect to any who have lived since. It may be that Plato, and Shakespeare, and Bacon, and Milton were loftier types of humanity than the world since their day has ever known. But such men are the direct gift of God to the

human race, and are not the growth, or the exponents, like other men, of the age in which they live. They come into the world because God sends them, and not because the culture of their times finds in them its true expression. They come as the instruments and authors of a higher culture, not as indexes of the height which the advancing tide of civilization has already reached. They were above the knowledge of their time, — so far above it that they generally became its victims; and the very fact that we understand and appreciate them better proves that our age is in advance of that in which they lived. Human progress consists in the elevation of the human race, and not in the elevation of individuals above the race. The superiority of individuals is only a means for the elevation of the race. All men, however unequal in faculties and condition, in the eye of God and of reason, stand upon the same level; all are gifted with immortal souls; all are capable of knowledge, of thought, of heavenly aspirations, and of lofty enjoyments. No progress is complete, therefore, which does not carry the great mass of mankind forward, towards that perfection of faculties and enjoyments which ideal humanity contemplates. And those who would aid the cause of human progress must labor for that wide diffusion of knowledge and of virtue — for that general education and guidance of all their fellow-men — by which alone that progress can be secured.

Societies are the appointed means for the growth of man; for the development of his moral and intellectual faculties; for the promotion of human happiness and the advancement of the human race. They are the offspring of nature and necessity. It is idle to look for their origin in compacts or calculations; in specific acts or special faculties. Societies are not formed, — they only grow. Their seed is inherent in humanity. Wherever men exist, society springs up spontaneously. It is the body, — the outward, organic form in which the soul of humanity clothes itself as it is developed and enlarged. It is, therefore, only through society that this essential spirit of the race can be reached; that anything effectual can be done towards carrying man forward on the high career of progress and improvement on which his nature and his destiny compel him to enter. Human progress, the growth of man, is accordingly measured by the progress of society; and the history of society, political, social, and religious, is thus the history of humanity. It is only by tracing the growth of nations, of churches, and social organizations; by marking the degree of mental and moral culture which they have reached; by noting the extent to which they have developed the faculties, and secured the well-being of those whom they embrace, — that we can determine the tendency of the age and the rate at which it moves. We judge that humanity in England has gone forward, because the English nation has grown powerful, intelligent, religious, and brave. We decide that in Spain the race has gone backward, that social life has there lost its vigor and its health, because the nation has grown feeble, the church superstitious, and society corrupt. It is by the condition of human societies that we thus judge of the progress of the human race; and it is through such societies that scholars must labor to advance the welfare of their fellow-men.

The American scholar is a member of American society. He is identified with its interests, and bound up in its destiny. And upon him, in a peculiar degree, — as possessed of peculiar power, — devolves the duty of guiding its

energies, shaping its character, and determining its fate. The knowledge he has acquired, the discipline he has undergone, are intended to give him clearer insight than other men possess into the complex energies that constitute its vitality, and thus to give him greater power in guiding them to noble and beneficent ends. Society is not wholly mechanical, nor is it wholly intellectual. Its interests belong to both departments, and its progress consists in the development and advancement of both. And this development in each depends upon a knowledge and mastery of the principles, — the fixed, inherent, controlling laws by which both are shaped. Now that knowledge and that mastery, it is the specific object of scholarship to confer. The special purpose of those studies to which colleges and universities are everywhere devoted is to make the student at home among the secret springs of all social life; to give him a clear, comprehensive, and accurate knowledge of the principles and the laws of social growth, so that he may labor with more intelligence, with greater precision of purpose, and with more complete success for its promotion. All his studies tend, or should tend, to this result. He has studied the ancient languages, — those standing miracles of philosophy and of thought, — and had learned by thus “examining the power and nature of words,” which are, in Lord Bacon’s phrase, “the footsteps and prints of reason,”* how language contributes to the development of thought and the growth of social character. He has studied the history of other nations, and has traced out the secret springs of their strength, and the progress of their decay and death. He has pondered the words and the acts of great men who have guided nations and shaped the character of whole ages, and has learned to follow them, with intelligent vision, step by step, on the shining path which they illumined. He has looked in at least upon the wondrous arrangement of Nature’s divine machinery, and has learned the principles and the laws upon which the power and order and harmony of the universe depend. He has had his reflections turned back upon his own mind, and has thus learned the laws of thought — the rules which reason imposes upon the operations of the intellect — the influences which direct and control the actions of men. And the result of all this study and all this discipline — if they have been pursued aright — has been to give him greater power over nature and over man; to send him forth into society armed with higher faculties of vision and of action than the mass of his fellow-men possess. He can see more clearly the tendencies of events; he understands more accurately the grounds and the worth of current opinions; he foresees with more certainty the result of any movement; he estimates more correctly the weight of special motives; he knows more of the character of all social influences, and can guide them better, oppose them, if necessary, with more success, infuse into them the elements of healthful power which they lack, and exert over all social movements and tendencies and speculations a greater, a better, and a more beneficent control than those who have not enjoyed the discipline which has given him this power. He can do more for society, because he knows it better; because he knows the principles, the inherent energies, which constitute its life, and by which alone its growth is possible.

And now it is his duty to use the power thus acquired for the advancement

* *Advancement of Learning, Book II.*

of the society in whose bosom he lives, and whose welfare he is bound to serve. In this country, especially, no man can be wholly a private citizen; no man can throw off all public and all social duties. The form of our government, the whole structure of our institutions, make every man a distinct, component part of that sovereign power which gives laws to the State, form to society, and character to the nation. It is incumbent, therefore, upon every one to take such part as his faculties fit him to perform, in the public business of society and the State. Every American is of necessity, in the original meaning of the word, a politician, charged with the care and the conduct of public affairs. And the American scholar has certainly no right to withdraw from the performance of public duties, because he is, or ought to be, pre-eminently qualified to perform them aright. The State needs his best services. American society — the destiny of the greatest nation of its age the world has ever seen — demands his best endeavors to shape its character and direct its course. Why should any scholar — any man animated with the courage, inspired by the enthusiasm, and gifted with the power which true scholarship confers — shrink from this hearty, hand-to-hand enlistment in the great struggles upon which the well-being of so many millions of his fellow-men depends? What is there in the culture of letters which should make man insensible to the claims of his race, or relax his sinews for the work which the welfare of the world requires? We stigmatize the religious devotee, who, for the good of his soul, dwells apart in the desert, or shuts himself up in his cell, to spend his life in meditation and in prayer, as having so far mistaken the spirit of religion as to substitute selfishness for the charity which it enjoins; why should the literary monk or hermit obtain more favor, or upon what ground can he claim greater indulgence, for a similar act of selfishness and insensibility?

American society is marked by features and tendencies which render the efforts of scholars especially desirable, as well as especially hopeful. The influence of cultivated intellect upon any people is always good; but nowhere is it more needed, or more certain to produce good results, than in this country and in this age. The great characteristic of American society is the vigor of its vitality — the wonderful rapidity of its growth — the transcendent energy which marks all its movements. All its activities, in all departments, are more nervous, more full of life, and more effective in results than those of any other age or any other people. Colonies are planted, plantations spring into States, and States put on the strength of empires, more rapidly than ever before since the world began. Revolutions take place in modes of action and of thought, in churches, in societies, and in civil government; constitutions are reformed, creeds are sloughed off, customs and habits are outgrown, plans and projects become obsolete; everything moves with a quicker step, and with more force than in any other age or country. I am aware that all this has its evils; but I speak of it now merely to say that this transcendent energy of the times demands and encourages, in a peculiar manner, the direct, systematic, courageous, sympathetic, and persevering efforts of the American scholar. He is needed, with his quicker insight, and his clearer vision, to guide it aright. He is needed, with his sounder judgment and his greater knowledge of the shallows and quicksands of social navigation, to keep the ship of state from being driven upon wreck by this

tremendous power. American scholarship must take the helm, and hold it with firm and unyielding grasp, throughout the adventurous voyage, on seas untraversed before, upon which this great society has embarked. And it must be a scholarship adapted to the work, and filled with a courage and a hardihood equal to the emergency. It must reach down below the surface of scholastic learning, and take hold upon the roots of things as well as of words, of human action and human character as well as of speech. It does not consist in familiarity with names, or events, or written books, — even the greatest and the noblest the world has known. All this is well in its place. It lends a grace to manners and to life, and becomingly adorns the conquests over ignorance and vice and degradation, which the hard blows of sinewy arms have already won. But it is no substitute for them; it will not do their work. The scholarship which the country and the age require must make Greek and Latin, science and art, philosophy and history, the means and materials out of which the good shall acquire strength, and activity, and ability to work. It must build up and strengthen the whole man, giving him wider sympathies, quicker sensibilities, more courage, loftier views of life and of duty; arming him with power to strike harder blows, and with a surer aim, and a higher purpose, and thus fitting him for the championship and the guidance which the time demands. Nor is it enough that the scholar carry with him into the world that love of letters which his studies here may have engendered, or that he solace his leisure hours with the recreation which the continued pursuit of letters is so well calculated to afford. Studies of this kind are needed, as Cicero* says; a solace for all hours and all occasions; but in this age, and especially in this land, they must be something else. They must give strength as well as delight. They must breathe courage and high resolves into the heart, and nerve the arm with power to carry them into effect. Not only must they go with us as we seek the shade, or wander in listless admiration among the retired recesses of the world, but they must descend into the dust of the arena, and infuse life and courage and strength into the soul of the American scholar there, as he performs his part in the elevation and advancement of American society.

And, not to deal too much in generalities upon this subject, let me say that the scholar should enter zealously and with energy into the daily labors of every department of social life. His efforts should be felt in everything which relates to the improvement of society, or which influences, in any degree, the character and destiny of his fellow-men. His voice should be heard in the public councils of his country; and his judgment should make itself felt in shaping the laws, and in forming that public sentiment higher than laws by which this land is to be governed, and the action of her people guided and controlled. No engine of public influence should be beyond his reach or beneath his care. He should remember that as the life of an individual is made up of successive hours, and his character and destiny shaped by the acts of each, so the national history is the result of those movements of society, trifling and unimportant as they often appear, which mark the progress of its daily life. If he would influence that history, therefore, and aid in giving it character and tone, he must do it through these occurrences of

* Cicero's *Oratio pro Archia Poeta*.

its ordinary activity. He must not wait for great occasions, or for some overwhelming crisis, as alone worthy of his interposition. Every day presents opportunities, every event brings its own demand, for his exertions. The energies of social life are always active, and are always shaping the destinies of the community. Nations do not live in great events alone. The vital forces which create their history, like the powers of nature which stimulate its growth, work without ceasing, though often without noise or observation. It is by and through them that the scholar must stamp his own character upon the times in which he lives. No political election can take place, no public law can be framed, no social usage can spring up, no opinion can be broached, no public question can be mooted, — nothing can be done or proposed, which will not be better done for the active participation of the sound, well-trained, right-minded scholar.

I would not be thought insensible to the dignity or the worth of a profounder and more exclusive devotion to solid learning than is contemplated by these remarks; nor do I question the necessity and utility of a higher class of scholars, even if they take no direct part in the affairs of social life. The nation needs such men and such a culture. They tend to elevate the spirit of a people, to carry forward the higher interests of science and letters; to build up the loftiest love of knowledge and of truth, and, in Milton's fine phrase, "to inbreed and cherish in a great people the seeds of virtue and public civility." No nation ever can have too many of such men, provided they are all of the proper stamp. This nation especially courts their culture, and needs their elevating and ennobling spirit. But even they must not live for themselves alone, nor for the studies which enlist their love; nor can they safely or rightfully hold themselves aloof from the race, whom God has made it *their* duty also to serve. Let them devote themselves as ardently as they may to the cultivation of science; let them push their researches into the farthest recesses of nature and of life; let them master all wisdom, penetrate all hidden mysteries; let them

" With lamp at midnight hour,
In some high, lonely tower,
Outwatch the Bear,
With thrice great Hermes, or unsphere
The spirit of Plato; " —

but let them not forget that the object of all their learning, — the true end at which, as men and as scholars, they are bound to aim, — is "God's glory and the relief of Man's estate." It is a mistake, moreover, to suppose that such a class can be created by outward appliances or encouragements. The men who are to fill its ranks are marked out for that service by natural endowments and by strong indications thereto, which outward hindrances can do little to thwart, and which direct temptation and rewards would be more likely to betray and deprave than to encourage and fortify. They must be men of loftier spirit and higher aims than to seek or require factitious assistance, — men whose temper difficulty only exalts, whose courage danger quickens, and who are content to leave their labors, if need be, to be weighed and estimated by the "times succeeding." Such men are not the product of national manners, or of the spirit and life of any age.

Nor can the great mass of American scholars — of those who every year go forth from these and kindred halls of learning — look forward to any such devotion to letters alone. Here and there, from among them all, one and another may come forth, to be thinkers for the race, — to live above the age and for future generations; but the great mass of them are to be active part-takers in the bustle of their own society and in the activities of their own time. And it is to them that my remarks are designed to be addressed. I desire to impress upon them the lesson, that it is their duty to make themselves the captains and the guides, the leaders and inspirers, the teachers and the helpers, of those among whom their lot may be cast, and whose advancement they are bound to seek. And whatsoever they find to do in this wide and fertile field let them do it with their might. Let them bring to whatever needful work lies nearest their hands all the clearness of vision, the fairness of temper, the soundness of judgment, the insight and the foresight, the strength and the skill, which their studies are designed to create and develop.

There is another point of no small importance in connection with the duty of the scholar to his country and his age. If he would render it any effectual service, he must work in *sympathy* with its general spirit and its predominant tendencies. There is a current in the stream of time and of national life, which, however it may seem to break into eddies, and even to turn and double upon its own course, has yet a uniform direction and a resistless power. It is not needful that the scholar should passively surrender himself to its sweep; but it will be worse than useless for him to spend his strength in beating against it. No one can have read history to any purpose without having seen that particular nations at particular times are under the domination of some pervading tendency, — are swept on by the strong current of some prevailing thought. There is a spirit in every age which is not the conscious creation of any individual, but the spontaneous growth of the events of the time. The great eras and exploits of history are its offspring and its expression. The Crusades were not the work of Peter the hermit, although his, perchance, was the voice which, like a rallying trumpet, gathered the hosts in whose hearts had long been burning the purpose to rescue the holy sepulchre from the hands of its infidel despoilers. Cromwell was not the author of the great revolution, which did more for English liberty than any event by which it had been precedent. The stealthy tread of civil and ecclesiastical despotism had been detected years before; and a current of popular feeling had set in; a spirit of resistance had been silently growing up and acquiring strength, which needed only some mighty hand and courageous heart to summon it to the field, and guide its tremendous energies in the great encounter. Individuals may direct and sometimes control the spirit and tendency of the time; but they cannot turn it backward, nor, without losing all their influence over it, can they themselves go backward upon its bosom. They must work with it. They must direct, and elevate, and purify its strivings; they must use its energies, and compel them to work out their higher ends, if they would render any effectual service to their country and their age. They must imitate the process by which improvement is effected in the world of vegetable life. The skilful gardener will not cut down the wildest and most unfruitful tree, if it have life and productive vigor at its heart. Let them engraft upon the least promising tendency of the time their

germs of a better life; let them infuse into the wild energies of the day their clearer spirit and their higher aims; for they may have power thus to redeem what they cannot successfully resist or destroy. Let them learn practical philosophy from the counsel of the Bohemian king to the fair Perdita:—

“ You see, sweet maid, we marry
 A gentler soion to the wildest stock,
 And make conceive a book of baser kind
 By bud of nobler race:— this is an art
 Which does mend nature, — change it rather; but
 Tho art itself is nature.” *

And in close connection with this principle lie considerations of marked importance for the American scholar who would understand aright his own relations to the society and the times in which he lives.

The tendencies of American society, political and civil, are often represented by thoughtful men as being wholly evil and dangerous. The current of public opinion and of public conduct is regarded as downwards. In political matters it is said that we are rapidly running into the most perilous radicalism; that our lack of social rank, of a high nobility, of an ancestry to which we may look back with pride, and of a long history made brilliant by its events, and potent over the imaginations of our people, deprives us of what will always be found essential to national growth and culture. It is argued that we are rapidly becoming *leaders*; that we grow more and more intolerant of superiority; that the dominant American sentiment is one of distrust and dislike of everything above us in power, in intellect, or in position; that public morality is becoming extinct; that we are not only losing all love for noble culture and for high scholarship, but that we distrust, denounce, and would destroy them; that the whole tendency of opinion and of effort is to check all high ambition, and to bring society to one dead and unproductive level. And upon this gloomy representation of American life and society, many of our worthiest and best men ground their earnest exhortations for the practical interference of the American scholar. It is his special mission, they say, to withstand this current of the times; to “take up arms against this sea” of dangers, and, “by opposing, end them.” It is for him, they urge, to turn back this tide of radicalism which threatens destruction to all established laws, to all that has been sanctioned and sanctified by antiquity, and to bring men back to the old ways which experience has sanctified, and which ancestral wisdom has stamped with its hallowing approbation.

Not denying or doubting that there is much room for improvement in all these matters connected with our national character and social tendencies, I nevertheless distrust the soundness of the sweeping judgment which is thus pronounced. The effect of thus dwelling exclusively upon the darker and least promising symptoms of our social life seems to me injurious, because it tends to bring scholars and the world into hostile relations; to implant distrust and defiance where common interests demand that sympathy, mutual confidence, and hopeful alliance should unite the best energies of both for a common end. I doubt, moreover, the correctness of the assumed facts on

* *Winter's Tale*, Act IV., Scene III.

which this condemnation of the age is based. I recognize, it is true, on every side the energies and the influences which elicit this alarm as to the growth and welfare of our country, but I cannot see that they justify it to anything like its full extent. It is true that, as a separate, sovereign nation, we are still young. As compared with the nations of Europe, or the dead and buried nations of remote antiquity, we are still in infancy. But certainly youth cannot be deemed a disadvantage, either to nations or individuals. If it be a fault in a people to be young, it is one which, as Jeremy Taylor answered the king who told him he was too young to be his chaplain, they may hope, under God, and with due diligence, in course of time somewhat to amend. The fact that we are young—that we have no history—should in truth excuse the errors into which we fall, or at least afford ground of good hope that they may be corrected. It certainly is greatly to our advantage that we have not reached that stage of social life when social evils have become chronic—when false principles and habits have become so thoroughly inwoven with the whole fabric of our society as to form the main pillars of its strength, poisoning and destroying what nevertheless rests upon them for support. Even the worst and most threatening of the evils which this over-jealous scrutiny detests in our society are comparatively harmless on this very account,—because they have but just taken root; because they have not yet entwined themselves into the whole fabric of our life, and may yet be plucked away without injury to the system which they threaten to injure. The greatest impediment to progress and improvement in the nations of Europe springs from the fact that they are no longer young; that the evils which afflict society have become so thoroughly inwrought into its whole constitution that they cannot be plucked away without imminent peril to society itself. The disease has become so thoroughly seated, so deeply rooted, that the use of the knife, imperative as it seems, threatens the life of the patient. Here is the most formidable obstacle which reformation in England is compelled to encounter. The roots of her greatest evils—those which bear most heavily upon the great mass of her people, and which seem to shut them out forever from the sunlight of hope—reach far back in her history, and have intertwined themselves with every muscle and nerve of her existence. Her nobility, which, to a certain extent, is a bulwark of her power; is also an element of her weakness. Her debt, which is a bond of the loyalty of one portion of her people, crushes and destroys the rest. The social distinctions which she has established,—founded, not upon worth and personal qualities—not the natural, normal growth of nature and of social life, but based upon arbitrary and accidental differences, upon accidents of birth or of wealth,—while they do something to strengthen that gradation of rank which is necessary to support a throne at its summit, do much more to alienate and oppress the great body of her people, and thus to weaken the great base upon which the whole fabric rests. And the fact that she is an old nation, that her framework has become firmly knit, and her constitution fixed, makes it impossible for her to throw off these elements of her peril and decay. The same thing holds true of the other nations of Europe. Even slight reforms, which are among us affected by the regular goings-on of every-day life, these cause convulsions which “shatter the whole bulk” of their society. Herein, certainly, it is an advantage to be young; for the evils and the dangers

which the inexperience and impulsive energy of youth involve are more than counterbalanced by the vigor and elasticity which render their correction easy.

Now the correction and amendment of these evils, in this country, is peculiarly the work of the American Scholar; and he will find unlooked-for aids in this endeavor, in that youth of the nation which is so often considered a serious defect. He will find that in nations, as in individuals, youth is the susceptible period of life; that impressions and instructions will then be easy which afterwards become impossible; that earnest, intelligent, right-minded effort will, in this country, produce results at which it would be folly to aim in any other. We have not reached that stage when habit becomes law; when all the modes of thought and activity grow rigid and inflexible; when innovation seems death, and when the man who suggests change, or proposes reform, is branded as an enemy of the society which he seeks to serve.

And yet, this very openness to new impressions, this ductility of temper, this very docility and teachableness, which is always and everywhere the only ground and condition of knowledge and improvement, is often made the occasion for new despondencies and complaints. We lack conservatism; we have no reverence for the past, we do not lean upon and adhere to the wisdom of antiquity. Instead of riding in the safe and easy anchorage which our fathers, or their fathers, have found out, we are cutting adrift from all these old moorings, and are launching out for ourselves, rashly relying upon our own wisdom and courage, upon the broad and stormy sea of radical experiment. And timid prophets of the past see nothing but certain and disastrous wreck in the immediate future.

The times teem, to their vision, with perilous inventions, with projects of radicalism and reform, which threaten to sap all the foundations of society and plunge mankind into anarchy and ruin. Conservatism is, to a certain extent, unquestionably an essential element of social stability and strength. No wise man will turn his back upon the past, or undervalue the teachings of its experience. Especially is it the province and the duty of the scholar to study the successive developments of its history, and to trace through them the elements of its failure or its success. But this is not the extent or the nature of the claims that are often preferred on behalf of the conservatism so warmly commended to favor. Its motto — *stare super antiquas vias* — implies much more than this. It enjoins an adherence to the old, not because it is proved to be better, but because it is old. It inculcates reliance upon the superior wisdom of those who have lived before us, merely because they did live before we were born. It seeks not for the reason of a practice or the ground of a principle, but for a precedent in their support. Its look is always to the past, and it is always a look of confidence, of reverence, of fascinated and complete reliance. It deprecates every variation from the paths by which ancient nations travelled their weary and devious journey, and enjoins us to stand upon the ways which they found safe.

This gloomy and desponding view of our character and prospects, in my judgment, involves two serious and mischievous misapprehensions, — the one of a principle, the other of a fact. I do not believe that conservatism, in this sense, is an element of growth; and I do not believe that there is any essential lack of true conservatism; any peculiar and perilous excess of radicalism, political or social, in our own country and age.

Lord Bacon has a remark which should strike at the root of the false notions of conservatism, of which I have been speaking. "*Antiquitas seculi*," he says, "*juventus mundi*. These times are the ancient times, when the world is ancient, and not those which we account ancient *ordine retrogrado* by a computation backwards from ourselves."*

We are living in the real antiquity. The ways of to-day are *antiquissimas vias*. The earth is older now than it has ever been before. Whatever wisdom, therefore, age may bring with it, is our inheritance. To look backward for it, to grope among the early nations and experiences of time for maxims and principles of wisdom, is like going back to childhood for the sagacity and judgment which mature years and long experience alone can bring. It would be very difficult to assign any valid reason why a principle which had its advent into actual life—which was brought forth and applied to the affairs of society—a thousand years ago, should be *a priori* sounder or more worthy of our faith and adoption than one born to-day. If experience has proved its truth—if its essential justice may be clearly traced in the benefits it has conferred upon the race, from that time to this, then, indeed, does it come to us with "titles manifold" to our favor and our faith. But the bare fact that it had its birth in the past does not entitle it to our reception. It is not in its favor. The just presumption which that fact warrants is against its worth, because it was the growth of a cruder and less mature time than that which it claims to rule. Unless we assume that the world has gone backwards; that men have become less wise, less intelligent, less able to judge accurately and weigh candidly, than they were ages ago, we should naturally regard a new thought, a new discovery, a new practice better than the old, because it is truly the child of all the culture which the past affords. The present is the offspring of the past, and the natural inheritor of its culture and its wealth. Whatever of good and true, of just and befitting, the past, by its long experiences and accumulated wisdom, has elaborated, descends to the present, and forms part of its essence and its life. All the noble deeds and noble words of the olden time,—the achievements of heroes, the songs of poets, the eloquence of orators,—whatever tended to give to any portion of the past its grandeur and its strength,—has entered into the present, and made it nobler and wiser and better than it would otherwise have been. Thus it is that nations grew. Each generation feeds upon the action and the thought bequeathed to it by those which went before. From this nurture its spirit receives a loftier tone—its energy has more vitality—and its achievements in all departments become correspondingly greater and worthier, and more beneficent.

The life of every age, the predominant spirit which gives it character and activity, has a vigor and power peculiar to itself. Its natural tendency

* Advancement of Learning, Book I. The same sentiment is repeated in the *Novum Organum*, Book I., Aphorism 84. "The opinion which men cherish of antiquity is altogether idle, and scarcely accords with the term. For the old age and increasing years of the world should, in reality, be considered as antiquity; and this is rather the character of our own times than of the less advanced age of the world in those of the ancients. For the latter, with respect to ourselves, are ancient and elder, with respect to the world, modern and younger."

is *advancement*, growth, new developments of itself. It strives constantly and strenuously to go forward, and to carry forward with it the body of society; of which it is the informing and energizing spirit. Conservatism would have it stand still; plant its feet in the footsteps which its predecessors trod, and be content with the degree of wisdom and of achievement which they reached. But this is unreasonable, and, fortunately for the world, it is impossible. Social life is as truly and as thoroughly subject to the law of growth as vegetable life or the soul of man. It pushes forward by its own inherent power. It seeks change, innovation, new forms of life, new modes of activity and self-development. And the great advantage which American society enjoys over any other society on the face of the earth is the free scope which it affords to this progressive tendency. Society here is thoroughly alive. It is thoroughly pervaded by this spirit of innovation and advancement. Every mind teems with new suggestions, new devices, new inventions, some of them crude, foolishly absurd, the offspring often of ignorance; but all indicating life, energy, activity, a forth-reaching and progressive spirit. "What," we may exclaim with Milton, "what could a man require more from a nation so pliant and so prone to seek after knowledge, — a nation not slow and dull, but of a quick, ingenious, and piercing spirit, acute to invent, subtle and sinewy to discourse; not beneath the reach of any point the highest that human capacity can soar to? What wants there to such a towardly and pregnant soil, but wise and faithful laborers, to make a knowing people a nation of prophets, of sages, and of worthies?"*

And yet this spirit is distrusted as radicalism, and the scholarship of the land is invoked to a crusade against it. The dangers of radicalism, to this country and this age, seem to me to have been greatly exaggerated, mainly because we are apt to underrate the power of latent conservatism which always inheres in society. We do not realize the degree to which actual life is a matter of habit. Each generation is naturally inclined to follow the example of its predecessors. Its *vis inertia* is at war with its law of growth. Every variation from established customs and established laws, no matter how evidently it may be the natural growth of time and progress, is always regarded with distrust and aversion. There is not a movement of the mind towards improvement, in any age or nation, which has not been forced to contend with this conservative tendency. Even in science, where the demonstrations of pure intellect seem entitled to pure authority, and in practical life, where the convenience and comfort of man should convince his judgment, no new step has ever been taken which had not to struggle, more or less, with this unwillingness to leave the ancient and accustomed ways. The theory of gravitation was once distrusted as a novelty. The rotation of the earth was once looked upon with horror, as a most daring device of impious radicalism. The conservatism of the time was menaced by both, and made war upon both with all the energy and fervor characteristic of its claims. So has it been with all the inventions of science, and all the devices of art. From the highest to the lowest, from a new theory of the heavens to a novel construction of a cart-wheel, everything new has been compelled to fight for a foothold on the earth. When Edward Herring, in 1690, under letters patent, proposed

* Speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing.

to light the streets of London, he was denounced with as much zeal as if he had proposed to set the world on fire. When the first stage-coach was started from London in 1669, the daring innovation of running forty miles a day aroused the conservatism of the kingdom to a most vigorous war of remonstrances and protests, of petitions and complaints. The first newspaper created as much alarm among the conservatives of England, as the depravity of the press awakens among those of our own time.* Less than thirty years have elapsed since the leading Quarterly of Europe ridiculed the project of a railroad on which trains could run fifteen miles an hour; and ten years were spent by the American inventor of the magnetic telegraph before he could obtain even a respectful hearing for his claims. Every new discovery in every department of science, — in chemistry, in astronomy, in medicine, — every new invention in every department of art and of practical life, has been compelled to encounter the sternest hostility of the conservatism of its age. Saturn now, as in the old mythology, strives to devour his offspring. Time distrusts and trembles before the new powers and principles which she herself brings forth.

We are apt to complain that in this country there is no reverence for the past, no respect for its wisdom, no willingness to consult and profit by its experience. Is this so? Are we really so *self-reliant* as this opinion would imply? It would be difficult, I suspect, to find any department of society or of life, in which warrant can be found for such a judgment. All our institutions, political, social, and religious, are merely transplantations of those of former ages; or, at most, they are engrafted upon those which are the growth of former times. We have in some things, it is true, made changes; but it has only been to lop off excrescences, or to dispense with unessential forms. Our boldest innovations have been made in political affairs; yet even here we have adopted the fundamental principles of the British constitution, only giving them more full and complete development, and adopting their organic forms to our new condition. The right of the people to frame their own laws, and to choose their own rulers, — the fact that essential sovereignty rests with the people and for their well-being, — is as explicitly recognized in the English constitution as in our own. We have only given it more full and complete effect, and even this has been done as it ought to be done, with cautious steps, and by a timid course of hesitating experiment. And even now our public sentiments are far more conservative than much that may be found in the writings of Milton, of Algernon Sydney, and of other red-letter names in political philosophy. The seventeenth century witnessed professions and proclamations of democracy and natural rights on the floor of Parliament, which have seldom been equalled in our halls of legislation. And in almost every nation of Europe at the present day, — fortified as they are by conservative institutions and elements of stability, — opinions are prevalent, purposes are cherished, and efforts are organized, which, even in this democratic society, whose radical tendencies are so widely feared, would be scouted and scorned as the very ultraism of perilous and unprincipled speculation. Regard for settled law, voluntary respect for its mandates, an unforced acquiescence in its behests, an intelligent, conscientious subjection to the embodied reason of the State, have obtained nowhere more than among us, at the

* See Macaulay's History of England, Chapter III.

present day. Great names hold sovereign sway over the hearts of our people. Indeed, it is often made a ground of reproach that they surrender their own convictions of justice and of expediency to the authority of men, living or dead, in whom they have learned to confide. Examine the subject in whatever manner we may, if we will but examine *the whole* of it, and not look only at those facts which fortify a preconceived opinion, we shall find that the conservative element is still the predominant element of our political society. No change is made, no departure from old forms, however palpably demanded by the new structure and requirement of the time, is proposed, without strenuous struggle and determined resistance.

The same fact may be traced with equal clearness in the religious movements of the time. Conservatism is the ruling element in all our church organizations. Luther's great reformation was the most thoroughly radical movement of modern times. It was an assertion of the right of each individual of the race to read the Bible for himself, and from it frame a religious creed to meet the conscious wants of his own soul, and according to the guiding light of his own conscience and judgment. Its essential spirit was *protestant*. It denounced and threw off that gigantic and overshadowing conservatism, which commanded the conscience to receive its faith from the fixed and infallible past. It is not too much to say that this spirit has lost its essential vigor; that the movement which began in radicalism has itself become conservative. How many of the men of this present time really and truly form their religious creed for themselves? How many of us are there who do not receive it from some external source, — from some church organization, from the education of our childhood, from family tradition, from social connection, or from some other of the manifold forms of conservative power? The whole religious world stands marshalled into conservative organizations, — each claiming, with more or less modification, to be infallible, and all requiring adherence to the fixed and immutable past, as the basis of favor and of faith. No fortress was ever more closely guarded against external foes than are these enclosures of religious faith against heresies and innovations. Not a door or window — not a tower or loop-hole — without its special sentinel; and let any man, high or low, learned or unlearned, breathe the faintest doubt, or give utterance to any conviction of his own soul, to any new speculation in philosophy or metaphysics, which may even seem to threaten any doctrine, or any practice of the established faith, and sonorous blasts from the warder's trumpet will soon summon the enlisted hosts to defeuce of their ancient and established ways. The warmest controversies even of the present day are waged by ecclesiastical conservatism against dawning opinions which menace its peace, or call in question its infallibility. I mention the fact, not to censure or complain of it, for I believe it to be of good omen; but simply as an indication of the prevalence and power of the conservative element in the religious movements of the age.

Dangers to the social organizations of the time are widely apprehended from the social radicalism which prevails. There is certainly a great deal of clamor nowadays, — as there has been at intervals since the world began, about the false organizations of society, — about the unnatural relations which obtain between the different classes which compose it, and about the gigantic evils of which these are the fruitful source. We have reformers in

abundance, rampant for its reconstruction, eager to impress the world with the opinion that everything is wrong, and equally eager to obtain for themselves the job of setting it right. The theories which many of them propound are certainly radical enough, and contradict plainly enough some of the fundamental truths of philosophy and common sense. And yet, it would be an error to mistake these for the sentiments or tendencies of the age, and it would be a still greater error to distrust and condemn the age on their account. A glance shows us that the latent conservatism of society; that reliance upon past wisdom and past experience which is inherent in the mind, and which forms the balance-wheel of society, is quite sufficient for any emergency which their promulgation may create. The slight extent to which they have affected public sentiment in this country, urged and advocated as they have been by able, earnest, and vigorous minds, — by men who enjoy a rare degree of public confidence and of sway over the public mind, — the slight hold they have taken upon the community, the steady and constant certainty with which they have rebounded (so to speak) from the hard, clear, common sense of the great masses of our population, affords decisive evidence of the comparative groundlessness of the apprehension to which, in many quarters, they have given rise.

Nearly all these schemes and theories embody something, in principle and in practice, which is just and true, and which is somewhat in advance of that which has hitherto obtained. This the natural growth of society and the age will absorb into its own life, and from it form material for marked and substantial progress. The rest will die and fall away, making no impression upon the public health, or creating at the worst only a local irritation, which the lapse of time itself will cure. All these schemes, even the wildest of them, are of goodly promise, inasmuch as they indicate a stretching toward improvement. They evince a disposition and desire in some way to remove the evils which afflict the race; to carry man forward and to lift him upward towards greater wisdom, greater virtue, and greater happiness than he has yet enjoyed. It is impossible that the generous heart should not sympathize with the motive, however the intelligent mind may distrust the means, by which its beneficent ends are sought to be attained.

We are liable to serious error, from various sources, in attempting to pronounce judgment upon the characteristics, the tendencies, and the prospects of our own country and our own age. The scholar, especially, when he first steps from the seclusion of his study, and looks out upon the field of active life, brings feelings and a vision which unfit him, in a great degree, to form an accurate estimate of the influences and agencies that are at work around him. He has been studying the great movements which gave shape and character to the nations of the ancient world. He has followed the steps of their great leaders of action and opinion; he has pondered the words of their great philosophers, and hung in rapture on the sentences of their orators and their poets. He has traced, on the page of history, the great "stream of tendency" — the sweeping, continuous current of public action and public thought — which gave the nations their peculiar form, and power to develop their peculiar life. He sees in them nothing but what is great, heroic, and of permanent and formative power. The currents and eddies of false opinion, the small tricks and devices of evil men, the projects of ignorance and

the designs of fraud, have perished with their authors, and left no fruit behind them. These things find no place in history. The student does not come in contact with them, until he goes forth into the age in which he lives. Then his ears are stunned with the din of discordant strife, the petty jarings and commotions of the world around him, so that he fails to catch that lofty music of the motion of the time, which future history will alone preserve. His eyes have been dazzled by the contemplation of unmixed excellence, so that he cannot readily separate the gold from the dross in the mass by which he is surrounded. Therefore, as in the past he sees only what is good, and in the present mainly that which is evil, he falls into desponding moods, and fears the world is going backward, and that he has lived too late. The same error is likely to influence our minds in comparing our own country, and the agencies that constitute its social life, with those of other lands. We have a quick sensibility for the evils which seem to menace our prosperity, and underrate the conservative elements which are inherent in our society; while we attach undue weight to the outward buttresses by which foreign nations seem to be defended. Thus, and through the influence of these very natural mistakes, it is that American scholars are apt to speak despondingly of the prospects of their country and their age; that they become unreasonably timid concerning the influence of radical notions and radical efforts, and spend their strength, if they enter upon the labors of active life at all, in fighting the shadows which they have themselves projected.

A close scrutiny will afford ground for a more just and a more hopeful judgment. We shall find that other ages have not been free from the vices and the evils which afflict our own, while we have outgrown many that belonged to an earlier time. We shall find that even those eras of the world's history, which rise before us effulgent in the glory of their great men and their great events were also darkened by gigantic evils which escape our vision only because they are concealed in the blaze which makes their age illustrious. We shall find, if we will embrace time enough and facts enough for a just induction, and purge our minds of the preconceived opinions which distort the justice of its judgments, that public morality has kept pace with public intelligence; that the public conscience is more sensitive, and has greater sway; that regard for justice and the general good has wider control over the masses of every community now, than in days which we are accustomed to regard as purer and happier and nobler than those in which we live. When we wander in the groves where Plato taught "divine philosophy," and rejoice in the fruitful freshness of their sound shade, and listen to those strains that rise and melt into the sublime harmonies of the Christian faith, let us not confound this high melody with the age whose dull, cold ear it pierced, or forget the reception which its master met from the spirit which ruled the councils, and stamped the character of the time. We look to the age of the English Elizabeth with wonder, not unmixed with envy, at its transcendent displays of intellectual power. But how often are we compelled in reading even Shakespeare, the purest as well as the greatest of its poets, to excuse his grossness and his vice by imputing them to the age in which he lived, — to the general grossness of the time whose common air he breathed, and whose polluting spirit even his nobler nature could not wholly escape! We study with delight the high thoughts

of the heroic Milton and the learned Sydney, and envy the age which had them for its teachers and its guides; while we forget that they became martyrs of the generation which they sought to serve, and that in our own country and our own time alone have their principles been embodied in institutions, and made the basis of a national life. We regret the land and the age which had Bacon for its Lord Chancellor, and Coke for its King's Attorney, and Jeremy Taylor for its Chaplain, and which sends over all coming time the guiding light of transcendent genius in law, in philosophy, in poetry, and religion; but we forget that the age in which they lived hated their nobleness, and loved them only as they were subservient to its baseness; that their vices challenged the favor they enjoyed, while their virtues were bequeathed to the "times succeeding." We forget the savage cruelty of an age whose courts were converted into shambles, — whose high places were the guerdon of corruption, or the reward of flattery; when public justice was the tool of private malice; when piracy was heroism; when religion was a jest at court, and a nightmare to the masses; when men like Essex, and Raleigh, and Bacon, could be hunted by lawyers like Coke, with an ingenuity and a steel-hardened malignity that might challenge the rivalry of fiends, to prison, to disgrace, to torture, and to death; and when the applause of society was reserved for the vices, and its hatred for the virtues, which have since combined to make the age illustrious. We look regretfully back to the time which witnessed the birth of the *Novum Organum*; but we forget that the general sentiment of the age was expressed by the sneering comment of the king that, "like the peace of God it passed all understanding;" and by the equally contemptuous judgment of him who is since revered as the Father of the Common Law, —

"It deserveth not to be read in schools,
But to be freighted in the ship of fools."*

We cannot doubt, loudly as some may deplore the degeneracy of our own times, that Shakespeare is more read and better understood; that Milton finds that fit audience which he sought for his immortal song; that Bacon meets that just judgment for which he appealed to coming ages from his own, — in *our* age rather than those in which they lived. No one can look beyond the brilliant names which "shine aloft like stars," and glorify the darkness through which they gleam, and read the history of their daily life, trace the manners and the morals of their society, follow the doings of courts, the habits of the people, the modes and practices that obtained in all circles and which thus gave character to the age, without feeling that, in all these respects, the race has made substantial progress; that public intelligence and public morals have alike advanced; and that we may, with no more than a just and proper exultation in the felicities of our own fortune, claim for our own age at least a good degree of that superiority over the past, which the lapse of time, under the guiding power of God, should render natural and certain. It is not too much to say, despite the opposite opinions which many of our best men entertain, that in this country, even in politics, virtue

* See Montague's Life of Lord Bacon.

is essential to success; that nothing is more sure to destroy a public man in public favor than reputed immorality; that our courts of justice are free from corruption; that our elections know nothing of that open venality which disgraces those of England; that good faith, adherence to constitutional engagements, obedience to law, devotion to public justice, public morals and the public good, characterize our political societies, to a greater degree than those of any other age or country. These are the marks by which we judge of social progress; and they seem to me fully to warrant that confidence in advances already made, that sympathy with the tendency of the times, that hopefulness and cheerful courage, without which all effort for the improvement of society must be spiritless, uncongenial, and unproductive. And upon a point on which some of our wisest thinkers — men of loftiest spirit and most noble aims — have held opinions so opposite to that which I have ventured to express, I am glad to avail myself of authority so good as that of Dr. Arnold, — at once a scholar and a worker; one who was a student of the past in order the more effectually to serve the present; one whose life furnishes proof and illustrations of the poetical views of the scholar's relations and duties, which I have endeavored to present.

"It is very well," he says, "that we should not swim with the stream of public opinion; places like this are exceedingly valuable as temples where an older truth is still worshipped which else might be forgotten; and some caricature of our proper business must oftentimes be tolerated, for such is the tendency of humanity. But still, if we make it our glory to run exactly counter to the general opinions of our age, making distance from them the measure of truth, we shall at once destroy our usefulness and our real respectability.

"And to believe seriously that the movement of the last three centuries has been a degeneracy; that the middle ages were wiser, or better, or happier than our own, seeing truth more clearly, and serving God more faithfully; would be an error so extravagant that no amount of prejudice could excuse us for entertaining it."*

There is another error by which we are betrayed into undue alarm as to the effect of the radical movements of the time: we make too little allowance for the *flexibility* of society. The very language we employ in speaking of it indicates the nature and the extent of the mistake. We look upon society as a framework — as a construction, in which every part has some mechanical dependence upon the rest, and no part of which can, therefore, be disturbed without danger of bringing the whole to the ground. Any change in any portion of the structure is deprecated as ruin to the whole. Any modification of the laws of property; any change in the political or social relations of different classes; any extension of the right of suffrage; any lowering of the requisitions for citizenship; anything which touches, however slightly, any of the pillars of this social framework, is regarded with alarm as threatening the overthrow of the whole fabric. But this view is altogether false. Society is no such mechanical contrivance, no such house of cards to be overthrown by deranging any of its combinations. It is a living growth; and it has all the flexibility, and all the tenacity of life,

* Lectures on History, vii. 337.

which belong to vital organisms. In its origin, the result of a vital necessity, its preservation is insured by the same necessity. As its life inheres in every part of its organic structure, so are the processes of life continually going on in every part, repairing its injuries, healing its wounds, and counteracting whatever threatens, from within or without, to do it essential harm. In every department of nature, in vegetable and in animal life, we see evidence of this incessant, recreative energy. Wound the trunk of a tree, and all its vital energy is at once at work to repair the loss. In some forms of animal life, limbs cut off are replaced by new ones; nay, the animal himself divided gives birth to two. A similar *vis vitæ* inheres in the social existence, repairing its losses, throwing off its poisonous impurities, and impelling it forward, in spite of injury and even of decay, into new developments, and more perfect forms. The destruction of human society is simply impossible. The natural tendency towards despotism, political and social, despotism of rulers, of laws, or of conservative usages and customs, is always stronger than the tendency to anarchy. And any excess of radicalism is sure to be thrown off, and even to react, by the natural course of social growth, by the natural strength and self-protecting power of the social life. Philosophers have pondered much upon the origin of human society. It has seemed impossible to account for the construction of so goodly a fabric; to understand how men, enjoying individual freedom, masters entirely of their own actions, should have ever bound themselves so strongly by social bonds. One fact should teach them that society does not depend upon human will. No instance has ever yet been known in which society was destroyed, except by the extermination or the dispersion of its members. History tells us of many instances in which anarchy has done its utmost to effect its overthrow; but, after its strength has been spent, society has risen from its sweeping force, and, though deep "scars of thunder" might tell of the conflict, it has sprung forward in its upward growth with new life and redoubled vigor. The Roman Empire seemed to have been swept from existence, and society to have perished, by the devastating hordes of northern barbarians; but a new and a fairer life sprung up even in their footsteps, and when the storm had passed, the world saw that an old and decaying social life had simply been replaced by one of more vigor, and better adapted to the wants and necessities of the advancing time. Radicalism and anarchy seemed to have done their worst, when they destroyed a throne, murdered those who had sat upon it, guillotined whole classes of society, made respectability a crime, and enthroned the most brutal and ferocious of human passions in the place of settled law. Yet out of the very heart of this dreadful lawlessness, which seemed to shut hope from French society forever, came forth a new social and political life, empowered by greater vigor and a more intense vitality; and straightway a new and a better organism took the place of that which had perished forever.

The law of social growth is thus always from the lower to the higher—from that which is good to that which is better. And it will work out these beneficent results against obstacles and influences which often seem to threaten its destruction. The radical movements which, at the present day, give alarm to many thoughtful minds, will seem of much less importance when thus considered in the light of this fundamental law of social life and

growth. They may be injurious, and may demand the efforts of wise and good men to prevent them from doing mischief. But they cannot destroy, or essentially injure, the great fabric of society. Mainly, moreover, in my judgment, they are only indications and results of that superabundant activity and energy which characterize the life and growth of our new society. What they need, therefore, is not suppression, but *guidance*; and this it is the peculiar province of the scholar to furnish. All these strivings of reformers; all these strong impulses towards improvement which mark the day, are indicative of life, of energy, of power, which may be made to promote the well-being of the society which they seem to injure and to menace. Their great fault is their blindness — their ignorance. They set at defiance established principles; they proceed in ignorance and disregard of laws as fundamental and as irreversible as that of gravitation. It is the scholar's duty to enlighten them; to seize hold upon them, and by his greater wisdom, his wider knowledge, his clearer, juster, and completer insight, to wield them for the advancement and improvement of society. He must make the tendency of the age, not his enemy or his discouragement, but his ally and his hope. He must make it subordinate to his higher and truer purposes, and compel it to work out those results which his clearer judgment sees to be essential to the welfare of his race.

GENTLEMEN, — I feel that I have been rash and imprudent in presenting for your judgment views upon so many and so important topics, formed not in the calm retirement most favorable to just thought, but in the midst of the severe and incessant labors of active life. They are in fact, to some extent, the result of the observation and experience which that life has afforded me. I have been led to feel keenly and sensibly the wants of the time, and my thoughts naturally turn to American scholars as qualified and compelled to meet them. It is our fortune, gentlemen, to live in the most stirring age of the world, and in the bosom of American society. That fortune shapes our destiny, and dictates our duty. It is for us as scholars, as educated men, as men who ought to be, from our advantages and our discipline, fitted to be captains and guides in the great movement of civilization and improvement, — it is for us to go down upon the plain, carrying thither the insight, the courage, and the power we have acquired from communion with the high thoughts and the great deeds of the noblest men, and the heroic times of the world's history, and to lead these struggling hosts in the great war against ignorance, misery, and guilt, which the tendency of the times compels them to wage. If they are ignorant and blind, it is for us to enlighten and guide them. If they are vicious and base, it is for us to reform their ways and elevate their aims. If they are rushing madly forward in pursuit of their end, blindly demolishing the good and the true as well as the false, it is for us to bring them up upon the high grounds of wisdom and of prudence, and to direct to worthy ends the energies which they wield. Coleridge has made the remark that every man who thinks at all is a radical at twenty, and a conservative at thirty; and the judgment was justified by his own experience. At the outset of life he based all his political theories upon the abstract doctrine of human rights; as he grew older, he founded them all upon the innate depravity of the human heart. His opin-

ions thus oscillated between two extremes, as do, unfortunately, those of most men who think deeply and feel profoundly. But this is not the course of prudence; this is not the way to form opinions, nor is it the way to exert a healthful influence upon the world around us. Unless I am much mistaken, the scholar who carries into the world a clear vision and a sound judgment, who has penetrated the secret life of the past, and can read by its light the characters of the present; who feels that as hours are but a small part of the life of an individual, so years afford no criterion of the progress and destiny of nations, — will see that in either extreme lurks essential error which must be fatal to the highest usefulness. He will see that the science of government and society is an *experimental*, and not an absolute, science; that there can be no such thing as a universal form of government, founded upon abstract principles, and adapted to all stages of national life; but that, in every particular case, the actual, efficient, living energies of the time must be guided and used for the attainment of the best results. He will learn that as science, applied to outward life, and using the principles and the powers of nature, has carried external civilization forward with transcendent rapidity, so social progress must be sought by a similar masterful seizure and guidance of the active energies which constitute the vitality and the tendency of the time. He will come to regard Radicalism and Conservatism as opposites indeed, but still as necessary opposites to the health and permanent equilibrium of society. He will see that if the one should obtain the entire ascendancy which it seeks, all the checks and restraints of wholesome law would be destroyed, and social life would plunge forward, by the very excess of its own vitality, into catastrophes from which a new creation could alone restore it; and that the sole predominance of the other would stop the life-current of society, paralyze its energies, and render advance and improvement forever impossible. The life of society is, like the life of man, like the law of all nature, dependent upon correlative, mutually counteracting forces. There is an all-pervading law which would bring everything to the centre, — to a stand-still; and an opposite law which would throw everything into endless motion from the centre. It is by the harmonious counteraction of these great laws that the universe is upheld; and when either shall obtain the ascendancy chaos will have come again. So is it with society. It carries in its bosom a latent conservatism, strong even in the breast of the most radical, drawn from a thousand sources, nurtured by the family, the church, and the state; strengthened by the indolence, the force of habit, inherent in all, and operating incessantly, noiselessly, and irresistibly for the preservation and safety of the world. Opposed to it is the radical movement, — not peculiar to our time, but always found where humanity has any vital vigor, and intellect any power. It is this which carries society forward; and it is, therefore, through this, and by this, that he must work who would do aught to advance the welfare of the human race.

Let us, then, when we go forth from these retired and serene heights, where the world's warfare reaches us only like the dim murmur of a far-off sea; when we descend into the dust, and the heat, and the noise of its strife, let us go as to the spot where God has appointed our work. Let us remember that if this age and this society are not better for our existence; if our

fellow-men are not wiser, and better, and happier, because we have lived and labored with them; if we do not infuse into the political and social activities of the time something of the healthful and the beneficent influence which our studies ought to have conferred upon us, — we shall have been scholars in vain; and scholarship will bear the curse of our unfruitfulness. Ours is the task to raise what is low, to illumine what is dark, to guide the blind, hope and help to all men, as our endowments may enable us to do. Not for ourselves, nor for our selfish purposes, or equally selfish pleasures; not for scholarship, or the pride of knowledge, have we received the culture and discipline which make us scholars. We must use the power thus acquired, for the upbuilding and the improvement of the society in which our lot is cast. We must put our hands to the great work of social progress, and give all the aid of our utmost strength to the enlightenment and the advancement of our fellow-men.

Thus, and thus only, can we discharge the duties which every AMERICAN SCHOLAR owes to AMERICAN SOCIETY.

APPENDIX F.

A PILOT-BOAT OCEAN VOYAGE IN SEARCH OF NEWS.

[THE voyage of the little pilot-boat William J. Romer, of the New York pilot fleet, across the Atlantic, was made in the early part of the year 1846. The following particulars are taken from the contemporaneous narrative mentioned in the text]:—

From the New-Yorker, April 18, 1846.

“Of the many excitements suffered and enjoyed in New York during the past twelve months, few have given rise to more mystery, speculation, curiosity, anxiety, gossip, wonder, and astonishment, than the voyage of the pilot-boat William J. Romer across the Atlantic. And this is by no means surprising. The bare idea of such a tiny Queen Mab’s barque as this starting off on a trip over the Atlantic in the midst of winter, was in itself well calculated to excite curiosity and strongly enlist public sympathy. Such a daring enterprise, we venture to assert, cannot be found in all the records of navigation; and the gallant and dauntless voyagers who were engaged in it have purchased immortality at the expense of a few weeks of suffering and privation, and as the just reward of their courage and perseverance. The Mysterious Clipper having returned safely into port after many had almost given her up as lost, and thus become as it were permanently identified with the history of the times, we have thought that a full and complete account of her voyage, compiled carefully from her log, and the notes of *The Man in the Glazed Cap*, would be an acceptable offering to the public.

“No sooner had the pilot-boat got her nose out of the smell of the land than it came on to blow, as if old Neptune had invoked *Æolus* to punish this daring little craft for so boldly adventuring out to sea. At six o’clock they were obliged to take one bonnet off the jib, two-reef the mainsail, and take in the square-sail altogether. In the course of the evening, however, the wind moderated a little, and both reefs were directly turned out of the mainsail, and before midnight the gaff-topsail was set — the little clipper singing over the singing waters at the comfortable rate of twelve knots.

“The weather was quite cold, and the vessel, being cut unusually low in the bulwarks, was covered with spray created by her own course, and which froze as it fell upon deck, and lay piled about the vessel like an amateur snow-storm, and tipped the ropes and rigging with frosty feathers.

“At half-past eight on the twelfth, the wind came strong out of the east, and Captain McGuire tacked to the southward and eastward, two-reefed the mainsail, unbonneted the jib, and finally hauled it down and stowed it — low-

ered the foresail, set the storm staysail, and put a balance-reef in the main-sail. The wind now blew a gale, accompanied by rain, snow, and hail, and the sleepless discomforts of the voyagers, stripped of romance and reduced to the most practical terms of reality, commenced in earnest.

“The next day the gale continued, the wind having skulked round by the way of Hudson’s Bay into the north-west, and spitting out bitter snow-squalls. The wind constantly increased, and the waves ran in mountains. The vessel now shipped a tremendous sea, which swept over her deck and carried away the binnacle. One after another the sails were taken in, and the little craft brought to under the storm-staysail, the wind blowing a perfect hurricane, and all hands expecting every moment to be their last. All this and the next day they were forced to lie by, the gale not having moderated in any perceptible degree. The next day at three o’clock in the afternoon the wind subsided a little, and the vessel was put upon her course.

“The next day, however, a tremendous gale came on from the south-south-east, hauling round to the west-north-west, and they were obliged to lie to again in a heavy cross sea, under a double-reefed foresail. This time the gale was accompanied with thunder and lightning, rain, hail, and snow, — a choice variety.

“On the eighteenth the gale still continued, and the clipper (which had again been put on her course) shipped a heavy sea, which carried away a portion of the cockpit bench. The next day they were obliged to luff to, there being a tremendous gale now blowing, with a heavy sea, and plenty of thunder and lightning, rain, snow, and hail. The storm now went on hourly increasing; until the next day, when it again claimed the name of a hurricane, with a tremendous sea running. Lay to all day and part of the next, and made a dredge by lashing two spars together — the vessel making bad weather of it, and expecting to lose the foresail every moment.

“On the twenty-second the weather was thick and heavy, the wind strong, and a tremendous sea running. At half-past eleven, however, the sky cleared, the captain was lashed to the mainmast and succeeded in taking an observation, — latitude $43^{\circ} 23'$. This was the first observation they had had in several days.

“On the twenty-third the weather continued very heavy, and the clipper passed a barque bearing north, under close-reefed topsail, with her head to the westward. She hove to for six hours to-day, but resumed her course in the evening, and kept on through the next day, although there was a heavy gale blowing and a sea running with which the clipper found it almost impossible to contend. On the next day the captain was obliged again to heave to; and at half-past seven in the evening a squall from the north-west struck the vessel and buried her to her hatches — where she remained for ten minutes, no one knowing whether she would right or go down.

“At length she righted, shipping a sea which swept the deck fore and aft, one man narrowly escaping being washed overboard. At half-past eight o’clock the wind had somewhat moderated, and the clipper (Captain McGuire being anxious to get to the eastward) wore round and kept on her course. But in ten minutes a heavy sea pooped her, and nearly washed the man at the helm overboard. For several minutes after she broached to, all was supposed to be lost; but fortunately the vessel was brought to, and lay with her

head to the wind; every sea making a clear breach over her, and the sky furiously pouring out wind and rain.

“The next day and the next (twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh) the gale continued with unabated violence, and at length increased to a perfect hurricane, with the vessel laboring very heavily. The dredge was now hove overboard, and a small piece of the storm staysail hoisted to bring her round to the wind. But the hawser parted, losing sixty fathoms of hawser, with squaresail boom and yards and two pigs of iron.

“While lying to during these protracted and unparalleled tempests, the hatches of the *Romer* were obliged to be kept constantly closed; the crew and passengers were confined in the little cabin, and the wild seas leaping and lashing themselves on deck, like infuriated animals, while the hurricane roared, and shrieked, and howled among the cordage and over the raging sea, like the prophetic voice of a dire destiny, which came at once to warn and destroy. For three days and three nights, at one time, all were thus confined below, not knowing, at every sharp dip of the little boat into the tremendous gulf between the mountain seas, whether she was to struggle up again to the air, or sink farther and farther down until she reached, with her living freight, those dreary depths of mid-ocean where float suspended so many ghastly and imperishable wrecks of things passed away forever from the knowledge and the memory of man.

“‘Along the dark and ruffled waters fled
The straining boat. A whirlwind swept it on
With fierce gusts and precipitating force;
Through the white ridges of the chafed sea,
The waves arose. Higher and higher still
Their fierce necks writhed beneath the tempest’s scourge,
Like serpents struggling in a vulture’s grasp.’

“And fearful and long protracted was the struggle between that little boat and the cool and determined skill of those who directed it, and the mighty ocean, lashed into its most magnificent grandeur by the torturing tempest. Often did hope quite abandon them, yet no cheek blanched with fear. Sometimes the captain or the mate would creep to the companion-way, cautiously open the hatch a little way, and look out to see the weather; watching the coming seas, as they tumbled their shapeless mountain masses towards the little vessel, and instantly closing the hatch as she buried her bows in the wave, which passed over her deck with a furious trample, making the vessel shudder through every timber. One great fear was, that if she escaped being swamped, her deck would be broken in by these tremendous seas; and in that case she would have filled and gone down ere the luckless voyagers had got a last glance at the sky.

“But the glorious little clipper lived through all, and on the afternoon of the twenty-seventh resumed her course to the eastward, skimming the dark waters like a bird. On the first of March she passed and spoke the ship *St. Patrick*, from Liverpool for New York, and on the fourth, for the first time during the voyage, a *dry spot was visible on the main deck*. At half-past four P.M., on the sixth, she made the Skelley Rocks, with two lights bearing

north-east by east, distant eighteen miles. At half-past eleven, P.M., made Cape Clear, light bearing north-north-east, distant sixteen miles.

"At nine o'clock the next morning a pilot-boat came alongside and a pilot was bargained for to take the Romer into Cork. A line was thrown from the Irish boat to the Romer, in the centre of which, in a tight noose, was securely fastened the pilot, who was then thrown into the sea, his friends keeping fast hold of the other end of the line. He was now hauled on board the Romer; and jumping on deck with the water dripping from him in streams, he made a single dash for the helm, singing out in the most indifferent manner imaginable, 'Port your helm!' On being asked by the captain if he would take something to prevent his catching cold, he pulled out a Father Mathew Temperance Medal, which he said, with a smile, was a sure preventive against taking cold.

"Arrived at Cork, the Man in the Glazed Cap started directly for Liverpool, whence he returned on the twelfth, and at noon on the next day the clipper got under way and started for home. In the meanwhile, however, an incident occurred on board the clipper which must not be omitted. On the eighth, while lying at Cork waiting the return of the messenger from Liverpool, the first officer of H. M. ship the Crocodile was sent on board by the admiral, with a request to Captain McGuire to *haul down the American Flag!* Suffice it to say that this strange request was peremptorily refused by Captain McGuire, and the officer took his departure. About three-quarters of an hour afterwards he returned with a very polite apology, stating that the admiral, from the smallness of his vessel, had taken Captain McGuire's clipper to be an English pilot-boat. This explanation was of course sufficient, and we are happy to state that *the gun on Admiral McGuire's vessel was not required to be used, and the Starry Pennant remained unruffled as his temper.*

"On leaving Cork Harbor, the Romer had the pleasure of outsailing the Irish pilot-boat which started with her, as well as of leaving several other vessels far behind her. She arrived home, as is already known, on the morning of the eleventh inst., *with five days' later foreign intelligence*, and with all on board in capital spirits and much improved in appearance by the voyage. It must be remembered that the clipper, in returning home, ran to the southward in search of smooth water, and thus made a thousand miles more of way than the packets which sailed at the same time. The fact about the relative speed of the pilot-boat and our best packets seems to be this: With a smooth sea and a good breeze, the pilot-boat can show anything that sails a clean pair of heels; but in rough weather and heavy seas the boat *must* lie to, while the ship cracks on in safety. On the voyage out, the time consumed by the Romer in lying to was equal to *nine days and nights*; and when this is deducted from her running time, we find that the Romer, in favorable weather, can make the trip either way in fifteen days. Capt. McGuire is an experienced and skilful navigator. He is of opinion that he can cross the Atlantic with the Romer, in all ordinary seasons, even in the winter, in less time than is required by any of the packet-ships.

"It is proper to add, in conclusion, that the ulterior objects of this mysterious voyage have never been made public.

"An article appears on our inside to-day which to some extent connects the

voyage with Newspaper Enterprise, but the objects appear not to be fully disclosed.

“The following is a list of the passengers, officers, and crew of this noble little craft, on her late voyage:—

PASSENGERS.

MONROE F. GALE,

WILLIAM BROGAN.

OFFICERS, ETC.

<i>Captain</i> JAMES MCGUIRE.
<i>First Mate</i> (one of the owners), JAMES J. WILKIE,
<i>Second Mate</i> , “ “ “ JAMES CONNER,
<i>Steward and Cook</i> , MARSHALL GREEN.

SEAMEN.

JAMES B. JOHNSON,
JAMES MCLEISLIE,

GEORGE COLTON,
EDWARD FRYER.”

INDEX.



INDEX.

A.

- ADDRESS, the Pittsburg, 148.
the Philadelphia, 171.
Advertising the Ledger, 346.
effects of, 346.
agencies, 348.
American Republican, the, 104.
Andrews, George H., 122, 138.
Angell, President, 24.
Archdeacon, English, on newspapers,
356.
- Arctic, the steamer, loss of, 230.
how the Times had news of,
231.
George H. Burns' narrative,
232.
Associated Press, the, 36, 326.
plan of, 327.
rivals of, 328.

B.

- BACON, E. M., 352.
Rev. Leonard, 343.
Balcom, Ransom, 173.
Baltimore Convention, 120.
Barnard, Rev. John, 16.
Beecher, Rev. Henry Ward, on H. J.
Raymond, 194.
eulogy on Henry J. Ray-
mond, 215.
and the Independent, 343.
Bennett, James Gordon, 37.
establishing the Herald, 37.
and Beach, uniting against
Greeley, 39.
personalities of, 43.
announcement of his mar-
riage, 44.
beaten at his own game, 230.
caricatured by the Times,
251.
and the Herald in 1870, 352.
Bigelow, John, 348, 352.
Boggs, William G., 348.
Bohemian trick, 250.
club, 330.
papers — See "Newspa-
pers."
- Bonner, Robert, 346.
Bores, newspaper, 266.
Bowen, Henry C., 343.
Brick Church, old, demolished, 154.
Briggs, Charles F., 144.
Bright, Rev. Edward, 344.
Brisbane, Albert, and Horace Gree-
ley, 54, 55.
on Fourier, 55.
Brockway, Clark, 15.
Lavinia, 15.
Brougham, John, 341.
Bruce, Benjamin F., 121.
Bryant, William C., reminiscences
by, 37.
to poets and poetesses, 268.
and the Evening Post, 348.
reminiscences by, 349.
and the Central Park, 349.
challenged, 351.
Buchanan, James, 150.
Buckle on the Press, 50.
Bundy, Jonas M., 348.
Burdett, Charles, 104.
Butler, Benj. F., letter from, 256.

C.

- CABLE excitement in 1858, 254.
Canals, H. J. Raymond on, 83.
the Nine Million bill, 83.
Charivari, Paris, 341.
- Chase, Lucien B., 150.
Childs, George W., 156.
Circulation of New York newspapers,
353.

- Clark, Myron H., 144.
 Clay, Henry, and H. J. Raymond, 26, 27.
 Clubs, Press, 328.
 Coleman, William, 348, 350.
 Comic journalism, 341.
 Commercial Advertiser, 51, 52, 347, 348.
 Commonwealth, Evening, 348.
 Communism — See "Socialism."
 Convention, Baltimore, 120.
 Henry J. Raymond in, 120.
 Republican, at Pittsburg, 147.
 Philadelphia, 170.
 Correspondents, war, 255.
 letter of Gen. Butler to, 256.
 Courier and Enquirer, 35, 38.
 H. J. Raymond in, 35, 38.
 twenty years ago, 52.
 socialist controversy with the Tribune, 58, 76.
 H. J. Raymond buying stock in, 82.
 withdrawal of H. J. Raymond from, 86, 87.
 Craig, D. H., 327.
 Crouse, L. L., 353.
 Cuba, the Times on, in, 1851, 99.
 Curtis, Geo. W., on Jenkins, 260.

D.

- DANA, Charles A., 194, 195.
 De Cordova, R. J., 144.
 Democrat, New York, 347.
 Duels between journalists, 36.
 Duelling, Evening Post on, 349, 351.
 Dutch papers — See "Newspapers."

E.

- EDITORS — See "Journalism."
 Evening Journal, Albany, 88, 318.
 Evening Mail, 347, 348.
 Evening papers, circulation of, 347.
 Evening Post, New York, in 1801, 37.
 index expurgatorius of, 264.
 on the Roorback hoax, 319.
 established, 347.
 Evening Post, history of, 51, 348, 350.
 on duelling, 349.
 and the Central Park, 349.
 See "Bryant, William C."
 Express, New York, 52, 348.
 Evangelist, New York, 344.
 Examiner and Chronicle, 344.

F.

- FEATHERSTONHAUGH — See "Roorback."
 Field, Rev. Henry M., on Henry J. Raymond, 227.
 editor of Evangelist, 344.
 Fillmore, Millard, 121, 122.
 candidacy of, in 1856, 150.
 Foreign newspapers in the United States, 335.
 Fourierism — see "Socialism."
 Freedman's Bureau bill, 174.
 Fremont, John C., 150.
 French papers — see "Newspapers."
 Future, the, 54.
 of journalism, 357, 358.

G.

- GALE, MONROE F., 40.
 pilot-boat voyage to Europe, 41.
 Garrison, William Lloyd, 147.
 "Gates Ajar," the, 227, 228.
 German papers — see "Newspapers."
 Godkin, E. L., 144, 221.
 Godwin, Parke, 54, 348.
 Greeley, Horace, 28, 29.
 employing H. J. Raymond, 29, 30.
 Greeley, Horace, establishing the Tribune, 30, 32, 38.
 tribute to H. J. Raymond, 32.
 error of, corrected, 32.
 visit to H. J. Raymond, 33.
 left by H. J. Raymond, 35.
 battle with Bennett and Beach, 39.
 receiving election news, 39.
 reply to J. W. Webb, 42, 43.
 and the Irish, 45.

- Greeley, Horace, reflections on Tribune fire, 46.
 and Albert Brisbane, 54, 55.
 on the socialist controversy, 54.
 on the rights of labor, 55.
 discussion on socialism with H. J. Raymond, 58-76.
 on political course of Henry J. Raymond, 190.
 and the Tribune in 1870, 351.
 Griswold, Rufus W., 30.

H.

- HALPINE, Charles G., 195, 345.
 Harbinger, the, 54.
 Harrison campaign, 28.
 Henderson, Isaac, 348.
 Hennessey, Michael, 107, 352.
 Herald, New York, 37, 38.
 former style of, 52.
 hatred of the Times, 91.
 present office of, 156.
 on the death of Henry J. Raymond, 212.
 injustice of, 214.
 Herald, New York, caricatured by the Times, 251.
 in 1870, 352.
 Hoaxes, newspaper, 44, 273.
 the Moon, 273.
 the Roorback, 317.
 the Lincoln Proclamation, 319.
 Hyacinthe, Father, 260.
 Home Journal, 347.
 Howe, Timothy O., 348.
 Hurlbut, William H., 144.

I.

- ILLUSTRATED papers, 345.
 Imperialist, the, 347.
 Independent, the, 342.
 and Mr. Beecher, 343.
 Index Expurgatorius, 264.
 Ireland, revolt in, in 1848, 45.
 Italy, campaign in — See "Raymond, Henry J.," and "Mincio, elbows of,"
 Italian papers — See "Newspapers."

J.

- JENKINS, romances of, 258, 259.
 Geo. W. Curtis on, 260.
 Jennings, L. J., 352.
 Jewish papers, 344.
 John Donkey, 341.
 Johnson, Andrew, 168, 169, 170, 174.
 Oliver, 343.
 Jones, George, and Henry J. Raymond, 88.
 in the Times, 91.
 as Henry J. Raymond's partner, 193.
 sketch of, 193.
 fulfilling requests of Henry J. Raymond, 222.
 responsible head of the Times, 352.
 Journal of Commerce, 38, 51, 52.
 Journalism in New York, 36.
 easy style of, before 1840, 36, 37.
 duels and horsewhippings, 36.
 changes of ten years, 47.
 periods in, 49.
 Macaulay on old, 49.
 Buckle on modern, 50.
 printer following pioneer, 50.
 Journalism, growth of, 50, 51.
 old papers dead, 38, 51.
 twenty years ago, 52, 53.
 the Times a remedy, 53.
 socialistic element in, 53.
 old newspaper offices, 155.
 Henry J. Raymond's ideas of, 224.
 war correspondents, 255.
 reporters, 257.
 Jenkins in, 258, 260.
 precision in, 263.
 newspaper bores, 266.
 newspaper hoaxes, 273.
 the press of to-day, 323.
 changes in, 324.
 catholic tone of, 324.
 profits of, 325.
 organization of a newspaper office, 325.
 prices of newspapers, 330.
 number of newspapers in New York, 330.
 comic, 341.
 political, 340.
 religious, 342.
 impersonal, 340, 351.
 W. C. Bryant on old style of, 349.

- Journalism, circulation of newspapers, 353.
 technical education in, 355.
 and General Lee's college, 355.
- Journalism, Thoreau on newspapers, 356.
 an English archdeacon on, 356.
 profits of, 356.
 old and new, 357.
 future of, 357, 358.

K.

- KANSAS feud, the, 147.
 Kladderadatsch, 341.
 Kossuth, Louis, arrival of, 109.
 reception of, 109.
- Kossuth, and Henry J. Raymond, 110.
 municipal banquet to, 110.
 press dinner to, 114.
 See "Raymond, Henry J."

L.

- LARDNER, Dr. Dionysius, 33.
 Leavitt, Rev. Joshua, 343.
 Ledger, Philadelphia, 156.
 New York, 346.
 Lee, General, and journalism, 355.
 Lecch, Charlotte, 17.
 Legislature, New York — See "Raymond, Henry J."
 address drawn by H. J. Raymond, 83.
 Leggett, William, 348.
 Letters — See "Raymond, Henry J."
 Lima, village of, 14.
 Raymond homestead in, 14.
 school-house in, 17.
- Lima, educational facilities enlarged, 18.
 Genesee Wesleyan Seminary in, 18, 19.
 Lincoln proclamation, forged, 319, 320.
 and the New York press, 320.
 Lobby, Congressional, and the Times, 105.
 Locke, Richard Adams, and the Moon hoax, 273.
 London Times, 340.
 Punch, etc., 341.

M.

- MACAULAY on old newspapers, 49.
 Madden, Senator E. M., 145.
 Magazines in New York, 334.
 Mann, Alexander, 19, 25.
 Mausfield, E. D., 25.
 Marsh, Edward W., 29.
 McDonald, Ranald, 352.
 McElrath, Thomas, 34, 39, 46.
 Meagher, Thomas Francis, 248.
 Methodist papers, 344.
- Mill, John Stuart, 229.
 Miucio, elbows of the, 238, 243.
 two versions of, 244.
 Mitchel, John, 344.
 Moon hoax, the, 273.
 Moore, Judge John, 139.
 Morris, George P., 347.
 Morgan, Christopher, 91.
 E. B., 91.
 Mrs. Grundy, 341.

N.

- NATION, the, 345.
 News, early difficulties of gathering, 39.
 present method of procuring, 326.
 New York, 347, 348.
- Newspapers, number of, in New York, 330.
 in foreign languages in the United States, 335.
 political, 340.
 comic, 341
- Newspapers, religious, 341.
 literary, 345.
 Sunday, 345.
 illustrated, 345.
 See "Journalism," and "Reporters."
- New York, western, in 1820, 13.
 population of, in 1820, 13.
 slaves in, 14.
 H. J. Raymond's arrival in, 29.
 old landmark removed, 154.

New York cable excitement in 1858, 254.
 number of newspapers in, 330.
 magazines in, 334.
 evening papers in, 347.
 morning journals in, 351.

New-Yorker, H. J. Raymond, writing for, 29.
 merged in the Tribune, 30.
 revived, 41.
 Norvell, Caleb C., 107, 352.

O.

O'BRIEN, Fitz James, 143, 144.
 Observer, New York, 343.

Ode, Fourth of July, by H. J. Raymond, 20.

P.

PALMER, Nehemiah C., 107.
 Park, Central, and W. C. Bryant, 349.
 Personalities in journalism, 251.
 —See "Herald," "Tribune," "Courier and Enquirer."
 Philadelphia Convention, the, 170.
 list of delegates to, 170.
 address of, 171.
 Phillips, Morris, 348.
 Pittsburg, Republican Convention, at, 147.
 address, 148.
 Pigeons, carrier, 40.
 Plumb, J. B., 91.
 Poets and poetesses, Wm. C. Bryant on, 268.

Political journalism, 340.
 Polk, James K., 318.
 Pond, George E., 352.
 Press clubs, 328, 330.
 Press, American — See "Journalism."
 Press and Globe, 347.
 Prices of newspapers, 330.
 Prime, Rev. S. I., 343.
 Rev. E. D. G., 343.
 Printers engaged on the Times, 107.
 Printing-House Square, 156.
 Profits of newspapers, present, 325.
 Prospectus, first of the New York Times, 93.
 Punch, 341.

R.

RAYMOND, Henry Jarvis, birth of, 15.
 early life, 16.
 a reader at three, 17.
 his first teacher, 17.
 a speaker at five, 17.
 studies as a schoolboy, 18.
 in the Wesleyan Seminary, 19.
 in a country store, 20.
 teacher of a district school, 20.
 Fourth of July ode by, 20.
 in college, 23.
 as a student, 24.
 reading Homer, 25.
 E. A. Stansbury on, 26.
 and Henry Clay, 26, 27.
 graduation, 27.
 first political speeches, 28.
 in the Harrison campaign, 28.
 arrival in New York, 29.
 visit to Horace Greeley, 29.
 advertising for a school, 29.
 in a law office, 29.

Raymond, Henry J., writing for the New-Yorker, 29.
 his account of his work, 29.
 employed by Horace Greeley, 29, 30.
 meagre pay and extra work, 30.
 as a correspondent, 30.
 in the Tribune, 30.
 determination of, 32.
 reporting Dr. Lardner's lectures, 33.
 serious illness of, 33.
 visited by Horace Greeley, 34.
 on remuneration, 34.
 Thomas McElrath on, 34.
 retirement from the Tribune, 35.
 in the Courier and Enquirer, 35.
 reporting Mr. Webster's speech, 40.
 first idea of the Times, 58.

- Raymond, Henry J., attack upon socialism, 58.
 discussion with Horace Greeley, 58-76.
 at twenty-eight, 77.
 apprised of burning of homestead, 77.
 letter to his father, 77.
 letter to his father and mother, 78.
 letter to his brother Samuel, 79.
 visit to Lima, 79.
 filial devotion of, 80, 229.
 generosity of, 80, 219, 221, 222.
 entrance into political life, 81.
 first election to the Assembly, 81.
 report on Rackett River, 81.
 return to editorial duty, 81, 82.
 buying stock in the Courier and Enquirer, 82.
 second election to the Assembly, 82.
 chosen speaker, 82.
 opening address, 82.
 as a parliamentarian, 83.
 on canals and schools, 83.
 session broken up, 83.
 address to people of the State, 83.
 comical incident, 84.
 and the Albany wolves, 84.
 rescued by Alden J. Spooner, 84, 85.
 difference with J. W. Webb, 86.
 withdrawal from the Courier and Enquirer, 86, 87.
 first visit to Europe, 86.
 letter from London, 87.
 and Thurlow Weed, 88.
 and George Jones, 88, 90, 91.
 a walk upon the ice, 89.
 proposes a new paper, 90.
 bargain with George Jones, 90.
 chosen editor of the Times, 91.
 his shares given to him, 91.
 attempts to prejudice, 92.
 second visit to Europe, 92.
 return of, 92.
 begins the Times, 95.
 salutatory address, 96.
- Raymond, Henry J., tributes to his assistants, 103.
 and Louis Kossuth, 110.
 sympathy for Hungary, 110.
 speech at the municipal banquet to Kossuth, 111.
 in conflict with J. W. Webb, 111.
 finishing what he undertook, 112.
 speech at the press dinner to Kossuth, 114.
 in the Baltimore Convention, 120.
 admitted as a delegate, 121.
 attempt to expel from Baltimore Convention, 122.
 and J. W. Webb, 122.
 Geo. H. Andrews, on, 122.
 despatch to the Times, 122.
 his defence in the Baltimore Convention, 125-138.
 Col. T. B. Thorpe on, 138.
 triumph of, at Baltimore, 138.
 Judge Moore on, 139.
 Albany Evening Journal on, 140.
 resolves to leave political life, 142.
 enlarges the Times, 143.
 again in politics, 144.
 elected delegate to the Saratoga Convention, 144.
 nominated for Lieutenant Governor, 144.
 elected Lieutenant-Governor, 145.
 taking his seat in the Senate, 145.
 return to New York, 145.
 declining a nomination for Governor, 145.
 letter to Senator Madden, 145.
 in the Pittsburg Convention, 148.
 Republican address drawn by, 148.
 in the Fremont campaign, 150.
 discussion with Lucien B. Chase, 150.
 battling secession, 160.
 speech at Albany, 160.
 warnings of, 161.

- Raymond, Henry J., letters to Wm. L. Yancey, 163.
 course of, in the war, 163.
 courage of, 164,
 and the riot of July, 1863,
 164.
 editorial articles on the
 riot, 164-6.
 address of, at Wilmington,
 168.
 delegate to Conventions,
 168.
 and Andrew Johnson, 168,
 169, 170.
 elected to Congress, 169.
 and reconstruction, 169.
 temporizing tendency of,
 170, 192.
 in the Philadelphia Con-
 vention, 170.
 Phila. address drawn by,
 171.
 political failure of, 173.
 on the Democratic party,
 178.
 letter to Ransom Balcom,
 173.
 forsakes Andrew Johnson,
 174.
 speech at Cooper Institute,
 174.
 declines a renomination to
 Congress, 184.
 letter to citizens of New
 York, 186.
 the Tribune on, 190.
 return to journalism, 193.
 relations with George
 Jones, 193.
 visit to Europe in 1867,
 194.
 farewell dinner to, 194.
 Rev. Henry Ward Beecher
 on, 194.
 speech at farewell dinner,
 197.
 return to New York, 200.
 speech at the Dickens din-
 ner, 201.
 devoted to the Times, 204.
 sudden death of, 205.
 effect of his death, 205.
 last appearance in public,
 206.
 tributes to his memory,
 206-214, 221.
 tardy justice to, 214.
 funeral of, 215.
 Beecher's eulogy on, 215.
 remains of, interred in
 Greenwood Cemetery,
 218.
 review of life of, 219.
 application of, 220.
 as a worker, 221.
 regard for subordinates,
 222.
 appreciation of labor, 222.
 tact of, 223.
 incidents in editorial life
 of, 223.
 ideas of journalism, 224.
 causes of his failures, 224.
 mental habits of, 225.
 methods of literary labor,
 225.
 his biography of Lincoln,
 226.
 college address by, 226.
 his biography of Wehster,
 226.
 address of, at Geneseo,
 227.
 mental activity of, 227.
 religious belief of, 227.
 and "Gates Ajar," 227.
 domestic relations of, 228,
 229.
 wife and children of, 228.
 kindness of, 228.
 why reserved, 228.
 his mother's words, 229.
 visit to Europe in 1859,
 160, 238.
 in the Italian campaign,
 238.
 on the "Elbows of the
 Mincio," 239.
 account of the battle of
 Solferino, 240.
 "run" of, from Solferino,
 241.
 challenged by T. F.
 Meagher, 248.
- Raymond, Henry W., 353.
 family, 15.
 Jarvis, 15, 16, 23.
 children of Jarvis and La-
 vinia, 15.
 Samuel B., 15.
 James Fitch, 15.
 homestead, 14.
- Homestead burned, 77.
 Henry J. Raymond on, 77.
 sold, 79.
- Receipts of New York newspapers,
 354.
- Religious journalism, 342.
- Reporters, tricks of, 39, 40.
 H. J. Raymond as a, 33, 40.

- Reporters on the Times, 257.
 anecdotes of, 258, 259.
 Bohemian club, 330.
- Republic, the New York, 347.
- Republican party, birth of, 147.
- Revolution, the, 344.
- Romer, W. J., pilot boat, 41.
 her voyage across the ocean,
 41.
- Roorback hoax, the, 317.
- Roorback hoax, Evening Journal on,
 318.
 Evening Post on, 319.
- Roosevelt, Robert B., 195.
 "To Raymond on his
 Travels," 196.
 and the Citizen, 345.
- Rowell, George P. & Co., 334.
- Ruggles, Francis B., 91.
- Russell, William H., 255.

S.

- SCANDINAVIAN papers — See "News-
 papers."
- School-house in Lima, 17.
- Sedley, Henry, 345, 352.
- Seminary, Genesee Wesleyan, 18, 19.
- Sewell, W. G., 144.
- Seymour, Charles C. B., 143.
 Edward, 144.
- Sheppard, George, 352.
- Simouton, James W., 104.
 and the Congressional lob-
 by, 105.
 and Dr. Tuthill, 143.
 and the Associated Press,
 327.
- Sinclair, R. R., 352.
- Slavery — See "Baltimore Con-
 vention," "Pittsburg Convention,"
 "Yancey," "Raymond."
- Slaves in New York in 1820, 14.
- "Slievegammon" hoax, 44, 45.
- Socialism twenty years ago, 52.
 in the New York press, 54.
 fallacies of, 55.
 failures of, 56.
 list of experiments in, 56,
 57.
- "South" and his adventure, 232.
- Spanish papers — See "Newspapers."
- Spaulding, James R., 25, 105.
- Speeches by Henry J. Raymond: —
 in the Harrison campaign,
 28.
 at the municipal banquet to
 Kossuth, 111.
 at the press banquet to
 Kossuth, 114.
 in the Baltimore Con-
 vention, 125-138.
 at Albany, 160.
 at Wilmington, 168.
 at Cooper Institute, 174.
 at a farewell dinner, 197.
 at the Dickens dinner, 201.
 before alumni of Universi-
 ty of Vermont, 226.
 at Geneseo, 227.
- Spoooner, Alden J., and H. J. Ray-
 mond, 84, 85.
- Spring, Rev. Gardiner, 154.
- Stansbury, E. A., on H. J. Raymond,
 26.
- Storrs, Rev. R. S., Jr., 343.
- Sun, New York, under Beach, 37.
- Sunday papers, 345.
- Swain, James B., 107.
- Swinton, John, 353.
 William, 353.

T.

- TELEGRAM, New York, 347, 348.
- Thompson, Rev. J. P., 343.
 Jacob, 352.
- Thoreau on newspapers, 356.
- Thorpe, Col. T. B., 138.
- Tilton, Theodore, 195, 343.
- Times, New York, 38, 53, 88.
 advertised, 92, 93.
 project of, broached, 90.
 capital of, subscribed, 91.
 name selected, 91.
 first owners of, 91.
 formal announcement of, 91,
 93.
 tempest created by, 91, 92.
- Times, first prospectus of, 93.
 first office of, 95.
 first night of, 96.
 salutatory address, 96.
 a success, 98.
 on Cuba, 99.
 handbill of, 99.
 amount of capital sunk in, 100.
 results of first year of, 100,
 101.
 first workers on, 103.
 and the Congressional lobby,
 105.
 enlarged, 143.
 new writers employed, 143.

- Times**, purchase of new site for, 155.
 a new building erected, 155.
 its present office, 156.
 in the riot week of 1863, 164.
 increasing prosperity of, 193.
 rise in value of shares, 204.
 sale of, refused, 204.
 beating Bennett at his own
 game, 230.
 getting news of the Arctic,
 231.
 a night scene in the office of,
 233.
 and the "Elbows of the Min-
 cio," 238, 243.
 and the carriers' address, 250.
 caricaturing Bennett, 251.
 on the cable excitement, 254.
 and George Jones, 88, 91, 193,
 222, 352.
 in 1870, 352.
 editorial force of, 352.
- Tribune**, New York, 28.
 established, 30, 32, 38.
 original capital of, 38.
- Tribune**, reporter playing a trick, 39,
 40.
 and the "Slievegammon"
 hoax, 44.
 office burned, 46.
 joint-stock company, 47.
 in disrepute, 52, 58.
 socialistic controversy with
 the *Courier and Enquirer*,
 58-76.
 profits of, 90.
 hatred of the *Times*, 91.
 notice to carriers of, 92.
 secession from, 92.
 in the war, 164.
 on political course of Henry
 J. Raymond, 190.
 on the death of Henry J.
 Raymond, 209.
 injustice of, 214.
 in 1870, 351.
- Tricks of reporters**, 39, 40.
 Bohemian, 250.
- Tuthill**, Dr. Frank, 143, 144.
- U.**
- UNIVERSITY of Vermont**, 23.
- VANITY Fair**, 341.
- WAR**, civil, beginning of, 163.
 Henry J. Raymond's course in,
 163.
- Webb**, James Watson, 32.
 attack upon Horace Greeley,
 42.
 quarrel with H. J. Raymond,
 86.
 in a dinner conflict, 111, 113.
 and H. J. Raymond in the Bal-
 timore Convention, 122.
- Webb**, John, 352.
- Webster**, Daniel, Raymond's biogra-
 phy of, 226.
- Weed**, Thurlow, and Henry J. Ray-
 mond, 88.
- Welden**, Charles, 143, 144.
- Welsh papers** — See "Newspapers."
- Wesley**, E. B., 90, 91.
- Willis**, N. P., 347.
- Wilson**, Alexander C., 103.
- World**, New York, 352.
 on the death of Henry J. Ray-
 mond, 213.
- Y.**
- YANKEE**, William L., 163.
- Yankee Doodle**, 341.

